

**Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project Title: Zone 12 Line P – San Leandro Creek Desilting Project

2. Lead Agency name and address:

Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
399 Elmhurst Street  
Hayward, CA 94544

3. Contact person and phone number:

Emmanuel da Costa  
Phone: (510) 670-6479

4. Project location:

The proposed project is located on the Zone 12 Line P flood control channel (San Leandro Creek) approximately 110 feet upstream of the 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue bridge and 130 feet downstream of the Hegenberger Road bridge in the City of Oakland (see Figures 1 and 2).

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

COUNTY OF  
ALAMEDA  
399 Elmhurst Street  
Hayward, CA 94544

ALAMEDA COUNTY FLOOD  
CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
399 Elmhurst Street  
Hayward, CA 94544

OTHER:

6. General plan  
designation: Central Business & Business Mix

7. Zoning: Flood Plain

8. Description of project:

The Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) proposes to remove approximately 5,000 cubic yards of deposited silt along approximately 2,500 linear feet in an earthen flood control channel (designated Line P in the District's Zone No. 12-San Leandro Creek) from approximately 110 feet upstream of the 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue bridge to 130 feet downstream of the Hegenberger Road bridge (see Figure 1). Desilting the existing flood control channel will increase capacity to the original design configuration. The project consists of the placement of inflatable dams at the upstream and downstream limits of the project and placement of a pipe to route water around the construction area, the removal of silt using a long reach excavator stationed on the banks along the existing access roads on both sides of the channel, and the removal of the silt offsite to a landfill.



The Zone 12 Line P (San Leandro Creek) Desilting Project (project) site is approximately 2,500 linear feet in length by approximately 50 to 100 feet wide. Removal of sediments would restore the original design configuration and capacity of the channel. A long reach excavator would be staged primarily on the existing access road above the north bank of the project site. This existing access road runs the length of the project. The excavator would place materials into dump trucks that will deposit the accumulated silt at an upland disposal site.

The upstream coffer dam would be positioned approximately 110 feet upstream of the 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue bridge and the downstream coffer dam would be positioned under the Hegenberger Road crossing both in the flood control channel to restrict both tidal and fluvial flow from disturbing the project site during the desilting operation and will be removed after the project is complete. Creek flow would be directed downstream using piping and pumps.

Accumulated sediments removed during the proposed maintenance desilting project would be delivered to the Alameda County Flood Control District silt-transfer site on Grant Avenue in the City of San Lorenzo. This would require trucks to travel from the project site south down Highway 880, south on Washington Avenue and continue west on Grant Avenue to the landfill. Trucks would return to the project site along the same route.

The purpose of the project is to remove accumulated silt that decreases capacity and obstructs flow within the existing flood control channel. This maintenance project would relieve potential flooding of the area surrounding the project site and upstream of the 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing.

#### 9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Surrounding land uses:

The flood control channel (Zone 12, Line P – San Leandro Creek) is owned by the District. The subject property is bordered to the north by residential property and urban open space. To the west, south, and east of the subject property are commercial properties. The project area is designated as Central Business & Business Mix according to the City of Oakland General Plan.

Setting:

Zone 12, Line P (San Leandro Creek) was created by the Army Corps of Engineers as a flood control channel for residents living in the San Leandro Creek Watershed. Currently, Line P is a trapezoidal earth channel with a bottom width of 50 feet, top width of 100 feet, and 2:1 side slopes. It drains directly into San Leandro Bay.

Ecology of the Line P channel is tidal wetland dominated by rushes, sedges, and grasses common to the Bay Area. There are no significant stands of trees or shrubs within the project area of impact though a few scattered trees and shrubs do exist along the access road. The vegetation loss associated with the project is not considered significant because the rushes, sedges, and grasses common to the area would quickly reestablish via fluvial processes and tidal cycling which re-distribute seeds (see photograph below).



The flood control channel conveys freshwater flows from a large urban watershed. The watershed is approximately forty eight square miles and is located in the southeast section of the City of Oakland.

Upstream of the 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing, the channel consists of both alternating concrete and earthen segments extending all the way to the base of Lake Chabot Dam where line P confluences with line P-1.

A cross-section of the channel reveals the project site supports open water habitat with emergent tidal marsh throughout the reach. Ruderal vegetation then covers the upper bank on the north side of the channel as the site transitions into a gravel access road that separates the site from the agricultural field. The southern bank transitions into a dirt pathway that separates the channel from commercial buildings, a parking lot, and empty dirt lot.

Topography of the project site is generally flat along the channel bed, with moderately sloped banks on both sides (2:1 design build), forming plateaus that are used as access roads approximately 10 feet above the bed. The generally flat channel bed has some local variations in topography due to accumulated silt.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)  
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

Both the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) will be consulted prior to the issuance of any of the above permits. (23)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the checklists and responses contained on the following pages:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials   | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project; nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Rick Ruiz, Deputy Director – Maintenance and  
Operations

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
For

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:**

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**II. 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:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 on the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**III. AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Results in a conversation of Oak Woodlands that will have a significant effect on the environment   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:**

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**VII. 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –**

**Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:**

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**X. 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?                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-born vibration or ground-born noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

- |                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Fire protection?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Police protection?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Schools?               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Parks?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**XIV. RECREATION**

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |                                     |
| 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)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

## ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

**An explanation of the basis for the response to each item in Sections I through XVII and of ways to mitigate any identified significant impacts are provided below unless the item has been checked “No Impact” and one or more of the references in Section 18 has been cited in the parentheses following the item.**

### **I. AESTHETICS**

The Zone 12, Line P (San Leandro Creek) flood control channel area consists of level, urbanized space gently descending toward the Hegenberger Road crossing. There are no scenic vistas and no state-designated scenic highways in the project area. Views toward the project are of flood control channels and associated maintenance access roads, rights-of-way, fences, light industrial and commercial facilities, and agricultural fields. North of the project area includes the plowed row crops on the agricultural fields. The east, west, and south limits of the project are bordered by light industrial and commercial properties.

- a) **No Impact.** The project would not adversely affect a scenic vista. No scenic vistas exist, no view-affecting structures would be erected, and equipment would not be of a size that would affect views. (16, 2)
- b) **No Impact.** No relevant state designated scenic route or highway exists with views of the project site. (16, 2)
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** No structures would be erected that would permanently change the visual character of the project site. The project would remove vegetation along the flood control channel resulting in short-term alteration of the naturally vegetated visual character. The channel is not designed as a visual resource, and the impact would be less than significant. (3)
- d) **No Impact.** No new permanent structures or sources of lighting are proposed as part of this project. Construction would occur during daylight hours and would not introduce a new source of light. Construction equipment would not create a discernible glare. (3)

### **II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

- a) **No Impact.** No farmland designated Prime, Unique, or of Statewide Importance occurs within or immediately adjacent to the project site would be considered part of the project impact area. (20)
- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not change the zoning or current land use of the project area or other area, including agricultural lands. No conflict with existing agricultural zoning or with a Williamson Act contract would result from project construction. (6, 20)

- c) **No Impact.** The project is limited to maintenance activities within existing disturbed areas and does not propose any activity that directly or indirectly would change the existing environment conversion of farmland to non- agricultural uses would result. (6, 20)

### **III. AIR QUALITY**

The City of Oakland is located in western Alameda County, part of the 9-county San Francisco Bay Air Basin. Oakland is bounded on the west by San Francisco Bay. Oakland is indirectly affected by marine air flow. Marine air entering through the Golden Gate is blocked by the East Bay hills, forcing the air to diverge into northerly and southerly paths. The southern flow is directed down the bay, parallel to the hills, where it eventually passes over the Oakland area. These sea breezes are strongest in the afternoon. The further from the ocean the marine air travels, however, the ocean's effect is diminished. Thus, although the climate of Oakland is affected by sea breezes, it is affected less so than the regions of the Bay Area closer to the Golden Gate.

The climate of the San Francisco Bay Area, including the project site, is classified as Mediterranean, with mild wet winters and warm dry summers. Local climate is influenced by topography and proximity to the Pacific Ocean and the Bay. Winds are predominately from west to east and average 10.1 miles per hour. In the summer months, there is a strong west-east temperature gradient with inland temperatures much higher than nearby coastal temperatures.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) maintains air quality monitors throughout the Bay Area, with one monitoring station located in Oakland. Oakland currently meets current State standards for all identified pollutants<sup>1</sup>.

