CITY OF HAYWARD
AGENDA REPORT

AGENDA DATE 12/13/01
AGENDA ITEM 2
WORK SESSION ITEM _____

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Gary Calame, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Review of Draft Environmental Impact Report on the Draft General Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission review and comment on this report and invite public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

BACKGROUND:

On September 5, 2000, the City Council approved a process for conducting the comprehensive revision of the General Plan. This year-long process has included a series of joint study sessions with the City Council and Planning Commission to discuss identified issues and develop policies and strategies for dealing with those issues. Public workshops were held at key points in the process. The Draft General Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) were released for public review and comment on November 20, 2001. The purpose of this hearing is to provide an opportunity for commissioners and the general public to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

DISCUSSION:

The Draft General Plan and the DEIR have been prepared concurrently. In this way, the information generated as part of the updated environmental analysis has assisted in the formulation of the policies and strategies. As a result, the General Plan is essentially "self-mitigating," and the DEIR has found that almost all of the potentially significant impacts can be mitigated through implementation of the proposed policies and strategies and adherence to existing development regulations and practices.

Draft General Plan

The Draft General Plan is organized by chapters, which include background information on the particular subject as well as the policies and strategies discussed by the City Council and Planning Commission. This revision of the General Plan has concentrated on updating the background information and consolidating previously adopted elements. Various elements that were adopted in the 1970s (Noise, Seismic Safety, and Conservation and Environmental Protection) have been updated and incorporated as a single chapter in the revised General Plan.

Other elements that have been adopted since the last comprehensive revision in 1986 (Housing, Circulation, and Economic Development) have been updated and incorporated as separate chapters in the revised General Plan. Components of the Growth Management Element adopted in 1993 have been incorporated in the relevant chapters in the revised General Plan.

Policies and strategies are presented at the end of each chapter in the General Plan. Polices and strategies contained in the previously adopted elements have been retained as much as possible. Efforts were made during formulation of the preliminary policies and strategies for discussion at the joint work sessions this past summer to eliminate unnecessary duplication as well as any potential inconsistencies that may have existed among the multiple documents.

Several changes are being proposed to the General Plan Land Use Map. These changes were reviewed with the City Council and Planning Commission at the joint work session on October 30, 2001. Some of the changes are proposed to more accurately reflect existing land use and/or recent development. Other changes are proposed to limit urban development in environmentally sensitive areas, reduce the maximum allowable density of future residential development in hillside areas, or to more accurately reflect the potential for various types of development consistent with the proposed policies and strategies. Staff will be advising affected property owners of the proposed changes in advance of the public hearings. Any zoning changes that may be required due to changes in the land use designations will be processed following adoption of the General Plan.

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Potentially significant impacts identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) are summarized in Exhibit A. Potentially significant impacts (denoted "PS" in the table) require the implementation of mitigation measures, or alternatives, or a finding that the measures are infeasible for specific reasons. Some impacts are listed even though they are considered less than significant ("LS"). These effects would not require mitigation, but measures could be applied to further reduce the effect of the implementation of the General Plan. For some of the significant impacts, mitigation measures may not be effective in reducing the impact to a less than significant level. These impacts are designated as Significant Unavoidable ("SU"). For each impact identified as Significant Unavoidable, findings of overriding considerations will need to be made pursuant to provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Significant Unavoidable impacts are related to regional traffic growth and roadway congestion, construction noise, and seismic ground shaking. Even though the General Plan includes programs for the design and construction of capital roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as land use policies that encourage mixed-use and transit-oriented development to reduce automobile trips, the DEIR concludes that overall growth trends in the region and the limited land area and capital resources for major changes in development patterns are likely to result in increased traffic congestion on several roadways in the planning area. According to the DEIR, noise during construction projects may be unavoidable as a short-term effect that could interfere with the comfort or convenience of those nearby. The DEIR notes that anticipated development assumed by the General Plan could be subject to the risk of damage and injury due to seismic ground shaking. This is an impact that exists throughout the San Francisco

Bay Area, and despite best efforts at mitigation, the risk of damage and injury during a large seismic event is unavoidable.

