

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

1. Project Title: Installation of Athletic Field(s) Lighting Poles Standards for Bishop O'Dowd High School
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Oakland
Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 2114
Oakland, CA 94612
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Moe Hackett (510) 238-3973 & Robert Merkamp (510)238-6283)
4. Project Location: 9500 Sterns Avenue, APN# 043A-4755-001-09
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Jeffery Wood Architects
3845 Glen Park Road
Oakland Ca 94602
6. General Plan Designation: Institutional
7. Zoning: R-30
8. Description of Project: Bishop O'Dowd High School is proposing to install permanent field lighting on its two athletic fields. The field lighting system will consist of eight 70-foot tall light standards that are each mounted with between five and fourteen luminaries. A total of four of the proposed standards will be located on the outer periphery of the campus with two on 98th Avenue and two on Sterns Avenue. The existing field has no infrastructure to allow for night and evening illumination.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The existing school (athletic fields / project site) is located in a developed area of the City of Oakland, containing a mix of residential uses and resource conservation areas. The project site is immediately surrounded by school building, school parking lots, the 98th Avenue thoroughfare, and residential housing (Located approximately 60 feet away on the Stearns Avenue frontage).
10. Actions/permits which may be required, and for which this document provides CEQA clearance, include without limitation: Major Conditional Use Permit, Minor Variance, Building and Electrical Permits
11. Other Public Agencies Interested in the Project: None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages, which can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input 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 checked="" 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/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment with Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standards Conditions of Approval, 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 mitigation measures and Uniformly Applied Development Standards (imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval) have been imposed on the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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 earlier document(s) pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures or Uniformly Applied Development Standards (imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval) based on the earlier analysis, and, in part, on CEQA Guidelines section 15183. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed, which include. No other environmental factors will be further studied.

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

Moe Hackett
Planner II

9-1-08

Date

For Eric Angstadt
Deputy Director of the
Community and Economic Development Agency
Environmental Review Officer

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

CEQA requires that an explanation of all answers be provided along with this checklist, including a discussion of ways to mitigate any significant effects identified.

Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, less than significant with development standards, or less than significant. As defined here, a “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if the significant effect is considered to have a substantial or potentially substantial adverse effect on the environment. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

A “Less than Significant with Mitigation” answer applies where incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from a “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.

A “Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval” answer applies where incorporation of a development standard has reduced an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The City’s Uniformly Applied Development Standards (contained in a separate document) are incorporated into projects as Standard Conditions of Approval regardless of a project’s environmental determination. As applicable, the Standard Conditions of Approval are adopted as requirements of an individual project when it is approved by the City and are designed to, and will, substantially mitigate environmental effects, in part, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183. In reviewing project applications, the City determines which of the standard conditions are applied, based upon the zoning district, community plan, and the type(s) of permit(s)/approvals(s) required for the project. Depending on the specific characteristics of the project type and/or project site, the city will determine which standard conditions apply to each project; for example, standard conditions related to creek protection permits will only be applied projects on creekside properties.

The Standard Conditions of Approval incorporate development policies and standards from various adopted plans, policies, and ordinances (such as the Oakland Planning and Municipal Codes, Oakland Creek Protection, Stormwater Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, Oakland Tree Protection Ordinance, Oakland Grading Regulations, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, Housing Element-related mitigation measures, California Building Code, and Uniform Fire Code, among others), which have been found to substantially mitigate environmental effects. Where there are peculiar circumstances associated with a project or project site that will result in significant environmental impacts despite implementation of the Standard Conditions, the City will determine whether there are feasible mitigation measures to reduce the impact to less than significant levels in the course of appropriate CEQA review (mitigated negative declarations or EIRs).

A “Less than Significant Impact” answer applies where the project creates no substantial or potentially substantial adverse effect on the environment.

A “No Impact” answer applies where a project does not create any impact in that category. A “No Impact” answer needs to be 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 doesn’t apply to projects like the one under involved. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project –specific factors as well as general standards.

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state or locally designated scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would substantially and adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Introduce landscape that now or in the future cast substantial shadows on existing solar collectors (in conflict with California Public Resource Code Section 25980-25986)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Cast shadows that substantially impairs the function of a building using passive solar heat collection, solar collectors for hot water heating, or photovoltaic solar collectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Cast a shadow that substantially impairs the beneficial use of any public or quasi-public park, lawn, garden, or open space?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Cast shadow on an historic resource, as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5(a), such that the shadow would materially impair the resource's historic significance by materially altering those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion on or eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, Local Register of Historic Resources or a historical resource survey form (DPR Form 523) with a rating of 1-5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Require an exception (variance) to the policies and regulations in the General Plan, Planning Code, or Uniform Building Code, and the exception causes a fundamental conflict with policies and regulations in the General Plan, Planning Code, and Uniform Building Code addressing the provision of adequate light related to appropriate uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Create winds exceeding 36 mph for more than 1 hour during daylight hours during the year?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Explanation:

Comments to I (e), (f), (g), (h) and (j) No Impact

e) and f) The proposed project includes lighting standards with landscape as mitigation for the glare (See Mitigation Measure AES-2 below). No buildings using passive solar heat collection or photovoltaic solar collectors are known to exist near the project site. Therefore, the project and the landscape mitigation will not create shadows that will impact passive solar collection.

g) The King Estate Open Space (and underground reservoir) borders the northern perimeter of the Bishop O'Dowd campus. The King Estate Open Space is primarily used for passive recreation. This open space is located more than 500 feet away from the athletic fields and the proposed location of the lights. Based on this distance and the limited height of the poles, the proposed project will not generate a shadow that would cross onto the open space. Therefore, the project will not impair the use of the open space

h) There are no existing historic resources or items listed on Local, State, or National Historic registries.

j) The project would not result in potential wind impacts; the project is less than 100 feet in height, not located adjacent to a substantial water body, and not located in Downtown Oakland.

Comments to I (a), (b), (c), and (i) Less than Significant

a) and b) No scenic vistas or scenic resources exist within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Views to the Oakland Hills are present on some east/west streets in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed lighting standards would not substantially block views from public places, including roadways. The project site is not clearly visible from a state-designated scenic highway or scenic route. Interstate 580 is listed as a Scenic Highway from the I-980/CA-24 interchange in Oakland to the Oakland San Leandro border (the section of I580 in San Joaquin County between the Altamont Pass and I-5 is also a Scenic Highway). Information from the Department of Transportation website shows that I-580 has won several awards for landscaping in this section of Oakland and is known for providing spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, and Oakland. As stated the portions of the 580 where the campus and proposed lights will be visible only briefly and will be situated as part of the east Oakland vista both day and night.. Therefore, the project is considered to have no impact on scenic vistas or scenic resources within a state or locally designated scenic highway.

The project site is located on a flat graded plateau with is shielded from the views of the properties located on Stearns Avenue and 98th Avenue. The views down slope from the areas of and near the 580 Freeway and the Oakland hill are shielded for the most part by the existing topographic contours of the surrounding terrain. View as seen from this direction are of the lower lands (flats) of east Oakland which is an existing built up urban area. The proposed light standards will present a very minimum / narrow aspect as seen from any direction, and are located completely on the subject property.

c) The visual character surrounding the project site is eclectic. The single family residential buildings range in age and vary considerably in terms of size, scale, and architectural style. The arterial corridor on which the project is located on features an undeveloped urban landscape with some small commercial structures (auto services).

The project site itself has low visual quality because it is currently occupied by a number of institutional building surrounded by surface parking, undeveloped open space and the athletic fields. The proposed project would install eight 70 foot tall lighting standards with between 5 and 9 light fixtures each. The proposed new lighting standards would encircle the baseball and football fields. The change would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site or surroundings due to the very thin nature of the poles and their neutral coloring.

i) The proposed project requires a variance for the proposed height of the poles (70 feet in a residential zone). This variance will cause no fundamental conflict to the policies and regulations in the General Plan, Planning Code or Uniform Building Code addressing the provision of light.

Comments to I (d): Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval and Mitigation Measure

Lighting would be installed within the project site for the maintenance of public safety. This lighting, which would be directed downward and away from neighboring properties, is not expected to substantially adversely affect nighttime views. The proposed lighting system incorporates a low intensity (and energy saving) setting that will be employed for non-athletic activities such as field maintenance (cleaning) and spectator / player egress at the end of the evenings event or workout. As a condition of approval this setting will be required at the completion of any athletic use that would require the higher setting.

The primary use for the lights would be for the various team practices. Games and practices usually take place from a start time of 3:15 or 3:30 in the afternoon and run until their completion. It is foreseen that the lights would be use primarily to light the few twilight hours of practice, but could be required until 10:00 pm in the event of a game.

The incorporation of a lighting plan is a Standard Condition of Approval.

Standard Condition AES-1: Lighting Plan. Prior to the issuance of an electrical or building permit, the proposed lighting fixtures shall be adequately shielded to a point below the light bulb and reflector and that prevent unnecessary glare onto adjacent properties. Plans shall be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division and the Electrical Services Division of the Public Works Agency for review and approval. All lighting shall be architecturally integrated into the site.

It is possible that even though the lights are directed downward and the intensity setting will be regulated, that the light could affect nighttime views and disturb residents. Staff has included the following Mitigation Measure to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure AES-2: Landscape Plan for Trees. Prior to the issuance of electrical or building permits the applicant shall submit a landscape plan with shall allow for the planting of tall native trees (preferably coast redwood, *Sequoia sempervirens*). These trees shall be located around the athletic field perimeter or in other locations as needed to facilitate the shielding of any excess spill light and glare from neighboring properties and vistas. Care shall be taken to avoid the creation of excessive shadows beyond the sites property lines. A licensed landscape architects and accredited engineers and contractors shall be employed for the design and implementation of these plans. Appropriate provisions shall be made for the ongoing irrigation and maintenance of both trees and their related facilities. All sick, dead, or damaged trees shall be replaced as need. This screening tree stand shall remain in place as long as the athletic fields and lights exist.