- a to c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The Bay Area is in attainment for all federal and state standards except for the state standards for ozone (one-hour standard), particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) (annual mean and 24-hour standards), and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (annual mean) (13). In addition, the Bay Area is considered a marginal non-attainment area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard and is waiting for re-designation to attainment for the federal 1-hour ozone standard (13)

The operation of construction equipment during sediment removal and disposal would result in vehicular emissions; however, these emissions would be temporary. In addition, handling of dry sediments and operation of construction equipment on unpaved roads may cause PM<sub>10</sub> emissions.

In order to limit the generation of PM<sub>10</sub> at the project sites, best management practices (BMP's) shall be implemented consistent with BAAQMD regulations, including the following.

- Trucks hauling sediments and other loose material shall be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Tailgates of trucks shall be sealed.
- Trucks shall be brushed down before leaving the project site.
- Unpaved access roads and staging areas shall be watered three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied to control dust generation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mike Basso, BAAQMD, Jan. 15 2008. [mbasso@baaqmd.gov](mailto:mbasso@baaqmd.gov) [http://www.baaqmd.gov/pio/aq\\_summaries/pollsum06.pdf](http://www.baaqmd.gov/pio/aq_summaries/pollsum06.pdf)

- Paved site access roads shall be swept when visible soil material is carried onto the roadway.
- d) **No Impact.** No sensitive receptors are located on or near the project site and none would be affected by implementation of the project.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities would result in minor short-term emissions from construction equipment and some dust generation. This impact would be temporary in nature during construction of the project due to construction vehicle exhaust and excavation of the channel bottom, which may have associated odors. It is anticipated that the increase would be less than significant because it is temporary and would disperse before reaching sensitive receptors. (13)

#### **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- a) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** An evaluation for special status species was conducted as part of a biological survey (23), consisting of site surveys, a review of available literature. A list of protected species that potentially occur within the San Leandro USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle was provided in the biological survey (23). These lists and other available information were screened for candidate, sensitive, or special status species for which habitat might exist on or near the project site. A site reconnaissance level survey was conducted on November 2007, to determine whether there was a potential for the occurrence of any of these species. (23, 27)

Of the 125 special-status species that could occur in the region, six were determined during the field survey to have the potential to occur within the project area. These include burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), Alameda song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia pusillula*), California clapper rail (*Rallus lonirostris obsoletus*), and Steelhead-Central California Coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).

**Table 1, below, includes a summary of the animal species potential for occurrence in the project site**

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<b>Birds</b>					
<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>	Cooper's hawk	-	SC-	Woodland, Chiefly Of Open, Interrupted Or Marginal Type.	No suitable woodland habitat present in Study Area
<i>Accipiter striatus</i>	sharp-shinned hawk	-	SC-	Ponderosa Pine, Black Oak, Riparian Deciduous, Mixed Conifer & Jeffrey Pine Habitats. Prefers Riparian Areas.	No suitable woodland habitat present in Study Area
<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	tricolored blackbird	-	SC-	Highly Colonial Species, Most Numerous In Central Valley & Vicinity. Largely Endemic To California.	Not likely to occur. Closest reported occurrence is approximately 13 miles south of Study Area.
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	golden eagle	-	SC-	Rolling Foothills, Mountain Areas, Sage-Juniper Flats, & Desert.	No suitable woodland habitat present in Study Area
<i>Ardea herodias</i>	great blue heron	-	-SA	Colonial Nester In Tall Trees, Cliffsides, And Sequestered Spots On Marshes.	No suitable nesting habitat available in Study Area. Potential foraging habitat available.
<i>Asio flammeus</i>	short-eared owl	-	-SC	Found In Swamp Lands, Both Fresh And Salt; Lowland Meadows; Irrigated Alfalfa Fields.	Not likely to occur. Dense vegetation requirements are not present in Study Area
<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	burrowing owl	-	-SC	Open, Dry Annual Or Perennial Grasslands, Deserts & Scrublands Characterized By Low-Growing Vegetation.	<b>Low potential to occur in Study Area.</b>
<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>	marbled murrelet	FT	SE	Feeds Near-Shore; Nests Inland Along Coast From Eureka To Oregon Border & From Half Moon Bay To Santa Cruz.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>	western snowy plover	FT	-SC	Sandy Beaches, Salt Pond Levees & Shores Of Large Alkali Lakes.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	northern harrier	-	-SC	Coastal Salt & Fresh-Water Marsh. Nest & Forage In Grasslands, From Salt Grass In Desert Sink To Mountain Cienagas.	No suitable nesting habitat is present in Study Area, however suitable foraging habitat is present.
<i>Dendroica petechia brewsteri</i>	yellow warbler	-	-SC	Riparian Plant Associations. Prefers Willows, Cottonwoods, Aspens, Sycamores, & Alders For Nesting & Foraging.	<b>Low potential to occur. Marginal nesting habitat is present in Study Area.</b>
<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	white-tailed kite	-	-SA	Rolling Foothills And Valley Margins With Scattered Oaks & River Bottomlands Or Marshes Next To Deciduous Woodland.	No suitable woodland or foothill habitat present in Study Area

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	American peregrine falcon	Delisted	SE	Near Wetlands, Lakes, Rivers, Or Other Water; On Cliffs, Banks, Dunes, Mounds; Also, Human-Made Structures.	<b>Low potential to forage in Study Area.</b>
<i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i>	saltmarsh common yellowthroat	-	-SC	Resident Of The San Francisco Bay Region, In Fresh And Salt Water Marshes.	No suitable nesting or foraging habitat (dense vegetation requirements) are present in Study Area
<i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>	California black rail	-	ST	Inhabits Freshwater Marshes, Wet Meadows & Shallow Margins Of Saltwater Marshes Bordering Larger Bays.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Melospiza melodia pusillula</i>	Alameda song sparrow	-	-SC	Resident Of Salt Marshes Bordering South Arm Of San Francisco Bay.	<b>Suitable marginal nesting and foraging habitat present in Study Area</b>
<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>	black-crowned night heron	-	-SA	Colonial Nester, Usually In Trees, Occasionally In Tule Patches.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</i>	California brown pelican	FE	SE	Colonial Nester On Coastal Islands Just Outside The Surf Line.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>	double-crested cormorant	-	-SC	Colonial Nester On Coastal Cliffs, Offshore Islands, & Along Lake Margins In The Interior Of The State.	Not likely to occur. Marginal nesting habitat present, however closest reported nesting occurrences are on the San Mateo & Oakland Bay Bridge.
<i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i>	California clapper rail	FE	SE	Salt-Water & Brackish Marshes Traversed By Tidal Sloughs In The Vicinity Of San Francisco Bay.	<b>Potential to occur. Foraging habitat is present in Study Area and closest reported occurrence is approximately 100 meters downstream.</b>
<i>Riparia riparia</i>	bank swallow	-	ST	Colonial Nester; Nests Primarily In Riparian And Other Lowland Habitats West Of The Desert.	No suitable roosting/nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Rynchops niger</i>	black skimmer	-	-SC	Nests On Gravel Bars, Low Islets, And Sandy Beaches, In Unvegetated Sites. Nesting Colonies Usually Less Than 200 Pairs.	No suitable nesting habitat present in Study Area
<i>Sternula antillarum browni</i>	California least tern	FE	SE	Nests Along The Coast From San Francisco Bay South To Northern Baja California.	No suitable breeding habitat present in Study Area
<b>Amphibians/Reptiles</b>					
<i>Actinemys marmorata</i>	western pond turtle	-	-SC	A Thoroughly Aquatic Turtle Of Ponds, Marshes, Rivers, Streams & Irrigation Ditches With Aquatic Vegetation.	No suitable breeding habitat present in Study Area
<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>	California tiger salamander	FT	-SC	Central Valley Dps Listed As Threatened. Santa Barbara & Sonoma Counties Dps Listed As Endangered.	No suitable breeding habitat present in Study Area

