ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: THE CITY OF HAYWARD PLANNING DIVISION

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.

_____ _____

Erik Pearson, Senior Planner Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

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

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

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

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

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EXISTING SETTING

The annexation area is relatively flat. The Hayward Hills are visible to the east, but there are no views to the San Francisco Bay to the west.

Views from scenic routes have been modified extensively over the past four decades and generally reflect the urban context of the City and region. There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways in the City of Hayward.

The annexation area is also in close proximity to a great deal of urban activity, including in association with the Chabot College campus, nearby industrial parks, individual industrial and commercial areas, a nearby regional shopping mall, and a nearby local airport.

Figures I.1a through **I.3b (Photos)** present the existing visual character of the annexation area. The annexation area is surrounded by the City of Hayward and their development pattern includes single-family homes built on larger size parcels. This results in a character that some residents characterize as semi-rural. Some parcels within the annexation area also contain multi-family residences, and institutional uses.

Many of the parcels have been developed for a considerable period of time, including some since the 1920's and 1930's. Consequently, numerous trees on private property and within public rights-of-way have grown to significant size and would be considered Protected Trees, per the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. Typical tree species include coast live oak, eucalyptus, pine, and silver maple.

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Impacts are considered significant if they alter the type of use on the land to create an adverse visual character on a scenic vista. Significant impacts would also occur if the project substantially altered existing scenic resources including trees, earth formations, or buildings, or if the project created a new light source that adversely affected the visibility of the site and views from adjacent areas.

IMPACT DISCUSSION

SCENIC VISTAS

a) ***Less than Significant.*** The proposed project includes pre-zoning of the annexation area, annexation, and extension of street and utility system improvements. Unregulated land development in the Mt. Eden area could potentially block some views of the Hayward Hills and other features. However, the land uses and new potential development anticipated for the annexation area per the proposed pre-zoning and City of Hayward General Plan, are not of a nature that are highly likely to block regional scenic vistas. Furthermore, the required adherence to the City's Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines would limit the height and bulk of new structures so that significant views would still remain. Consequently, the project would have a less than significant impact on regional scenic vistas.

SCENIC RESOURCES, INCLUDING TREES, ROCK OUTCROPPINGS, AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS WITHIN A STATE SCENIC HIGHWAY?

b) ***Less than Significant.*** Interstate 580 from San Leandro to the eastern border of Alameda County is an Eligible State Scenic Highway, but the annexation area is not located within visibility of Interstate 580. There are no City, County or State designated Scenic Highways located within or adjacent to the annexation area.

VISUAL CHARACTER

c) ***Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated***. The annexation area is surrounded by the City of Hayward and an urban environment, including existing residential uses, some industrial uses, and public facilities. Please refer to **Figures I.1a** through **I.3b (Photos)** for more information on the visual character of the annexation area. The proposed project would result in the extension of street and utility improvements and new potential development, but such improvements and additional development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the annexation area and vicinity. Also, future development would be subject to City site development review and design guidelines, which could result in beneficial impacts.

However, the annexation area does contain scenic resources, including trees and historic buildings, and the project could indirectly influence these scenic resources. Street and utility system improvements could result in removal or damage to trees that would qualify for protection under the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. Other trees that qualify for protection would likely be removed on private property to accommodate development envisioned in the Hayward General Plan. New potential development and usage at parcels containing historic buildings could potentially influence the historic integrity of those buildings. Please see Section IV.e), Biological Resources and Section V.a), Cultural Resources for additional discussion.

T:_CS\Work\Hayward, City of\Mt Eden Phase II Annexation 28-0008\Aesthetic Figures

Intersection of West St and Saklan

Intersection of West St and Mohr Dr

Chabot Campus Parking Lot

Public Transit

Figure I.1a

Photos of Surrounding Area

PMC®

T:_CS\Work\Hayward, City of\Mt Eden Phase II Annexation 28-0008\Aesthetic Figures

Mt. Eden Cemetery on Depot Rd

Intersection of Depot Rd and Clawiter Rd

Laguna Dr Looking East

Occidental Rd Looking East

Figure I.1b

Photos of Surrounding Area

PMC®

T:_CS\Work\Hayward, City of\Mt Eden Phase II Annexation 28-0008\Aesthetic Figures

Property on Mohr Dr

Property on Mohr Dr

Property on Mohr Dr

Figure I.2a

Photos of West-Mohr Island

PMC®