The DEIR also addresses alternatives to the revised General Plan and possible cumulative effects associated with each area of impact. The DEIR determined that the "No Project" alternative, or existing General Plan, is the only other reasonable alternative. The DEIR has found that the revised General Plan is the environmentally preferred alternative, based on the updated policies and strategies and the recommended changes in land use designations. The DEIR has concluded that the cumulative environmental impacts of the revised General Plan would not be substantially different from conditions that would occur with the present General Plan.

NEXT STEPS:

Release of the Draft General Plan and the DEIR marks the start of the formal public review period. The Housing Element portion of the Draft General Plan has already been forwarded to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review. The DEIR has been forwarded to the State Clearinghouse and all affected federal, state and local agencies for their review and comment. Notice of the completion and availability of both documents has been sent to the General Plan mailing list of neighborhood groups and homeowners associations, community organizations, and other interested parties. In addition, both the Draft General Plan and the DEIR are being posted on the city's website at the General Plan Revision homepage.

As noted previously, the purpose of this hearing is to provide an opportunity for the public to offer oral or written comments on the DEIR. These comments, and all other written comments received during the formal 45-day review period, will be incorporated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). Additional work sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council are scheduled in January to review these comments and any proposed revisions to the Draft General Plan and DEIR.

Formal public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council are scheduled in January and February of 2002. Separate hearings focusing only on the Housing Element have been scheduled to allow ample opportunity for comments by all interested parties.

Prepared by:

Gary Calame, AICP
Senior Planner

Approved by:

Dyana Anderly, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachment:

Exhibit A. Summary of Draft Environmental Impact Report

12.5.01

Table 2.1
Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
4.1: Adoption and implementation of the General Plan Update would by definition be consistent with adopted City plans, as it would establish the overall "constitution" for development in the City for the next 20 years.	LS	4.1: None Required.	LS
4.2: Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in increased density and changes in land use that could result in incompatibilities with existing land uses.	PS	4.2: The City of Hayward should evaluate new land uses for site specific impacts to established land uses in the surrounding area, according to standard Conditional Use Permit, Variance, and Site Plan review procedures, to determine if, in the short or long term, the new land use is an enhancement to the area's land use patterns and provides offsetting benefits such as improved housing conditions, more economic activity, or better overall operations. The City should also consider whether the new use will be exposed to unacceptable impacts from pre-existing uses that are not likely to phase out in the near future. Such reviews should continue to occur as part of the public review process, affording residents, property owners and business operators an opportunity to present relevant information to decision-makers. Conditions of approval that serve to mitigate specific impacts should be required.	LS