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<i>Caretta caretta</i>	loggerhead turtle	FT	-	Sandy Beaches, Open Ocean, And Benthic Feeding Grounds	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	green turtle	FT	-	Sandy Beaches, Open Ocean, And Benthic Feeding Grounds	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>	ridley sea turtle	FT	-	Sandy Beaches, Open Ocean, And Benthic Feeding Grounds, & Estuaries.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus</i>	Alameda whipsnake	FT	ST	Restricted To Valley-Foothill Hardwood Habitat Of The Coast Ranges Between Vic Of Monterey And N San Francisco Bay.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>	California red-legged frog	FT	-SC	Lowlands & Foothills In Or Near Permanent Sources Of Deep Water With Dense, Shrubby Or Emergent Riparian Vegetation.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Rana boylei</i>	foothill yellow-legged frog	-	-SC	Partly-Shaded, Shallow Streams & Riffles With A Rocky Substrate In A Variety Of Habitats.	No suitable freshwater habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia</i>	San Francisco garter snake	FE	SE	Vicinity Of Freshwater Marshes, Ponds And Slow Moving Streams In San Mateo County & Extreme Northern Santa Cruz County.	No suitable freshwater habitat present in Study Area.
<b>Mammals</b>					
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	pallid bat	-	-SC	Deserts, Grasslands, Shrublands, Woodlands & Forests. Most Common In Open, Dry Habitats With Rocky Areas For Roosting.	Not likely to occur. No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Dipodomys heermanni berkeleyensis</i>	Berkeley kangaroo rat	-	-SA	Open Grassy Hilltops & Open Spaces In Chaparral & Blue Oak/Digger Pine Woodlands.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Dipodomys venustus venustus</i>	Santa Cruz kangaroo rat	-	-SA	Silverleaf Manzanita Mixed Chaparral In The Zayante Sand Hills Ecosystem Of The Santa Cruz Mountains.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	western mastiff bat	-	-SC	Many Open, Semi-Arid To Arid Habitats, Including Conifer & Deciduous Woodlands, Coastal Scrub, Grasslands, Chaparral Etc	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Lasionycteris noctivagans</i>	silver-haired bat	-	-SC	Primarily A Coastal & Montane Forest Dweller Feeding Over Streams, Ponds & Open Brushy Areas.	No suitable roosting habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>	hoary bat	-	-SC	Prefers Open Habitats Or Habitat Mosaics, With Access To Trees For Cover & Open Areas Or Habitat Edges For Feeding.	Not likely to occur. Closest reported occurrences are 6 miles away and historic.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<i>Nyctinomops macrotis</i>	big free -tailed bat	-	-SC	Low-Lying Arid Areas In Southern California.	No suitable roosting habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>	salt-marsh harvest mouse	FE	SE	Only In The Saline Emergent Wetlands Of San Francisco Bay And Its Tributaries.	Not likely to occur. No suitable dense pickleweed habitat present in Study Area. Closest reported occurrence is approximately 1 mile north at Arrowhead marsh.
<i>Scapanus latimanus parvus</i>	Alameda Island mole	-	-SC	Only Known From Alameda Island. Found In A Variety Of Habitats, Especially Annual & Perennial Grasslands.	No suitable upland habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Sorex vagrans halicoetes</i>	salt-marsh wandering shrew	-	-SC	Salt Marshes Of The South Arm Of San Francisco Bay.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	American badger	-	-SC	Most Abundant In Drier Open Stages Of Most Shrub, Forest, And Herbaceous Habitats, With Friable Soils.	No suitable shrub habitat present in Study Area.
<b>Invertebrates</b>					
<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	vernal pool fairy shrimp	FT	-	Endemic To The Grasslands Of The Central Valley, Central Coast Mtns, And South Coast Mtns, In Astatic Rain-Filled Pools.	No suitable vernal pool habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Calicina minor</i>	Edgewood blind harvestman	-	-SA	Open Grassland In Areas Of Serpentine Bedrock.	No suitable serpentine habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Cicindela hirticollis gravida</i>	sandy beach tiger beetle	-	-SA	Inhabits Areas Adjacent To Non-Brackish Water Along The Coast Of California From San Francisco Bay To Northern Mexico.	No suitable non-brackish water habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	monarch butterfly	-	-SA	Winter Roost Sites Extend Along The Coast From Northern Mendocino To Baja California, Mexico.	No suitable roosting habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Efferia antiochi</i>	Antioch efferian robberfly	-	-SA	Known Only From Contra Costa And Fresno Counties.	Study Area is out of known species range.
<i>Euphydryas editha bayensis</i>	Bay checkerspot butterfly	FT	-	Restricted To Native Grasslands On Outcrops Of Serpentine Soil In The Vicinity Of San Francisco Bay.	No suitable serpentine habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Helminthoglypta nickliniana bridgesi</i>	Bridges' coast range shoulderband (snail)	-	-	Inhabits Open Hillsides Of Alameda And Contra Costa Counties.	No suitable upland habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Hydrochara rickseckeri</i>	Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle	-	-SA	AQUATIC (Freshwater).	No suitable habitat in Study Area.
<i>Icaricia icarioides missionensis</i>	mission blue butterfly	FE	-	Coastal Chaparral And Coastal Grasslands.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Incisalia mossii bayensis</i>	San Bruno elfin butterfly	FE	-	Coastal Mountains & Rocky Outcrops Around Its Host Plant <i>Sedum Spathulifolium</i> .	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<i>Ichnura gemina</i>	San Francisco Forktail Damselfly	-	-SA	AQUATIC (Freshwater).	No suitable habitat in Study Area.
<i>Lepidurus packardii</i>	vernal pool tadpole shrimp	FE	-	Inhabits Vernal Pools And Swales In The Sacramento Valley Containing Clear To Highly Turbid Water.	No suitable vernal pool habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Microcina leei</i>	Lee's micro-blind harvestman	-	-SA	Xeric Habitats In The San Francisco Bay Region.	No suitable grassland habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Microcina lumi</i>	Lum's micro-blind harvestman	-	-SA	Xeric Habitats In San Francisco Bay Region	No suitable grassland habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Nothochrysa californica</i>	San Francisco lacewing	-	-SA	Coastal Woodlands	Occurrence of species is historic (1959)
<i>Speyeria callippe callippe</i>	callippe silverspot butterfly	FE	-	Restricted To The Northern Coastal Scrub Of The San Francisco Peninsula.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Speyeria zerene myrtleae</i>	Myrtle's silverspot	FE	-	Restricted To The Foggy, Coastal Dunes/Hills Of The Point Reyes Peninsula; Extirpated From Coastal San Mateo County.	No suitable habitat present in Study Area.
<i>Tryonia imitator</i>	mimic tryonia (=California brackishwater snail)	-	-SA	Inhabits Coastal Lagoons, Estuaries And Salt Marshes, From Sonoma County South To San Diego County.	Potential to occur, however it is assumed to be extirpated from Study Area
<b>Fishes</b>					
<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	Green Sturgeon	FT	-	Spawns In The Sacramento River And The Klamath River.	No suitable spawning habitat present in Study Area. (Leidy 2007)
<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	tidewater goby	FE	SC-	Brackish Water Habitats Along The Calif Coast From Agua Hedionda Lagoon, San Diego Co. To The Mouth Of The Smith River.	Not likely to occur. Suitable habitat present, however historic San Francisco Bay populations have been extirpated.
<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	Delta smelt	FT	ST	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Seasonally In Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait & San Pablo Bay.	No suitable spawning habitat present in Study Area. (Leidy 2007)
<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	coho salmon	FT	SE	Coastal Streams And Open Ocean	Suitable habitat is present, however it is presumed extinct in Study Area. (Leidy 2007)
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>	Steelhead - Central California Coast ESUs	FT	-	From Russian River, South To Soquel Cr & To, But Not Including, Pajaro River. Also San Francisco & San Pablo Bay Basins.	<b>Suitable habitat is present in the Study Area. (Leidy 2007)</b>
<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha spring-run</i>	spring-run chinook salmon	FT	ST	Adult No.S Depend On Pool Depth & Volume, Amount Of Cover, & Proximity To Gravel. Water Temps >27 C Lethal To Adults	Suitable habitat is present, however it is presumed extinct in Study Area. (Leidy 2007)
<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha winter-run</i>	chinook salmon winter-run	FE	SE	Sacramento River Below Keswick Dam. Spawns In The Sacramento River But Not In Tributary Streams.	Suitable habitat is present, however species is presumed extinct in Study Area. (Leidy 2007)