Sources:

Field Surveys
Project Plans

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), List of Officially Designated State Scenic Highways
City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Plan Element, March 1998

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | X |

Explanation:

Comments to II (a), (b), and (c). No Impact

There are no agricultural resources on or near the project site area. The proposed project would not create a significant impact on agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:

Project Impacts

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) Frequently create substantial objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| f) Contribute to CO concentrations exceeding the State AAQS of 9 ppm averaged over 8 hours and 20 ppm for 1 hour? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| g) Result in total emissions of ROG, NOx, or PM10 of 15 tons | | | | | |

per year or greater, or 80 pounds (36 kilograms) per day or greater? X

h) Result in potential to expose persons to substantial levels of Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC), such that the probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million? X

i) Result in ground level concentrations of non-carcinogenic TACs such that the Hazard Index would be greater than 1 for the MEI? X

j) Result in a substantial increase in diesel emissions? X

Cumulative Impacts

k) Result in any of the above project-specific significant impacts? X

l) Result in a fundamental conflict with the local general plan, when the general plan is consistent with the regional air quality plan? When the general plan fundamentally conflicts with the regional air quality plan, then if the contribution of the proposed project is cumulatively considerable when analyzed the impact to air quality should be considered significant? X

Explanation:

Comments to III (a), (c), (d), (k), and (l) No Impact

The proposed project with the installation of lights is not expected to generate any substantial pollutant concentrations or in a net increase of any criteria pollutant. The use proposed at the Project site comply with the existing zoning and General Plan designation for the site. The City of Oakland General Plan is consistent with the BAAQMD's Air Quality Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable air quality management or clean air plans. No air quality impacts associated with the Project as proposed have been identified as significant or potentially significant, above, so the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable adverse impact on air quality.

During construction, the project would generate temporary emissions, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions. Project-related activities would include grading and trenching for the light foundations and the conduits. Emissions generated from these activities include dust and combustion emissions primarily from operation of construction equipment and from worker vehicles.

Comments to III (b), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j) Less than Significant with Standard Condition of approval. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines recognize that construction equipment causes emissions, but indicate that such emissions are included in the inventory that is the basis for regional air quality plans.

Construction-related dust emissions would be temporary due to the limited grading and excavation for the project. The BAAQMD's approach to analyses of dust emissions from construction is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive dust control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions. The District considers any project's construction-related impacts to be less than significant if the

required dust control measures are implemented. Without these measures, the impact is generally considered to be significant, particularly if sensitive land uses are located in the project vicinity. In the case of the Project, residential land uses and a school are located adjacent to the Project site. The proposed Project would be subject to the measures approved by the BAAQMD (listed below), which City Standard Conditions of Approval, and which could reduce the impact of fugitive dust emissions to a level of less than significant.

AQ-1 Dust Control Prior to issuance of a demolition, grading or building permit

During construction, the project applicant shall require the construction contractor to implement the following measures required as part of Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) basic and enhanced dust control procedures required for construction sites. These include:

- a) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.**
- b) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).**
- c) Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.**
- d) Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.**
- e) Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.**
- f) Limit the amount of the disturbed area at any one time, where feasible.**
- g) Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.**
- h) Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as feasible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.**
- i) Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as feasible.**
- j) Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).**
- k) Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.**
- l) Clean off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving any unpaved construction areas.**

AQ-2 Construction Emissions Prior to issuance of a demolition, grading or building permit

To minimize construction equipment emissions during construction, the project applicant shall require the construction contractor to:

- a) Demonstrate compliance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Regulation 2, Rule 1 (General Requirements) for all portable construction equipment subject to that rule. BAAQMD Regulation 2, Rule 1 provides the issuance of authorities to construct and permits to operate certain types of portable equipment used for construction purposes (e.g., gasoline or diesel-powered engines used in conjunction with power generation, pumps, compressors, and cranes) unless such equipment complies with all applicable requirements of the "CAPCOA" Portable Equipment Registration Rule" or**

with all applicable requirements of the Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program. This exemption is provided in BAAQMD Rule 2-1-105.

- b) Perform low- NOx tune-ups on all diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (no more than 30 days prior to the start of use of that equipment). Periodic tune-ups (every 90 days) shall be performed for such equipment used continuously during the construction period.**

The proposed project is not expected to result in any operational impacts associated with air quality. The proposed land use is consistent with the uses of the surrounding vicinity, and is not expected to generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Although some heavy equipment involved in grading and trenching at the site may emit diesel fumes, potential odor effects associated with these activities would be temporary and intermittent, and would end with completion of construction.

Sources:

Staff research and analysis

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, December 28, 2005

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Revised San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard, October 24, 2001

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Rules and Regulations

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Guidelines, April 1996

City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Plan Element, March 1998

City of Oakland, Bicycle Master Plan, July 20, 1999

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? X

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? X

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act) or state protected wetlands, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? X

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? X

e) Fundamentally conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? X

f) Fundamentally conflict with the City of Oakland Tree Preservation Ordinance (Oakland Municipal Code (OMC) Chapter 12.36) by removal of protected trees under certain circumstances? Factors to be considered in determining significance include: The number, type, size, location and condition of (a) the protected trees to be removed and/or impacted by construction and (b) the protected trees to remain, with special consideration given to native trees.