ATTACHMENT A

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.3: Some public or private projects which might be implemented under the proposed General Plan Update could result in changes in existing land use and circulation patterns which could result in a physical division of existing neighborhoods or circulation patterns.	PS	4.3: Individual projects that involve major changes to circulation patterns for pedestrians and vehicles, for example intersection realignment, a new street, or large scale public land uses should be subject to public review and input, with particular attention paid to the effect on the established community. In addition, project-level environmental review may be required. The City should include appropriate conditions of approval to address the identified impacts of individual projects.	LS
Visual Quality			
5.1: Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in the obstruction of vistas and views from scenic routes, major roadways, and public and private properties. Intensified development could create barriers to views of the hills, Bay, and other visually attractive areas.	PS	5.1a: New development would continue to be subject to Site Plan Review, Conditional Use Permits, and Variances according to existing zoning procedures. Particular attention to new buildings and taller buildings with the potential to be highly noticeable from scenic routes should be required to provide a high degree of design quality. Requests for conditional use permits and variances should continue to be reviewed for view blockage and should be subject to redesign or conditions of approval to mitigate significant impacts. 5.1b: Public projects such as roadway widening, curb/gutter/sidewalk, drainage and utilities, and public buildings and open spaces should be planned, designed and reviewed for potential project-specific	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		impacts to scenic resources, such as tree rows and views to the hills. Appropriate mitigation should be incorporated to reduce impacts, including possible redesign or relocation of projects to balance the overall community objectives.	
5.2: Implementation of the General Plan Update could result in the alteration of visual characteristics and qualities of the City, due to new private development, public infrastructure development, rehabilitation of existing properties, and related activities. Temporary construction-period activity could present an image of disheveled property, for example due to the storage of materials and equipment. Development could also result in the removal of features considered scenic, such as trees or characteristics buildings.	PS	5.2: Private and public projects should be subject to Mitigation Measure 5.1, with an emphasis on consistent development patterns, architecturally distinct structures, mature vegetation, and natural open space.	LS
5.3: Private development and public projects undertaken in conformance with the General Plan could result in increased light and glare in the area, due to general development, signage, outdoor lighting, street lighting, reflective materials, and other sources.	PS	5.3: Design review and other discretionary approval for public and private projects should include consideration of potential light and glare impacts, and should include shielding and cutoff features for outdoor lighting for neighboring land uses (particularly residences), design revisions, or other means of reducing impacts to the extent feasible.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation			
6.1: Traffic in the City is expected to increase as a result of continued development allowed by the General Plan, which could result in traffic levels on some roadway segments or at some intersections which exceed established level of service standards.	PS	6.1: The Draft General Plan Update includes comprehensive policies and strategies that address regional and local traffic through a coordinated effort to provide roadway improvements, transit service, encourage bicycling and walking, carpooling, traffic calming, and land use strategies to reduce private auto use.	LS / SU
Noise			
7.1: Construction within the City in accordance with the General Plan Land Use Map could result in a temporary increase in existing noise levels that would be noticeable and significant, and could exceed established noise level standards.	PS	7.1: The City should require reasonable construction practices for public and private projects that could affect sensitive receptors, including limiting construction hours to avoid early morning and evening activity, muffling and properly maintaining construction equipment used at project sites, limiting the amount of time equipment is allowed to stand idle with the engine running, and shielding construction activity and equipment to the extent practicable.	LS / SU