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Habitat	Potential Occurrence
		Fed	State		
<p><b><u>Status Key:</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Federal Status</i></b>  FE – Federally listed as endangered  FT – Federally listed as threatened</p> <p><b><i>State Status</i></b>  SE – State listed as endangered  ST – State listed as threatened  SC – State Species of Concern  SA – Special Animal - A species that the CDFG tracks. Although it does not have state or federal status, it is regulated by CEQA as a species that may be locally rare, or is designated as a special status, sensitive, or declining species by other state or federal agencies, or non-governmental organizations, including: the World Conservation Union (IUCN), American Fisheries Society (AFS), Audubon Watch List, BLM - Sensitive, CDF - Sensitive, USFS- Sensitive, FWS - Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC), American Bird Conservancy Green Lists (ABC), US Bird Conservation Watch List (USBC), Western Bat Working Group (WBWG), or the Xerces Society, Red List of Pollinators.</p>					
		<p><b>California Native Plant Society (Cnps) Status</b></p> <p>1A – Plants Presumed Extinct In California</p> <p>1B – Plants Rare, Threatened, Or Endangered In California And Elsewhere</p> <p>2 – Plants Rare, Threatened, Or Endangered In California, But More Common Elsewhere</p>			

**Table 2: Special Status Plant Species with the Potential to Occur at Zone 5, Line K**

Family	Scientific Name	Common name	Status			Habitat	Blooming Period	Occurrence in Study Area
			Fed	State	CNPS			
<b>Apiaceae</b>	<i>Sanicula maritima</i>	adobe sanicle	-	SR	List 1B.1	Chaparral, Coastal Prairie, Meadows And Seeps, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Clay, Serpentinite	Feb-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Asteraceae</b>	<i>Balsamorhiza macrolepis</i> var. <i>macrolepis</i>	big-scale balsamroot	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Sometimes Serpentinite	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>congdonii</i>	Congdon's tarplant	-	-	List 1B.2	Valley And Foothill Grassland(Alkaline)	May-Oct(Nov)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Cirsium fontinale</i> var. <i>fontinale</i>	fountain thistle	FE	SE	List 1B.1	Chaparral(Openings), Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite Seeps	Jun-Oct	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Eriophyllum latilobum</i>	San Mateo woolly sunflower	FE	SE	List 1B.1	Cismontane Woodland(Often Serpentinite, On Roadcuts)	May-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Helianthella castanea</i>	Diablo helianthella	-	-	List 1B.2	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Scrub, Riparian Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Hesperevax sparsiflora</i> var. <i>brevifolia</i>	short-leaved evax	-	-	List 2.2	Coastal Bluff Scrub(Sandy), Coastal Dunes	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Holocarpha macradenia</i>	Santa Cruz tarplant	FT	SE	List 1B.1	Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Often Clay, Sandy	Jun-Oct	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Lasthenia conjugens</i>	Contra Costa goldfields	FE	-	List 1B.1	Cismontane Woodland, Playas(Alkaline), Valley And Foothill Grassland, Vernal Pools/Mesic	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Lessingia arachnoidea</i>	Crystal Springs lessingia	-	-	List 1B.2	Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite, Often Roadsides	Jul-Oct	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Layia carnosa</i>	beach layia	FE	SE	1B.1	Coastal Dunes, Coastal Scrub	Mar-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<i>Micropus amphibolus</i>	Mt. Diablo cottonweed	-	-	List 3.2	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Rocky	Mar-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area	

Family	Scientific Name	Common name	Status			Habitat	Blooming Period	Occurrence in Study Area
			Fed	State	CNPS			
	<i>Pentachaeta bellidiflora</i>	white-rayed pentachaeta	FE	SE	List 1B.1	Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland(Often Serpentinite)	Mar-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
Boraginaceae	<i>Amsinckia lunaris</i>	bent-flowered fiddleneck	-	-	List 1B.2	Coastal Bluff Scrub, Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Plagiobothrys chorisianus</i> var. <i>chorisianus</i>	Choris' popcorn-flower	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub/Mesic	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Plagiobothrys diffuses</i>	San Francisco popcorn-flower	-	SE	List 1B.1	Coastal Prairie, Valley And Foothill Grassland	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Plagiobothrys glaber</i>	hairless popcorn-flower	-	-	List 1A	Meadows And Seeps(Alkaline), Marshes And Swamps(Coastal Salt)	Mar-May	Presumed extinct. Last confirmed sighting 1954.
Brassicaceae	<i>Streptanthus albidus</i> ssp. <i>peramoenus</i>	most beautiful jewel-flower	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite	(Mar)Apr-Sep(Oct)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
Bryaceae	<i>Anomobryum julaceum</i>	slender silver-moss	-	-	2.2	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Lower Montane Coniferous Forest, North Coast Coniferous Forest.		No suitable habitat present in Study Area
Chenopodiaceae	<i>Atriplex joaquiniana</i>	San Joaquin spearscale	-	-	List 1B.2	Chenopod Scrub, Meadows And Seeps, Playas, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Alkaline	Apr-Oct	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Suaeda californica</i>	California seablite	FE	-	List 1B.1	Marshes And Swamps(Coastal Salt)	Jul-Oct	Habitat Present in Study Area, however not observed during November reconnaissance survey.
Cyperaceae	<i>Carex comosa</i>	bristly sedge	-	-	2.1	Coastal Prairie, Marshes And Swamps, Valley And Foothill Grassland	May-Sep	Suitable habitat present in Study Area, however species would have been detectable during November reconnaissance survey.
Ericaceae	<i>Arctostaphylos andersonii</i>	Santa Cruz manzanita	-	-	List 1B.2	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Chaparral, North Coast Coniferous Forest/Openings, Edges	Nov-Apr	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Arctostaphylos montaraensis</i>	Montara manzanita	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral(Maritime), Coastal Scrub	Jan-Mar	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Arctostaphylos pallida</i>	pallid manzanita	FT	SE	List 1B.1	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Closed-Cone Coniferous Forest, Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Scrub/Siliceous Shale, Sandy Or Gravelly	Dec-Mar	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
Fabaceae	<i>Astragalus pycnostachyus</i> var. <i>pycnostachyus</i>	coastal marsh milk-vetch	-	-	List 1B.2	Coastal Dunes(Mesic), Coastal Scrub, Marshes And Swamps(Coastal Salt, Streamsides)	Apr-Oct	Suitable habitat Present in Study Area, however it is not recorded in Alameda County.

Family	Scientific Name	Common name	Status			Habitat	Blooming Period	Occurrence in Study Area
			Fed	State	CNPS			
	<i>Astragalus tener</i> <i>var. tener</i>	alkali milk- vetch	-	-	List 1B.2	Playas, Valley And Foothill Grassland(Adobe Clay), Vernal Pools/Alkaline	Mar-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Hoita strobilina</i>	Loma Prieta hoita	-	-	List 1B.1	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Riparian Woodland/Usually Serpentinite, Mesic	May- Jul(Aug- Oct)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Lupinus eximius</i>	San Mateo tree lupine	-	-	List 3.2	Chaparral, Coastal Scrub	Apr-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Trifolium depauperatum</i> <i>var.</i> <i>hydrophilum</i>	saline clover	-	-	List 1B.2	Marshes And Swamps, Valley And Foothill Grassland(Mesic, Alkaline), Vernal Pools	Apr-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Geraniaceae</b>	<i>California macrophylla</i>	round-leaved filaree	-	-	List 1B.1	Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Clay	Mar-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Juglandaceae</b>	<i>Juglans hindsii</i>	Northern California black walnut	-	-	List 1B.1	Riparian Forest, Riparian Woodland	Apr-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Lamiaceae</b>	<i>Acanthomintha duttonii</i>	San Mateo thorn-mint	FE	SE	List 1B.1	Chaparral, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite	Apr-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Monardella villosa ssp. globosa</i>	robust monardella	-	-	List 1B.2	Broadleafed Upland Forest(Openings), Chaparral(Openings), Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland	Jun- Jul(Aug)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Liliaceae</b>	<i>Allium peninsulare var. franciscanum</i>	Franciscan onion	-	-	List 1B.2	Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Clay, Volcanic, Often Serpentinite	May-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Calochortus pulchellus</i>	Mt. Diablo fairy-lantern	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Riparian Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland	Apr-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Fritillaria biflora</i> <i>var.</i> <i>ineziana</i>	Hillsborough chocolate lily	-	-	List 1B.1	Cismontane Woodland, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite	Mar-Apr	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Fritillaria liliacea</i>	fragrant fritillary	-	-	List 1B.2	Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Often Serpentinite	Feb-Apr	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Lilium maritimum</i>	coast lily	-	-	List 1B.1	Broadleafed Upland Forest, Closed-Cone Coniferous Forest, Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub, Marshes And Swamps(Freshwater), North Coast Coniferous Forest/Sometimes Roadside	May-Aug	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Linaceae</b>	<i>Hesperolinon congestum</i>	Marin western flax	FT	ST	List 1B.1	Chaparral, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite	Apr-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Malvaceae</b>	<i>Malacothamnus arcuatus</i>	arcuate bush mallow	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland	Apr-Sep	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Malacothamnus davidsonii</i>	Davidson's bush mallow	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Scrub, Riparian Woodland	Jun-Jan	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Malacothamnus hallii</i>	Hall's bush mallow	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Coastal Scrub	May- Sep(Oct)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area