Protected trees include the following: Quercus agrifolia (California or coast live oak) measuring four inches diameter at breast height (dbh) or larger, and any other tree measuring nine inches dbh or larger except eucalyptus and pinus radiata (Monterey pine); provided, however, that Monterey pine trees on City property and in development-related situations where more than five Monterey pine trees per acre are proposed to be removed are considered to be Protected trees. X

g) Fundamentally conflict with the City of Oakland Creek Protection Ordinance (OMC Chapter 13.16) intended to protect biological resources. Although there are no specific, numeric/quantitative criteria to assess impacts, factors to be considered in determining significance include whether there is substantial degradation of riparian and aquatic habitat through:

(a) discharging a substantial amount of pollutants into a creek;
 (b) significantly modifying the natural flow of the water; (c)
 depositing substantial amounts of new material into a creek or
 causing substantial bank erosion or instability; or (d) adversely
 impacting the riparian corridor by significantly altering
 vegetation or wildlife habitat?

X

Explanation:

Comments to IV (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). No Impact

The project site is located in an urban area and surrounded by residential neighborhoods on all sides. The project site contains the school, parking areas, and playing fields. There are no habitats, special status species, creeks, wetlands or other sensitive natural communities located on-site or adjacent to the site that could be affected by the proposed project. Given the lack of wildlife habitat, the active school use and the surrounding residential neighborhood, the project would not interfere with the movement of wildlife nor would the site be used as a wildlife nursery. The project does not involve the removal of any trees pursuant to the Tree Preservation and Removal Ordinance. Therefore, proposed project would not create a significant impact on biological resources.

Sources:

Staff research and analysis

City of Oakland, Tree Preservation and Removal Ordinance (Oakland Municipal Code, Chapter 12.36)

City of Oakland, Creek Protection Ordinance (Oakland Municipal Code, Chapter 13.16)

City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, June 1996

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project?

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. Specifically, a substantial adverse change includes physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be "materially impaired." The significance of an historical resource is "materially impaired" when a project demolishes or materially alters, in an adverse manner, those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance **and** that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on an historical resource list (including the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historical Resources, Local Register, or historical resources survey form (DPR Form 523) with a rating of 1-5)?

X

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

X

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

X

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

X

Explanation:

Comments to V (b), (c), and (d). Less than Significant Impact

- b) Although the project site possesses no known archeological resources, and the project site is not listed on a map or survey indicating archeological sensitivity, the proposed project would require grading for the lighting standards foundations. With incorporation of the Standard Condition CUL-1 regarding archeological resources, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition CUL-1: Archaeological Resources. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction.

a) Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 (f), "provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction" should be instituted. Therefore, in the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the project applicant and/or lead agency shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of the project proponent and/or lead agency and the qualified archaeologist would meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate measure, with the ultimate determination to be made by the City of Oakland. All significant cultural material recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.

b) In considering any suggested measure proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the project applicant shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while measure for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is carried out.

c) Should an archaeological artifact or feature be discovered on-site during project construction, all activities within a 50-foot radius of the find would be halted until the findings can be fully investigated by a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find and assess the significance of the find according to the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource. If the deposit is determined to be significant, the project applicant and the qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate measure, subject to approval by the City of Oakland, which shall assure implementation of appropriate measure measures recommended by the archaeologist. Should archaeologically-significant materials be recovered, the qualified archaeologist would recommend appropriate analysis and treatment, and would prepare a report on the findings for submittal to the Northwest Information Center.

- c) The proposed project site possesses no known paleontological resources. However, with the incorporation of Standard Condition CUL-2 regarding paleontological resources, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition CUL-2: Paleontological Resources. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of a paleontological resource during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist (per Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 1995,1996)). The qualified paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The paleontologist shall notify the

appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important, and such plan shall be implemented. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.

d) The proposed project site contains no known human remains. However with incorporation of Standard Condition CUL-3 regarding human remains, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition CUL-3: Human Remains. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered at the project site during construction or ground-breaking activities, all work shall immediately halt and the Alameda County Coroner shall be contacted to evaluate the remains, and following the procedures and protocols pursuant to Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the City shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and all excavation and site preparation activities shall cease within a foot radius of the find until appropriate arrangements are made. If the agencies determine that avoidance is not feasible, then an alternative plan shall be prepared with specific steps and timeframe required to resume construction activities. Monitoring, data recovery, determination of significance and avoidance measures (if applicable) shall be completed expeditiously.

Comments to V (a). No Impact

a) There are no existing historic resources on-site or on nearby adjacent properties that would be affected by the proposed project.