7.2: General activity at residential, commercial, public and other facilities could result in an increase in the noise level exposure on sites throughout the City.	PS	7.2: The City of Hayward should continue to review projects for potential impacts (including impacts from existing or planned neighbors) as part of its development review process, and should require mitigating measures such as setbacks, site plan revisions, operational constraints, buffering, and insulation.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
7.3: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could lead to new development in areas where the ambient noise levels are or will be in excess of acceptable levels.	PS	7.3: The City should require a project-specific review of proposed development projects that are located along a major roadway to determine if noise intrusion will be a significant issue for residents or employees, and should require appropriate measures such as setbacks, soundwalls, and structural measures to reduce the interior and exterior noise levels to an acceptable level. Noise-sensitive public projects, such as parks, also should be evaluated for noise impacts and developed accordingly, by locating less sensitive uses such as ballfields close to the noise source, and sensitive areas such as picnic grounds and children's play areas further from the noise source.	LS
7.4: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in increased activity along local and arterial streets, which could adversely affect existing residents.	PS	7.4: Incremental traffic generated by new development should be used as part of a screening analysis for proposed projects, to determine if the project will contribute a significant amount of traffic noise to the existing area. In cases where the screening analysis is inconclusive, field measurements along the roadways near individual development projects should be conducted. If it is determined that the proposed development will result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels along nearby roadways, it should be the responsibility of the City of Hayward and project applicants to identify	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		and implement noise abatement measures which would effectively mitigate project-related noise effects on a site-specific basis. Such measures could include the installation of noise buffers (such as berms or sound walls) and increased setbacks for any sensitive receptors which may be proposed in the vicinity of such roadways.	
7.5: Existing and future residential development near the train tracks through the City could be exposed to high noise levels, which can have a deleterious effect on property values, personal health, and enjoyment of the area.	LS	7.5: None Required. See Mitigation Measure 7.3.	LS
7.6: Railroads, trucks and buses may induce ground vibration in local areas within the City.	PS	7.6: New development near railroad rights of way where vibration is suspected to be a problem should be evaluated for potential vibration impacts, and should be designed according to engineering recommendations, which may include excavation and compaction of soils, special foundation design, and structural design to reduce the vibration.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality			
8.1: Dust and diesel exhaust generated by equipment and vehicles operating at development sites during construction could result in a temporary adverse impact on local air quality.	PS	8.1: Each project applicant shall be required to comply with all applicable City regulations and operating procedures prior to issuance of building or grading permits, including standard dust control measures. The effective implementation of the applicable dust control measures would reduce the temporary air quality impacts associated with construction dust.	LS
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
9.1: The ground surface along fault traces can be gradually offset (at a rate of one-half inch or so per year) due to creep along the fault, and can be suddenly offset (horizontally and/or vertically) up to several feet due to a major earthquake, which will damage roads and buildings and can break pipes or other underground utilities.	PS	9.1: New development and major rehabilitation projects should continue to be required to comply with the regulations in force within the Alquist-Priolo (Earthquake Fault Hazard) Special Study Zone, which require that properties within the potential fault rupture hazard area be studied (usually by excavating a trench perpendicular to the suspected fault line), that the specific location of a fault trace be found or disproved for an individual property, and that habitable structures must be located a sufficient distance (usually 50 feet) from the trace to avoid direct impacts of surface fault rupture.	LS
9.2: Strong and very strong ground shaking is expected to occur within the City during the 20-year implementation period in the event of a major earthquake on the regional fault system, including the	PS	9.2: The effects of ground shaking on structures and other improvements which may be proposed under the General Plan should be reduced by earthquake-resistant design in accordance with the latest editions	SU