Family	Scientific Name	Common name	Status			Habitat	Blooming Period	Occurrence in Study Area
			Fed	State	CNPS			
<b>Onagraceae</b>	<i>Clarkia franciscana</i>	Presidio clarkia	FE	SE	List 1B.1	Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland(Serpentinite)	May-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Papaveraceae</b>	<i>Meconella oregana</i>	Oregon meconella	-	-	List 1B.1	Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub	Mar-Apr	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Polemoniaceae</b>	<i>Gilia capitata ssp. chamissonis</i>	dune gilia	-	-	List 1B.1	Coastal Dunes, Coastal Scrub	Apr-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Leptosiphon rosaceus</i>	rose leptosiphon	-	-	1B.1	Coastal Bluff Scrub	Apr-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Navarretia myersii ssp. myersii</i>	pincushion navarretia	-	-	List 1B.1	Vernal Pools/Often Acidic	May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Polygonaceae</b>	<i>Chorizanthe cuspidata var. cuspidata</i>	San Francisco Bay spineflower	-	-	List 1B.2	Coastal Bluff Scrub, Coastal Dunes, Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub/Sandy	Apr-Jul(Aug)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta</i>	robust spineflower	FE	-	List 1B.1	Chaparral(Maritime), Cismontane Woodland(Openings), Coastal Dunes, Coastal Scrub/Sandy Or Gravelly	Apr-Sep	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Eriogonum luteolum var. caninum</i>	Tiburon buckwheat	-	-	List 1B.2	Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, Coastal Prairie, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Serpentinite, Sandy To Gravelly	(May)Jun-Sep	No habitat present in Study Area
<b>Potamogetonaceae</b>	<i>Potamogeton filiformis</i>	slender-leaved pondweed	-	-	List 2.2	Marshes And Swamps(Assorted Shallow Freshwater)	May-Jul	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Rosaceae</b>	<i>Horkelia cuneata ssp. sericea</i>	Kellogg's horkelia	-	-	List 1B.1	Closed-Cone Coniferous Forest, Chaparral(Maritime), Coastal Dunes, Coastal Scrub/Sandy Or Gravelly, Openings	Apr-Sep	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Scrophulariaceae</b>	<i>Collinsia multicolor</i>	San Francisco collinsia	-	-	List 1B.2	Closed-Cone Coniferous Forest, Coastal Scrub/Sometimes Serpentinite	Mar-May	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
	<i>Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. palustris</i>	Point Reyes bird's-beak	-	-	List 1B.2	Marshes And Swamps(Coastal Salt)	Jun-Oct	Suitable Habitat Present in Study Area.
	<i>Triphysaria floribunda</i>	San Francisco owl's-clover	-	-	1B.2	Coastal Prairie, Coastal Scrub, Valley And Foothill Grassland/Usually Serpentinite.	Apr-Jun	No suitable habitat present in Study Area
<b>Thymelaeaceae</b>	<i>Dirca occidentalis</i>	western leatherwood	-	-	List 1B.2	Broadleaved Upland Forest, Closed-Cone Coniferous Forest, Chaparral, Cismontane Woodland, North Coast Coniferous Forest, Riparian Forest, Riparian Woodland/Mesic	Jan-Mar(Apr)	No suitable habitat present in Study Area

**Status Key:**

**Federal Status**

FE – Federally listed as endangered

FT – Federally listed as threatened

**State Status**

SE – State listed as endangered

ST – State listed as threatened

SC – State Species of Concern

**California Native Plant Society (Cnps) Status**

1A – Plants Presumed Extinct In California

1B – Plants Rare, Threatened, Or Endangered In California And Elsewhere

2 – Plants Rare, Threatened, Or Endangered In California, But More Common Elsewhere

**Mitigation Measure 4a-1):** Avian species, including species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, FESA, and CESA may occur in the project vicinity. Noise and associated disturbance created by construction equipment and crews, and increased vehicle traffic along the access roads may impact nesting birds. Table 1 includes a list of avian species that may be present in the project area. The proposed project is scheduled to occur late in the summer and into the fall, a time when most avian species have concluded nesting. Preconstruction surveys will be conducted within 30 days prior to initiation of construction activities to identify nesting avian species including the threatened and endangered species discussed below. Most avian species are not expected to be breeding in the late summer and fall when the maintenance desilting project would occur. If individual pairs began nesting late or had the opportunity to double-clutch, the preconstruction survey would include locations of any occupied nests. Ecologically Sensitive Areas (ESA's) will be established around any occupied nests found within the project area. These areas will be flagged and fenced to prevent encroachment within 200 feet of occupied nests. A qualified biologist will monitor the nests daily during construction until the young have fledged.

**Mitigation Measure 4a-2):** Steelhead is a special status fish species that has the potential to occur within the project area. If fish are present when cofferdams are installed, a fish relocation plan will be implemented to ensure that fish are not stranded. During initial site dewatering, any fish or amphibians stranded in the dewatered area will be relocated downstream or upstream as determined by a qualified biologist.

- b) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** The proposed project area is currently in a developed area and is surrounded by open water, salt marsh wetland, annual non-native grassland, ruderal areas, and ornamental plantings. (23, 27) Within the tidal inundation zone of the creek channel, numerous patches of generally sparse northern coastal salt marsh are present, interspersed with tidal mudflats when exposed at low tide. The taller vegetation found in the lower portions of the channel grades into narrow, somewhat discontinuous bands of low vegetation toward the upper margins of tidal influence. Outside of the tidal zone, a sparse plant cover is dominated by weedy, primarily non-native plant species characterized as ruderal vegetation. Graveled access roads are routinely maintained and support almost no vegetation. On the outer margins of the study area, adjacent to the fence lines on both sides of the creek, scattered trees and shrubs are present, mostly consisting of planted non-native horticultural species. A few native species of trees were also noted, although these may also have been planted. The agricultural lands north of the site are plowed in rows. Currently, riparian habitat is present within the vicinity of the proposed project.

The project area supports two primary vegetation types: northern coastal salt marsh and non-native grassland. These habitats will be temporarily affected, but are expected to rapidly reestablish following implementation of the project, with habitat quality (e.g., native species composition) meeting or exceeding pre-project conditions.

A brief description of each habitat encountered onsite is provided below, including a discussion of habitat sensitivity.

#### *Northern Coastal Salt Marsh*

On site, the lower elevation portions of the tidal zone are dominated by scattered stands of native wetland vegetation including common tule, bulrush, and California cord grass. At mid-to higher elevation within the tidal zone, other species such as pickleweed, saltgrass, jaumea, arrowgrass, marsh gumplant, alkali heath, sea lavender, and spearscale, become more common.

Non-native species such as opposite leaf Russian thistle, bristly ox-tongue, and cut-leaved plantain, were also noted. These species can be common in disturbed wetland habitats

It can be expected that vegetation patterns may change periodically within the channel of San Leandro Creek following disturbance by headwater flooding during winter and spring storm events.

#### Ruderal Vegetation and Ornamental Plantings

Ruderal vegetation is typically found in areas where the level of ground disturbance has been high, and natural vegetation has been entirely removed by human activities such as cultivation, grading, soil compaction, or the spreading of fill. In such places, in the absence of continued disturbance, weedy, generally non-native plant species frequently become established.