Sources:

Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey.
State Office of Historic Preservation, Directory of Properties

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to substantial 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 or Seismic Hazards 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 Publications 42 and 117 and PRC §2690 et. Seq.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, creating substantial risks to life, property, or creek/waterways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as it may be revised), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located above a well, pit, swamp, mound, tank vault, or unmarked sewer line, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located above landfills for which there is no approved closure and post-closure plan, or unknown fill soils, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Explanation:

Comments to IV (a:iv) and (f) No impact

The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat so the risk of landslides is minimal. The project is not proposing any septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system.

Comments to VI (a:i-iii), (b), (c), (d), and (e). Less than Significant

It is unlikely that the project site is located on expansive soils. The project only involves lighting adjacent to already developed athletic fields that have been used since approximately 1974. However, the proposed project is located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. In accordance with standard City practices, and in conformance with current codes and regulations, the project sponsor shall be required to submit detailed engineering drawings and materials to the Building Services Division prior to excavation,

grading, or construction on the site. This measure would ensure that the lighting standards are designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the City of Oakland Building Code and the applicable provisions of the California Building Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial risks to life or property due to unstable or expansive soil. It is also unlikely that the fields are located above a well, swamp, pit, unmarked sewer line, or landfill. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Sources:

Field Surveys
Project Plans

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"/> | X | <input 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"/> | X | <input 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"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) Be 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, and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| f) Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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"/> | X | <input 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"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Explanation:

Comments to VII (d), (e), and (f) No Impact

The proposed project site is not located on the Cortese List of hazardous materials. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, nor is within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impact is anticipated from the project.

Comments to VII (g) Less than Significant

Although 98th Ave is designated as an evacuation route, the proposed lights would not impede vehicular or pedestrian traffic on this route. Regular updating of the city's emergency plan would ensure that the project would not impair the city's emergency response and this would continue to be a less than significant impact.

Comments to VII (a), (b), (c) and (h) Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval

The construction and installation of the lighting standards is not to involve processes that have the potential to generate hazardous waste, involve the release of hazardous materials or involve the handling of either hazardous or acutely hazardous (toxic) materials near the school. However with incorporation the Standard Condition HAZ-1 regarding best management practices, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

HAZ-1 Hazards Best Management Practices

Prior to commencement of demolition, grading, or construction

The project applicant and construction contractor shall ensure that construction of Best Management Practices (BMPs) are implemented as part of construction to minimize the potential negative effects to groundwater and soils. These shall include the following:

- a) Follow manufacture's recommendations on use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- b) Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks;
- c) During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils;
- d) Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.
- e) Ensure that construction would not have a significant impact on the environment or pose a substantial health risk to construction workers and the occupants of the proposed development. Soil sampling and chemical analyses of samples shall be performed to determine the extent of potential contamination beneath all UST's, elevator shafts, clarifiers, and subsurface hydraulic lifts when on-site demolition, or construction activities would potentially affect a particular development or building.
- f) If soil, groundwater or other environmental medium with suspected contamination is encountered unexpectedly during construction activities (e.g., identified by odor or visual staining, or if any underground storage tanks, abandoned drums or other hazardous materials or wastes are encountered), the applicant shall cease work in the vicinity of the suspect material, the area shall be secured as necessary, and the applicant shall take all appropriate measures to protect human health and the environment. Appropriate measures shall include notification of regulatory agency(ies) and implementation of the actions described in the City's Standard Conditions of Approval, as necessary, to identify the nature and extent of contamination. Work shall not resume in the area(s) affected until the measures have been implemented under the oversight of the City or regulatory agency, as appropriate.

Although the site is located in the wildfire assessment district, the site is already developed with school buildings, fields, and parking lots. The lights are not expected to increase the exposure of the persons to risk involving wildfires. However with incorporation the Standard Condition HAZ-2 regarding vegetation management plan, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

HAZ-2 Vegetation Management Plan

<http://www.oaklandnet.com/wildfirePrevention/WildfirePreventionAssessmentDistrictMap.pdf>

Prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, and/or construction and Ongoing

- a) **The project applicant shall submit a vegetation management plan to the Planning and Zoning Division and Fire Services Division that includes if deemed appropriate, but not limited to the, following measures:**
- i. **Removal of dead vegetation overhanging roof and chimney areas;**
 - ii. **Removal of leaves and needles from roofs;**
 - iii. **Planting and placement of fire-resistant plants around the house and phasing out flammable vegetation;**
 - iv. **Trimming back vegetation around windows;**
 - v. **Removal of flammable vegetation on hillside slopes greater than 20%;**
 - vi. **Pruning the lower branches of tall trees;**
 - vii. **Clearing out ground-level brush and debris;**
 - viii. **Stacking woodpiles away from structures.**
- b) **The project applicant shall enter into a maintenance agreement with the City that ensures that landscaping will be maintained and adhere to measures listed above.**

HAZ-3 Fire Safety *Prior to and ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction*

The project applicant and construction contractor will ensure that during project construction, all construction vehicles and equipment will be fitted with spark arrestors to minimize accidental ignition of dry construction debris and surrounding dry vegetation.