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Hayward Fault. Such ground shaking is expected to cause severe damage to (or collapse of) buildings or other structures, and may result in significant economic loss and/or endanger the health and welfare of persons within the City.		of the Uniform Building Code and the California Building Code. The potential effects of ground shaking on existing structures should be evaluated by engineering studies as part of major rehabilitation projects. Where studies indicate that buildings may be subject to significant damage during earthquakes, the structures can be retrofitted for seismic resistance.	
9.3: Seismically-induced ground failures, which are secondary seismic effects related to soil, bedrock and groundwater conditions, could occur near buildings or other facilities, resulting in injury to persons and significant economic loss due to structural damage as a result of differential settlement, liquefaction, landslides, slumping, and subsidence.	PS	9.3: Geotechnical evaluations should be required for developments proposed in areas suspected of having high or very high potential for seismically-induced ground failure. Common measures for mitigating these hazards include over-excavation and recompaction of foundation soils, densification of site soils, or providing a mat or other type of reinforced foundation, and avoiding landslide-prone areas and areas with other severe constraints.	LS
9.4: The City includes a broad variety of soils types, some of which are highly susceptible to expansion, which may shrink or swell as a result of seasonal or human-made soil moisture content changes, which can damage structures and other improvements and utilities.	PS	9.4: The expansion potential for any clayey materials encountered should be determined on a project-specific basis per ASTM D-4829, Standard Test Method for the Expansion Index of Soils. Highly expansive soils under new buildings and utilities should be removed or amended, and compacted to provide a stable foundation. Surface water should be drained away from the building to minimize the potential for shrink-swell action.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		To ensure uniform characteristics in areas of low strength soils, and to obviate any potential for differential settlements, site preparation (consisting of over excavation and recompaction of the near-surface soils) may be required prior to placement of new fills, pavements, slabs, and structures, subject to review during grading.	
9.5: Landsliding may occur in areas where slope gradients exceed 50 percent, or where grading associated with development will produce steep cut or fill slopes and/or undermine adjacent hillsides. Slopes between 30 percent gradient and 50 percent gradient underlain by cohesionless soils (sand) may experience differential settlement or downslope creep.	PS	9.5: Because of the potential for landsliding or soil creep on steep slopes, a geologic evaluation by a registered geologist shall be prepared for any development planned within 200 feet of areas greater than 50 percent slope as shown on USGS topographic maps. Any structures situated on slopes greater than 30 percent gradient should incorporate geotechnical recommendations regarding foundations, retaining walls, and grading limitations derived from a site-specific geotechnical investigation.	LS
9.6: The development of relatively undisturbed portions of the City and the development of hillside urban areas would remove vegetation and disrupt the soil surface horizon in areas where soils may be susceptible to wind and water erosion. Sediment blown from exposed soils could damage other structures and vegetation, and would be a nuisance or hazard if it accumulates in adjacent areas and storm drainage systems. Removal of soils by wind or water can also undermine buildings, roads, and other	PS	9.6: During construction, efforts should be made to keep the disturbance of existing vegetation to a minimum. This can be accomplished primarily by keeping construction machinery off of established vegetation as much as possible, especially on the upwind side of the construction site. Specific access routes should be established at the planning phase of the projects, and limits of grading established prior to development should be strictly observed. In addition, mechanical measures, such as silt fences and straw	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
development, resulting in significant economic loss.		bales, should be used to reduce soil movement, in accordance with Best Management Practices.	
Hydrology and Water Quality			
10.1: Development anticipated in the City in conformance with the General Plan could entail construction activity which could be expected to have short-term, temporary adverse effects on local water quality, such as from erosion and siltation, illicit disposal of debris, and wash water from construction vehicles and equipment.	PS	10.1: Detailed plans for erosion and sediment control during and after construction should be prepared by development project proponents and approved by the City of Hayward prior to the issuance of a grading permit for any proposed development project. Such plans should include a schedule for the construction of erosion and sediment control structures which ensure that all erosion control will be in place by a specified time before construction begins. Grading should neither be initiated nor continued during the winter rain period between October 30th and April 15th unless approved by the Director of Public Works based on evidence of an effective erosion control plan. Grading and building permits should include requirements that Best Management Practices be adhered to.	LS
10.2: Development anticipated under the General Plan Update would be expected to result in localized modifications in existing drainage patterns, and an increase in the amount of stormwater runoff.	PS	10.2: Major development projects should provide a storm drainage report including calculations of hydrology and hydraulics to determine adequacy of both privately- and publicly-managed systems to	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		accept the increased runoff. Site-specific mitigation measures may be required to upgrade the City and / or County flood control system, if necessary. Storm drainage calculations should be required for all storm drains and overland flows. Drainageshed maps should be included that show all upstream acreages and run-off coefficients for each tributary area. Overland flow paths and site release points should be clearly identified. The on-site drainage facilities, such as catch basins and storm drain pipes, should be designed to convey runoff from a 10-year frequency storm. Plans for development projects should identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate to the uses conducted on-site to effectively prohibit the discharge of pollutants with storm water run-off.	
10.3: Existing development, vacant properties, and new development could be inundated by flood waters, presenting a hazard to persons and property.	PS	10.3: The City should work in cooperation with other agencies such as FEMA and the Alameda County Flood Control District to prepare plans and develop projects that will alleviate potential flooding in the newly mapped flood plain areas. The City should require all new development in the areas presently mapped as potentially subject to	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		flooding in the 100-year event to provide evidence of sufficient flood control protection and compliance with applicable regulations of the Alameda County Flood Control District and FEMA.	