Within the study area, on the upper portions of the channel banks outside the limits of tidal influence, vegetation is generally sparse and comprised primarily of weedy, non-native plant species.

Adjacent to the fence lines along the outer margins of the road, numerous ornamental trees and shrubs have been planted.

**Mitigation measure 4-b):** Along the outside edges of the salt marsh, a narrow band or zone of existing habitat will be spared dredging. These “pockets” of salt marsh will facilitate the re-establishment of wetland vegetation within the project corridor.

Any disturbance along the banks of the channel will be hydro-seeded to ensure bank stabilization post-construction.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the 4.42 acres of federally protected wetlands and waters as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, because the project is in a developed area and impacts to wetland vegetation in the channel associated with desilting of the channel would be minor and temporary. Regeneration of wetland vegetation would occur naturally. The wetlands are expected to rapidly reestablish following construction and no net loss of wetland area is expected to occur. Therefore, impacts to wetlands are not considered significant. (23)
- d) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** The project would temporarily interfere with the passage of native fish and wildlife. (23)

#### Native and Migratory Fish

Given the proximity to the Bay, the project is expected to support a variety of fish populations, including both native and migratory species. However, no established native resident, migratory wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites are known to occur in the project area.

**Mitigation Measure 4d-1):** The project area will be temporarily dewatered using cofferdams. If fish are present when cofferdams are installed, a fish relocation plan will be implemented to

ensure that dewatered areas will be relocated downstream or upstream as determined by a qualified fish biologist. Impacts to fish species are expected to be temporary, and with implementation of the measures described above in Mitigation Measure 4a-2, will be less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

#### Native and Migratory Birds

The project area supports habitat that could be used by a variety of birds, including resident and migratory species, such as raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of passerines. These species use open water and wetlands as foraging, resting, or hiding cover. The project will temporarily impact potential habitat for native and migratory birds; however, there is abundant habitat for foraging, resting and hiding cover available in the project vicinity and habitat is expected to reestablish after the project is completed.

**Mitigation Measure 4d-2):** Further implementation of Mitigation Measure 4a-1 will protect birds during their nesting period. Therefore, impacts to wildlife use in wetland habitats are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

- e) **No Impact.** The project will not conflict with local related ordinances
- f) **No Impact.** Currently, there are no local policies or ordinances that address natural resources in the project area. In addition, there are no HCP's or NCCP's known to apply to the project area. (22, 26) Currently, there are no regional, state, or local plans (such as habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans) that apply to the project area, nor any tree ordinances that apply to the project area. State and federal regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over plants and wildlife (and their habitats) include the California Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under authority of the Federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act, these agencies participate in the regulatory review and permitting processes for construction projects such as the proposed maintenance desilting project.

## **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

An archaeological and paleontological records search and literature review was performed for this project. The project from about midpoint to 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue is located within an area of "moderate" sensitivity for archaeological resources while the project from about midpoint to Hegenberger Road is located in an area of "minimal" sensitivity for archaeological resources. (12) No prehistoric sites have been recorded in the project or vicinity. Historic maps and the current configuration of the canal suggest that any potential Native American archaeological deposits likely would have been destroyed/disturbed by previous flood control efforts in and adjacent to the project.

- a) **No Impact.** No historic properties or resources in or adjacent to the project site were identified. Moreover, removal of silt and vegetation would not exceed the original channel configuration. Additionally the channel is not a historic structure. No impact to known or potential historic properties would occur. (12)
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sediment that would be removed from the channels has been recently deposited through tides and stormwater runoff; therefore, archaeological resources, which usually occur in intact undisturbed deposits, would not be expected to occur in the

sediments to be removed. Occasionally, archeological remains may be washed into a creek where they might be disturbed by sediment removal activities or other types of routine stream maintenance. In addition, the project site and adjacent areas are highly disturbed. The channels are man-made and were constructed in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, the likelihood of prehistoric artifacts occurring in the channel bed or bank is very low.

If archeological resources are discovered on the project site during sediment removal, work will be immediately halted at the location of the discovery while a professional archeologist is consulted to determine the significance of the find. ACPWA shall comply with recommendations of the archaeologist regarding the protection of archaeological resources prior to recommencing work in the vicinity of the find.

- c) **No Impact.** The project is located in an area of “moderate” sensitivity for archaeological resources. However, no prehistoric or historic sites have been recorded or observed in or adjacent to the project area. No unique paleontological or geological resources are known to exist in the area. (12)
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Proposed desilting would not exceed the original configuration of the channel and work would be done within previously disturbed areas. This, combined with the absence of known resources, leads to a conclusion that no impact to a significant archaeological or unique paleontological or geologic resource is likely to occur. Should previously unidentified cultural resources be encountered during construction, work in the vicinity of the discovery shall immediately be redirected until an assessment of the finds can be made by a qualified archaeologist. Should human remains be discovered, the archaeologist will evaluate the resource in consultation with local Native American organizations and the coroner. If the resource is found to be significant under CEQA, an appropriate mitigation plan must be developed.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The project site is generally flat with ground elevations ranging from approximately sea level to approximately 10 feet above mean sea level. The underlying geology in the vicinity is mapped as Quaternary alluvium, lake, playa and terrace deposits: unconsolidated and semi-consolidated; mostly non-marine.

Laugenour silt loam, drained, in the downstream third of the site, and Urban Land in the upland remainder, represents the two soil mapping units present within the project area. Laugenour silt loam, drained is characterized as a very deep and poorly drained soil that formed in recent alluvium adjacent to streams. Included in this mapping unit are small areas of Sycamore silt loam, drained, Omni silty clay loam, drained, and a few small areas of a soil that is similar to this Laugenour soil but is underlain by silty clay between depths of 24 and 40 inches. Permeability is moderately rapid to a depth of 40 inches and moderately slow below that depth. Runoff is slow, and there is no hazard of erosion. In nearly all areas, this soil is used for urban development. Most areas are protected from flooding by channels and levees (USDA 1981). Laugenour Loam, drained is listed as a hydric soil on flood plains (USDA 1992).

Urban Land is described by the USDA Soil Conservation Service as “land that is covered by buildings, roads, parking lots, and other urban structures “and the “soil material is mainly heterogeneous fill.”

This soil description is consistent with all of the land in the study area outside of the estimated limits of high tide in the San Leandro Creek channel.

The nearest active fault is the Hayward Fault, which is approximately three miles east of the project site. The USGS predicts that the Hayward Fault has a 27 percent chance of undergoing an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater between 2006 and 2032 (USGS 2006).

- a i to iv) No Impact.** The project lies within the seismically active San Francisco Bay region including the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, and is, therefore, exposed to seismic hazards, including fault rupture and ground shaking. However, if the proposed project were damaged by these events, it would not pose a greater risk than already exists, and would only impact surface improvements that can be easily repaired. With respect to the hazard of fault rupture, the risk would not be considered significant with or without the project. The project site is flat and is located a significant distance from any hill slopes which could pose a landslide hazard. (11, 25, 28)
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any areas on the channel slopes or banks that must be temporarily cleared for access and/or sediment removal will be revegetated with appropriate species following construction. With implementation of best management practices no substantial soil erosion would occur. (26)
- c) **No Impact.** Sediment removal would be exclusively from the channel bottom of an elevation primarily at sea level. As such, no landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. (25, 26)
- d) **No Impact.** No risk to life or property is associated with the desilting project. Construction involves the removal of fluvial deposited sediment. (25)
- e) **No Impact.** The maintenance desilting project would not result in increased development in the area or a need for septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems. This maintenance activity will restore the channel to the design capacity for existing occupancy within the watershed. (3)

## **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

A hazardous material is a substance with certain physical properties that could pose a substantial present or future hazard to human health or the environment when improperly transported, handled, disposed, or otherwise managed. State agencies most involved in enforcing public health and safety laws and regulations concerning designated hazardous waste or identified contaminated sites include the Department of Toxic Substance Control, the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Office of Emergency Services, State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Air Resources Boards, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board. A hazardous material is defined and regulated by RCRA and through the California Code of Regulations Title 22. If improperly handled, hazardous materials and waste can result in public health hazards including a release into the soil or groundwater, or through an airborne release in vapors, fumes, or dust. Construction materials, which could be considered hazardous, may include fuels, motor oil, grease, various lubricants, and solvents.