Sources:

Field Surveys
Project Plans

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	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"/>	X	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site that would affect the quality of receiving waters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create or contribute substantial runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Create or contribute substantial runoff which would be an additional source of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) 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, that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) 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 type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
k) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
l) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course, or increasing the rate or amount of flow, of a Creek, river or stream in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding, both on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
m) Fundamentally conflict with elements of the City of Oakland Creek Protection (OMC Chapter 13.16) ordinance					

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	---	------------------------------	-----------

intended to protect hydrologic resources. Although there are no specific, numeric/quantitative criteria to assess impacts, factors to be considered in determining significance include whether there is substantial degradation of water quality through (a) discharging a substantial amount of pollutants into a creek; (b) significantly modifying the natural flow of the water or capacity; (c) depositing substantial amounts of new material into a creek or causing substantial bank erosion or instability; or (d) substantially endangering public or private property or threatening public health or safety?

X

Explanation:

Comments to VII (b), (d), (e), (f) (g), (h), (i), (j) (k), and (m) No Impact

The project would not draw ground water from the site. The proposed lights would not result or contribute to run-off that would exceed the capacity of the stormdrain system or create an additional source of polluted run-off. The proposed lights would not degrade water quality and is not located within the 100-year flood plain. There is no threat of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, tsunami, or mudflow, nor will the project change in anyway the drainage patterns in the area. No creek exists on the site so the project will not conflict with the Creek Protection Ordinance. Therefore the proposed project would have no impact.

Comments to VII (a), and (c) Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval

The proposed project would involve minimal grading associated with the foundations for the poles and trenching for the electrical conduits. This grading and excavation could result in a temporary impact to water quality during this construction. However with incorporation the Standard Condition HYDRO-1 regarding erosion control, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

HYDRO-1 Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan *Prior to any grading activities*

- a) **The project applicant shall obtain a grading permit if required by the Oakland Grading Regulations pursuant to Section 15.04.780 of the Oakland Municipal Code. The grading permit application shall include an erosion and sedimentation control plan for review and approval by the Building Services Division. The erosion and sedimentation control plan shall include all necessary measures to be taken to prevent excessive stormwater runoff or carrying by stormwater runoff of solid materials on to lands of adjacent property owners, public streets, or to creeks as a result of conditions created by grading operations. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, such measures as short-term erosion control planting, waterproof slope covering, check dams, interceptor ditches, benches, storm drains, dissipation structures, diversion dikes, retarding berms and barriers, devices to trap, store and filter out sediment, and stormwater retention basins. Off-site work by the project applicant may be necessary. The project applicant shall obtain permission or easements necessary for off-site work. There shall be a clear notation that the plan is subject to changes as changing conditions occur. Calculations of anticipated stormwater runoff and sediment volumes shall be included, if required by the Director of Development or designee. The plan shall specify that, after construction is complete, the project applicant shall ensure that the storm drain system shall be inspected and that the project applicant shall clear the system of any debris or sediment.**

Ongoing throughout grading and construction activities

- b) The project applicant shall implement the approved erosion and sedimentation plan. No grading shall occur during the wet weather season (October 15 through April 15) unless specifically authorized in writing by the Building Services Division.

If addition to the standard condition of approval above, construction projects are required to seek coverage under the NPDES general construction permit and file a Notice of Intent with the Regional Water Quality Control Board for discharges of stormwater associated with construction. Since the project is only proposing the addition of 10 square feet of impervious surface but does not meet the exceptions, staff is unsure whether the project would require this condition. If applicable, the applicant shall incorporate the following Standard Condition of Approval.

HYDRO-2: Site Design Measures for Post-Construction Stormwater Management

Prior to issuance of building permit (or other construction-related permit)

The project drawings submitted for a building permit (or other construction-related permit) shall contain a final site plan to be reviewed and approved by Planning and Zoning. The final site plan shall incorporate appropriate site design measures to manage stormwater runoff and minimize impacts to water quality after the construction of the project. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. Minimize impervious surfaces, especially directly connected impervious surfaces;
- ii. Utilize permeable paving in place of impervious paving where appropriate;
- iii. Cluster buildings;
- iv. Preserve quality open space; and
- v. Establish vegetated buffer areas.

Ongoing

The approved plan shall be implemented and the site design measures shown on the plan shall be permanently maintained.

HYDRO-3: Source Control Measures to Limit Stormwater Pollution

Prior to issuance of building permit (or other construction-related permit)

The applicant shall implement and maintain all structural source control measures imposed by the Chief of Building Services to limit the generation, discharge, and runoff of stormwater pollution.