Biological Resources			
11.1: Public and private development activities in the City could result in the reduction of habitat and direct removal of special status plant and/or animal species, including mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, insects and invertebrates, which have previously been unidentified at land and/or water areas.	PS	11.1: Development of undisturbed portions of public and private project sites should be subject to sensitivity analyses, field surveys and mitigation (as required), conducted by qualified professionals according to established protocols in consultation with the appropriate regulatory agencies. Particular areas to evaluate include waterways, open grasslands, relatively undisturbed urban land, and vegetative cover along waterways.	LS
11.2: Some portions of the City which may be developed in conformance with the General Plan land use map may be adjacent to creeks which provide riparian habitat values. Development of such sites may have the potential to damage sensitive riparian habitat areas.	PS	11.2: Where development is proposed at sites within the City adjacent to natural channel creeks, the potential effects of the proposed development on riparian habitat should be evaluated as part of the use permit, building permit, or other approval process to determine the potential site-specific impacts associated with such development. All such development should be required to comply with the City's setback provisions, and to enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game (if required).	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
11.3: Public and private development projects as a result of continued development in the City could have an adverse effect on wetland areas, as noted above for habitat and riparian areas.	PS	11.3: See Mitigation Measures 11.1 and 11.2, above.	LS
Public Services and Utilities			
12.1: New development anticipated as part of the City's continued growth would result in an increased demand for school facilities within the City. The General Plan Update could have various community-wide effects that could have an impact on school sites, such as increased traffic, noise, and general hazards described elsewhere in this EIR. The increase in demand would be met by the responsible school district through the construction of new school facilities (most likely by adding structures on existing school grounds) which, depending on the characteristics of each proposed facility and site, could result in adverse physical effects on the environment.	PS	12.1: School districts should plan and construct new facilities based on long-range planning and growth projections, and according to State land use and environmental law using statutorily established funding mechanisms. The District should pursue all available means of funding for expansion of existing schools and development of new schools to meet the community's needs, according to adopted Master Plans and Facilities Studies.	LS
12.2: New development anticipated as part of the City's continued growth would result in an increased demand for parks, recreational facilities and open space in the City. This increase in demand could be met through the construction of new parks and recreational facilities (or the expansion of existing recreational facilities) which, depending on the	PS	12.2: Lead Agencies, including HARD and EBRPD, should conduct appropriate planning and environmental studies for the acquisition, construction and operation of new parks and recreational facilities (or the expansion of existing recreational facilities) to meet an increased demand for such facilities, consistent with State law.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
characteristics of each proposed facility and site, could result in adverse physical effects on the environment.		Large development projects should be coordinated with HARD to determine if it is feasible to incorporate park and recreation facilities. Private land dedications may be credited against the standard impact fees, public park and recreation projects may be jointly funded by the City and HARD, or facilities may be provided in other ways that meet the trail, parkland, and recreation facility needs of the City.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
13.1: As new or more intensive residential uses are introduced near existing commercial activities (which may be non-conforming but are capable of continuing operation for some time as pre-existing uses), then additional residents could be exposed to hazardous materials that are in storage, use, or disposal.	PS	13.1: The City should review sites listed pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 for proper use permits and other regulatory compliance, and undertake code enforcement as necessary to ensure the safety of existing and new development. Proposed land uses that pose potential threats to the health and safety of neighboring uses should be scrutinized as part of the Conditional Use Permit review procedure, and should be conditioned to ensure full compliance with the law. New residential and similar development, regardless of General Plan land use designations, should be scrutinized for possible exposure to hazardous materials, and should be sited and designed accordingly.	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
to lead and asbestos poisoning.			
Cultural Resources			
14.1: Development according to the proposed General Plan Update could result in the alteration of historical resources which have not yet been surveyed or formally protected.	PS	14.1: The City should review the HP ordinance includng the evaluation criteria, and conduct the necessary surveys, recording, and preservation of historic resources, and implement development review procedures according to the policies and strategies outlined in the draft General Plan Update.	LS
14.2: During construction that could occur as a result of the General Plan Update, archaeological resources may be uncovered and damaged if not properly recovered or preserved.	PS	14.2: In the event that any archaeological resources are uncovered during future construction activity associated with the implementation of the General Plan Update, there should be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area until the find has been evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, and appropriate site-specific mitigation has been identified to protect, preserve, remove or restore the artifacts uncovered.	LS
14.3: During excavation for public and private projects, it is possible that archaeological human remains may be uncovered.	PS	14.3: In the event that any human remains are uncovered during future construction activity, there should be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area until after the Alameda County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required or such investigation has occurred and appropriate actions have been taken, and (if the remains are determined to be of Native American	LS

Impact	Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		origin) the descendants from the deceased Native American(s) have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.	
Population, Housing and Employment			
15.1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update is expected to result in growth in residential, commercial and industrial areas.	LS	15.1: None Required.	LS
15.2: Development of property that is presently occupied with housing would displace existing residents.	LS	15.2: None Required.	LS