- a and b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Hazardous construction materials may include solvents, hydraulic fluid, diesel, etc. Construction hazardous materials would be transported, used, and disposed of in accordance with existing State and Federal regulations and requirements. These regulations stipulate appropriate vehicles and containers for transport, necessary transport procedures, worker training, and disposal requirements. By complying with regulations designed to protect human health and safety and the environment, normal construction and operations activities requiring routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public. (18)
- c) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within one quarter miles of an existing or proposed school. (18)
- d) **No Impact.** The project site is not identified by the State of California as a Hazardous Waste and Substances Site, and no substantial safety hazard to the public or the environment related to such sites would occur as a result of project development. (18)
- e) **No Impact.** The project site is located within two miles of the Oakland International Airport; however the proposed project involves ground level roadway improvements and would not result in any safety hazards to the people working in the project area. (7, 18)
- f) **No Impact.** The project site is located within two miles of the Oakland International Airport ; however, it would not result in any safety hazards to people residing or working in the Project area. (7, 18)
- g) **No Impact.** The project site is located in an isolated area with restricted access. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (18)
- h) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within an urban-wildland interface zone, therefore risk from wildland fires is non-existent. (14, 15)

## **VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

The Zone 12, Line P (San Leandro Creek) channel transports urban runoff during storm events, it does not generate any runoff or other wastewater, and does not contribute to pollution subject to water quality standards or subject to waste discharge requirements (WDR's) of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. By location, the channel discharges directly to San Francisco Bay.

The project site does not currently utilize groundwater, or in any way affect the supply or quality of groundwater available for other uses.

Flows enter Line P from storm drains that convey runoff from the urban areas in the City of Oakland and San Leandro.

Cohesive fine-grained materials occur within the project area channel. Visual inspection and evaluation of cross-sectional survey data suggest that sediment deposition is the dominant process within the project area.

The project site is located with a 100-year flood hazard boundary (21). The project site is not located within a dam failure inundation area (9). The project area is not located within a tsunami or seiche inundation zone, and conditions for mudflows do not exist at the project site.

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** During excavation of the channel, some soil/sediment materials may fall back into the channel and some localized turbidity is expected to occur when sediment material is re-suspended in the water column. The amount of turbidity associated with the excavation is not expected to be substantial and would be temporary and localized. Silt would settle due to the coffer dams that would be installed at the upstream and downstream limits of the project site. The dams would prevent flow from redistributing silt and sediment outside of the project area. Permits intended to protect water quality will be obtained from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the District will comply with all agency conditions. There will be no significant impacts to Waters of the State as a result of the proposed project. (13, 17)
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The channel bottom is earthen and would remain earthen after sediment removal, and any groundwater recharge occurring in these locations would not be affected. No groundwater supplies would be required for sediment removal; however, minor amounts of groundwater may be encountered and dewatered during construction. This quantity would not be significant. (18, 23)
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project is intended to improve the transport of urban runoff conveyed from upstream urban development through the removal of accumulated sediments in the flood control channel. The channel would remain in its current location and drainage patterns would not be altered. The proposed desilting would have the beneficial effects of restoring flood control capacity. Existing drainage patterns in the project area would remain unaltered with implementation of the proposed project. (14, 23)
- d) **No Impact.** The project would not alter drainage patterns or alter the rate at which runoff is generated or enters the stormwater transport system. No increase in additional impervious surfaces that would lead to an increase in surface water runoff would occur with the proposed project. (8, 14, 23)
- e and f) **No Impact.** The project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise degrade water quality. The project would restore flood system capacity to transport runoff. (14, 17, 23)
- g) **No Impact.** The project does not include nor facilitate construction of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. (21)
- h) **No Impact.** No structures will be permanently placed in the channels. Any materials or equipment placed in the channels during sediment removal (e.g., cofferdams) would be removed upon completion of project construction. The project would result in beneficial impacts related to flood flows through increasing the capacity of the channel. (21)
- i) **No Impact.** The proposed maintenance desilting project would not expose people or structures to significant loss, injury, or death involving flooding. Desilting the existing flood control channel will increase capacity to the original design configuration. The proposed project is not located in a dam failure inundation zone. (21)

- j) **No Impact.** Conditions do not exist at the project site for seiche, tsunami, or mudflows. (22, 30)

## **IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Land use in the vicinity of Line P includes agriculture north, commercial and industrial to the east, west, and south.

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves maintenance of an existing facility in an industrial portion of Oakland and does not include new facilities that could divide an existing community. (30)
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project is consistent with the policies of the City of Oakland General Plan (1998) and the City of Oakland zoning code. The Project would not affect adjacent land uses. The proposed Project would install upstream and downstream bladder dams to retard stormwater and tidal flow during construction. The bladder dams would be temporary and would be removed after completion of the desilting project. (18)
- c) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an area subject to a known HCP or NCCP. (18, 27)

## **X. MINERAL RESOURCES**

The proposed project involves the removal of accumulated silt in the existing flood control channel. Removal of material is restricted to accumulated sediment. Desilting operations will only be to the original design configuration of the channel. No known mineral resources are present on the project site.

- a) **No Impact.** No known mineral resources are present on the project site. (18)
- b) **No Impact.** The project site is not a locally important resource recovery site. (18)

## **XI. NOISE**

Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. The magnitude of sound is measured in decibels. Community noise within this area of Alameda County is currently governed by standards established in the Alameda County Noise Regulations.

The most significant sources of noise in the City of Oakland are transportation noise from vehicular traffic, airplanes, and railroads. Typical noise levels in the project area include road noise, airport noise, and noise levels associated with industrial land uses.

Local regulations include the Noise Element of the Oakland General Plan and General Ordinance Code of Alameda County. The Oakland General Plan Noise Element states that noise generated by new

projects shall meet the acceptable exterior noise levels standards of the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines.

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There would be a temporary increase in noise levels associated with the construction of the project. The duration of construction is expected to be approximately 45-60 days. Noise generating activities would consist of the use of trucks, grading equipment, compressors, generators, etc., typical of most construction sites. Due to the temporary nature of the noise impact, it is considered less than significant. After construction, the project would produce no increase in noise over existing conditions. (5, 18)
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities could generate localized groundborne vibration and noise. However, these levels would be very minor and would be temporary. (18)
- c) **No Impact.** Any noise generated by construction activities would be temporary. No permanent changes in ambient noise levels would result from the project. (5, 18)
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sediment removal would require earth-moving equipment, trucks, and other construction equipment that could result in temporary increases in noise levels that exceed normal background levels. Construction activities will be done in compliance with the City of Oakland noise ordinance. For construction activities in industrial areas requiring more than 10 days, the ordinance sets a maximum construction noise level of 70 dBA from 7 a.m. to 7p.m. Monday through Friday and 60 dBA from 9am. To 8 p.m. on weekends (19). No noise-generating activities would be done outside of these hours. In addition, there are no residents or other sensitive receptors on or near the project site.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within two miles of Oakland International Airport. However, the project involves no changes that would result in exposure to new airport noise. (7)
- f) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. (7)

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

The proposed project is a maintenance modification of an existing flood control channel. There are no residences in the vicinity of the Zone 12, Line P (San Leandro Creek) project area. The project area is not residential in character.

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves maintenance of a portion of an existing flood control channel and restoration of the original design capacity. The project would not include development of people-attracting elements, nor would it eliminate any current barriers to the development of people-attracting elements by others. Therefore, the project would neither directly nor indirectly induce population growth. (30)
- b and c) **No Impact.** Ground disturbing activities of the project would not exceed the original channel banks, and all project activities would occur within existing County right-of-way or existing roadways. Displacement of people, homes, or other structures would not occur. (18)

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

ai. to av.) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves maintenance desilting of an existing flood control channel. The project, as defined, does not include provision of new or physically altered government facilities. The project would not induce population growth nor does it include people-attracting elements that could contribute to a need for new or altered government services necessary to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities, or other government facilities. (18)

### **XIV. RECREATION**

The Martin Luther King Jr. Regional Shoreline represents the nearest location of recreational activities. However, the project area is not open for public use. The project area is security fenced and gated. Construction equipment will use the existing access road to enter and exit the project site. This movement will not interfere with the recreational uses of the Martin Luther King Jr. Regional Shoreline.

a and b) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth and does not otherwise propose activities or facilities that could increase the use of existing recreational facilities. The project does not include nor require expansion or construction of new recreational facilities. No impact would occur. (18)

### **XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

The proposed project involves the excavation of accumulated sediment and the disposal of these sediments. The sediment will be placed into trucks and delivered to an approved Alameda County Public Works Agency silt disposal site.