Ongoing

The applicant, or his or her successor, shall implement all operational Best Management Practices (BMPs) imposed by the Chief of Building Services to limit the generation, discharge, and runoff of stormwater pollution.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	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 type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Result in a fundamental conflict between adjacent or nearby land uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Fundamentally conflict with 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 and actually result in a physical change in the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Fundamentally conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

Explanation:

Comments to IX (a), (b), (c), and (d). No Impact

The proposed project, with the installation of athletic field lighting would not divide an established community. The use of the fields in an accessory use to the school and are already in use. The project would not result in a fundamental conflict between adjacent or nearby land uses and the use is not proposed to change. The proposed project is consistent with the City's land use regulations. The proposed project site is zoned R-30 One Family Residential Zone and is located in the Institutional General Plan Category. The use as a school is conditionally permitted in the R-30 Zone and permitted in the General Plan category. The City has no adopted a Habitat or Conservation Plan. Therefore, the project would have no impacts on land use.

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 type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | X |

Explanation:

Comments to X (a) and (b). No Impact

The project site does not possess any known mineral resources of value to the region. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	---	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Oakland general plan or applicable standards of other agencies (e.g., OSHA)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate the City of Oakland Noise Ordinance (Oakland Planning Code Section 17.120.050) regarding operational noise?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Violate the City of Oakland Noise Ordinance (Oakland Planning Section 17.120.050) regarding construction noise, except if an acoustical analysis is preformed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Violates the City of Oakland Noise Ordinance (Oakland Municipal Code Section 8.18.020) regarding nuisance of persistent construction-related noise?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create a vibration not associated with motor vehicles, trains, and temporary construction or demolition work, which is perceptible without instruments by the average person at or beyond any lot line containing vibration-causing activities, except vibration causing activities located within the (a) M-40 zone or (b) M-30 zone more than 400 feet from any legally occupied residential property (Oakland Planning Code Section 17.120.060)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Expose person to or generate rail-related groundbourne vibration in excess of standards established by the Federal Transit Administration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Generate interior Ldn or CNEL greater than 45 dBA for multi-family dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories and long-term care facilities (and may be extended by local legislative action to include single family dwellings) per California Noise Insulation Standards (CCR Part 2, Title 24):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Result in a 5dBA permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflicts with state land use compatibility guidelines for all specified land uses for determination of acceptability of noise after incorporation of all applicable Standard Conditions of Approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Be located within an airport land use plan and would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
k) Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would					

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Explanation:

Comment to XI (e), (f), (g), (i), (j) and (k) No Impact

Other than during the construction period the proposed project would not include any elements that would create or cause a significant vibration. The proposed project does not include any construction of buildings and therefore would not need to be the Title 24 requirements for interior noise. The project site is not within an airport land use plan, nor is it near a private airstrip. Therefore the project would have no impact.

Comments to XI (a) (c), (d) & (h): Less Than Significant.

Noise Standards:

Sound pressure is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing, and 120 dB to 140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain. Because sound pressure can vary by over one trillion times within the range of human hearing, a logarithmic loudness scale is used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. Owing to the variation in sensitivity of the human ear to various frequencies, sound is “weighted” to emphasize frequencies to which the ear is more sensitive, in a method known as A-weighting, and expressed in units of A-weighted decibels (dBA). The L_{eq} is the constant sound level, which would contain the same acoustic energy as the varying sound level, during the same time period (i.e., the average noise exposure level for the given time period). The day-night noise level (L_{dn}) is an average 24-hour noise level that accounts for the greater sensitivity of most people to nighttime noise by giving greater weight to nighttime noise.

City of Oakland noise guidelines recognizes the variable sensitivity of certain activities to noise, and establish noise exposure criteria defining acceptable noise levels. For residential land use, these guidelines indicate that noise levels of up to 60 to 65 dBA L_{dn} are normally acceptable, noise levels up to 70 dBA are considered conditionally acceptable, up to 75 dBA are normally unacceptable, and above 75 dBA are considered clearly unacceptable. Existing noise levels in the Project vicinity are primarily the result of motor vehicle traffic on the adjacent freeway and surrounding streets and noise from the athletic fields. The City of Oakland Noise Element Update Environmental Noise Background Report indicates that existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project site are 60-65 dBA L_{dn} . Projected noise contours for 2025 show the Project site within an area that would be expected to have ambient noise levels are expected to stay the same at 60 and 65 dBA L_{dn} .

Construction Noise

Construction activity at the Project site would be expected to generate noise which, if not mitigated, could affect those living and working nearby. Construction noise levels are related to the types of equipment used:

Typical Construction Noise Levels (Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1971)

<u>Equipment</u>	<u>Leq Noise Level (dBA) @ 50 Feet</u>	<u>With Feasible Noise Controls*</u>
<i>Earthmoving:</i>		
Front Loader	79	75
Backhoe	85	75
Dozer	80	75
Tractor	80	75

Scraper	88	80
Grader	85	75
Paver	89	80
<i>Materials Handling:</i>		
Concrete Mixer	85	75
Concrete Pump	82	75
Crane	83	75
<i>Stationary:</i>		
Pump	76	75
Generator	78	75
Compressors	81	75
<i>Impact:</i>		
Jack Hammer	88	75
Pneumatic Tools	86	80

* Estimated levels obtainable by selecting quieter procedures or machines and implementing noise-control features requiring no major redesign or extreme cost.