The pace at which traffic moves, or does not move, is a key indicator of how well the circulation network is functioning for vehicular traffic. It is standard practice to measure the performance of an intersection in terms of Level of Service (LOS), which is a system by which the level of congestion can be given a letter grade based on vehicle delay. LOS "A" indicates a facility with little congestion and LOS F indicates a highly congested facility.

The Alameda Congestion Management Agency (CMA) has a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The CMP includes operating standards for key roads and freeways. Most cities seek to maintain a level of service of "D" at peak times. Intersections approaching their capacity are at LOS "E".

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Transport of sediment materials from the flood control channel to the landfill will require truck travel from the project site to the silt disposal site. Trucks would return to the flood control channel along the same route. Based on the institute of Transportation Engineering Handbook, each truck trip is equivalent to 2.5 passenger car trips. An excavator equipped with a 1 cubic yard bucket would remove approximately 144 cubic yards of silt an hour. At this production rate, approximately 12 standard dump trucks would be filled each hour. Twelve loads per hour equals 24 one-way truck trips, or 60 passenger car trips per day. Over a 7 hour daily haul period would equal approximately 420 passenger car trips per day. The haul period of 7 hours avoids the peak traffic periods of 7 to 9

a.m. and 4 to 6 p.m. Because there would be no increase in traffic during peak periods, the project would not result in a substantial increase in traffic relative to the existing traffic load and capacity of the local street system. (4, 18)

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Alameda County congestion management agency (CMA) has adopted criteria for evaluating potentially significant impacts to regional roadways in the County. The CMA criteria states that any project that would generate 100 additional p.m. peak-hour trips could potentially impact the regional system and; therefore, must prepare a level of service (LOS) analysis for roadway segments within the project study area. Trucks hauling sediment materials to the landfill site and returning to the project area would not operate during peak traffic periods (7 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 6 p.m.). The proposed project would not increase peak period traffic trips and would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by CMA. (4, 18)
- c) **No Impact.** The project has no air traffic component and no change in air traffic patterns would occur. (4, 18)
- d) **No Impact.** The project has no traffic design features associated with construction of the project. There would be no conflict with agricultural features associated with the area surrounding the project site. (18)
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Emergency access plans would not be altered with implementation of the project. The County is aware of the mandate of first responders, and will contact area first responders to notify them of project startup prior to initiation of construction activities. (18)
- f) **No Impact.** No parking would be removed under the proposed project, nor would additional parking demand be generated. Construction personnel would park within the project site. (18)
- g) **No Impact.** The proposed project is to maintain an existing facility. Haul routes would be along County access roads currently unavailable to the general public, and along public roadways in the City's of Oakland, San Leandro, and Hayward; accessibility to alternative transportation would not be altered by project haul activities. The project would not include physical elements or activities that could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. (1, 4, 18)

## **XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

- a to e) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves maintenance desilting of an existing flood control channel. The project would not induce population growth nor does it include people-attracting elements that could contribute to a need for new or altered utilities or service systems, including, but not limited to, wastewater transport and treatment, potable water transport and treatment, stormwater transport, and solid waste disposal. The project would not generate solid waste, and would not affect compliance with regulation related to waste diversion or recycling.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Approximately 5,000 cubic yards of sediment are expected to be removed from the channels and may be reused or disposed of in an appropriate landfill. Existing landfills have adequate capacity for the sediment.

- g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sediment characterization sampling has been completed for the channel. The samples will be tested for constituents appropriate for determining suitability for landfill disposal or reuse, including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's), heavy metals, PCBs, and pesticides. Laboratory analytical results will be used to identify the appropriate disposal or reuse of the sediments. All applicable requirements for disposal of the sediments will be implemented.

## **XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project does not have the potential to cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.

The proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The proposed project has the potential to result in short-term adverse impacts to biological resources (special status species and riparian habitat),. With mitigation measures identified in this document, all significant adverse impacts can be avoided, minimized, reduced, or compensated for to a level that is less than significant.

- b) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project has the potential to result in minor and less than significant short-term adverse impacts to resources, property, or humans relative to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology/soils, hydrology/water quality, noise, and transportation/traffic. The project would have a positive effect on life and property by reducing potential flooding upstream of the project.

## REFERENCES CITED:

**XVIII. The number in the parentheses after an item in Section I through XVII refers to the references below. These references provide adequate support for the “No Impact” response. References cited are available for review at the Alameda County Public Works Agency, 399 Elmhurst Street, Hayward, CA, unless otherwise noted.**

1. AC Transit. 2006. *Rider Information*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.actransit.org/riderinfo/mapsandschedules.wu>
2. Alameda County. May 1966. *Scenic Route Element of the General Plan*.
3. Alameda County. May 1977. *Specific Plan for Areas of Environmental Significance*.
4. Alameda County Congestion Management Agency. 2006. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.accma.ca.gov/pages/index.aspx>
5. Alameda County Ordinance Code. *Noise Ordinance*. Chapter 6.60.
6. Alameda County Planning Department. 2004. Williamson Act Map for Alameda County.
7. Alameda County Planning Department. April 1977. *Alameda County Airport Land Use Policy Plan and Environmental Impact Report*.
8. Alameda County Public Works Agency and Community Development Agency. 2000. *Alameda County GIS Project*.
9. Association of Bay Area Governments. 2004. *Dam Failure Hazard Map*.
10. Association of Bay Area Governments. 2004. *FEMA Flood Hazard Boundary Map*.
11. Association of Bay Area Governments. 2006. *Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Study Zone Maps*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/faults/>
12. Basin Research Associates. 2008. *Archaeological Records Search, Limited Literature Review, and Field Review: Zone 12 Line P San Leandro Creek Desilting Project, City of Oakland, Alameda County*. January 21, 2008.
13. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *BAAQMD 2005*.
14. Bay Area Storm Management Agencies Association. *Flood Control Facility Maintenance Best Management Practices*. June 2000.
15. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, *Alameda County Natural Hazard Disclosure (Fire) Map*, <http://www.fir.ca.gov/ab6/nhd01.pdf>
16. California Department of Transportation. 2007. *California Scenic Highway System*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>

17. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, 1995. *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan)*.
18. City of Oakland. 1996. *General Plan*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.oaklandnet.com/government/ceda/revised/planningzoning/StrategicPlanningSection/CWPolicies.html>
19. City of Oakland. 2005. Oakland City Ordinance 17.120.050 Noise
20. Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2000. *Alameda County Important Farmland 2000*.
21. Federal Emergency Management Agency. *FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, City of Oakland, California, Alameda County, Panel 25 of 45*. September 30, 1982.
22. National Oceanic Atmospheric Association, National Geophysical Data Center. 2001. *Results of Tsunami Run-up Database Search for U.S. and Central American West Coast*.
23. NRM Environmental Consulting. *Final Biological Reconnaissance Survey, Wetland Delineation, and Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination of the Zone 12, Line P Portion of the San Leandro Creek*. January 7, 2008.
24. State of California Department of Conservation. 1997. *California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/LESA/lesamodl.pdf>
25. State of California Department of Conservation. 2003. *Seismic Hazard Zones (Map), Oakland East Quadrangle*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from [http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/pdf/ozn\\_oake.pdf](http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/pdf/ozn_oake.pdf)
26. United States Department of Agriculture. 1981. *Soil Survey of Alameda County, California, Western Part*.
27. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *Conservation Plans and Agreements Database*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from [http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv\\_plans/public.jsp](http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv_plans/public.jsp)
28. United States Geological Survey. 1980. 7.5 min Topographic Map: *Oakland East, Calif. Quadrangle*.
29. United States Geological Survey. 2006. *The Hayward Fault Exposed!* Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=1499>
30. United States Geological Survey and Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Relative Slope Stability and Land Use Planning in the San Francisco Bay Region, California, Professional Paper 944*, (Includes map: Regional Slope Stability of the Southern San Francisco Bay Region, California).