However, the construction contractor would be required to comply with nighttime, weekend, and holiday limitations on construction activity, and implement standard noise-reducing construction practices as a standard condition of project approval. These measures would ensure that temporary construction activities do not expose persons around the site to noise levels in excess of those established by the City of Oakland. With the incorporation of Standard Condition NOISE-1 regarding days/hours of construction operation, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition NOISE-1: Days/Hours of Construction Operation. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. The project applicant shall require construction contractors to limit standard construction activities as follows:

- a) Construction activities are limited to between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Friday, except that pile driving and/or other extreme noise generating activities greater than 90 dBA shall be limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.
- b) Any construction activity proposed to occur outside of the standard hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Friday for special activities (such as concrete pouring which may require more continuous amounts of time) shall be evaluated on a case by case basis, with criteria including the proximity of residential uses and a consideration of resident's preferences for whether the activity is acceptable if the overall duration of construction is shortened and such construction activities shall only be allowed with the prior written authorization of the Building Services Division.
- c) Construction activity shall not occur on Saturdays, with the following possible exceptions:
 - Prior to the building being enclosed, requests for Saturday construction for special activities (such as concrete pouring which may require more continuous amounts of time), shall be evaluated on a case by case basis, with criteria including the proximity of residential uses and a consideration of resident's preferences for whether the activity is acceptable if the overall duration of construction is shortened. Such construction activities shall only be allowed on Saturdays with the prior written authorization of the Building Services Division.
- d) No extreme noise generating activities (greater than 90 dBA) shall be allowed on Saturdays, with no exceptions.

- e) No construction activity shall take place on Sundays or Federal holidays.
- f) Construction activities include but are not limited to: truck idling, moving equipment (including trucks, elevators, etc) or materials, deliveries, and construction meetings held on-site in a non-enclosed area.

With the incorporation of Standard Condition NOISE-2 regarding noise control, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition NOISE-2: Noise Control. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. To reduce noise impacts due to construction, the project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement a site-specific noise reduction program, subject to city review and approval, which includes the following measures:

- a) Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).
- b) Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.
- c) Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.
- d) If feasible, the noisiest phases of construction shall be limited to less than 10 days at a time.

With the incorporation of Standard Condition NOISE-3 regarding pile driving and other extreme noise generators, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition NOISE-3: Pile Driving and Other Extreme Noise Generators. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. To further reduce potential pier drilling, pile driving and/or other extreme noise generating construction impacts greater than 90dBA, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted for review and approval by the City to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. This plan shall be based on the final design of the project. A third-party peer review, paid for by the project applicant, may be required to assist the City in evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of the noise reduction plan submitted by the project applicant. A special inspection deposit is required to ensure compliance with the noise reduction plan. The amount of the deposit shall be determined by the Building Official, and the deposit shall be submitted by the project applicant concurrent with submittal of the noise reduction plan. The noise reduction plan shall include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of the following measures. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- a) Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the construction site, particularly along on sites adjacent to residential buildings;

- b) Implement "quiet" pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions;
- c) Utilize noise control blankets on the building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;
- d) Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings by the use of sound blankets for example; and
- e) Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.

With the incorporation of Standard Condition NOISE-4 regarding noise complaint procedures, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Standard Condition NOISE-4: Noise Complaint Procedures. Ongoing throughout demolition, grading, and/or construction. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project applicant shall submit to the City Building Services Division a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include:

- a) A procedure and phone numbers for notifying the City Building Services Division staff and Oakland Police Department; (during regular construction hours and off-hours);
- b) A sign posted on-site pertaining with permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem. The sign shall also include a listing of both the City and construction contractor's telephone numbers (during regular construction hours and off-hours);
- c) The designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project;
- d) Notification of neighbors and occupants within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise generating activities about the estimated duration of the activity; and
- e) A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the job inspectors and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are completed.

With the incorporation of Standard Condition NOISE-4 regarding interior noise, the potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Traffic Noise

Vehicular traffic makes the greatest contribution to ambient noise levels throughout most of Oakland. Traffic volumes in an area would have to approximately double before the attendant increase in ambient noise levels would be generally noticeable. The proposed project would add a small fraction of the existing traffic in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause traffic volumes to double at any study location, and it would not have a noticeable effect on ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

Comments to XI (b) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

Operational Noise

The proposed project would generate the same noise levels as daytime use. Games will be played for the most part in the same fashion and at the same times as they always have. Therefore it is unlikely that the

proposed project will increase the existing noise level by 5 dBA. However, the following measures shall be implemented by Bishop O'Dowd High School to reduce potential noise impacts to surrounding neighbors:

Mitigation Measure Noise-5 The project applicant shall:

- a) Notify neighbors of the schedule of events**
- b) Limit events to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday**
- c) Utilize available noise suppression devices and techniques when appropriate.**

This will reduce the operational noise levels to less than significant.

Sources:

Field Surveys

Project Plans

City of Oakland, Noise Ordinance (Oakland Planning Code, Section 17.120.050)

City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Noise Element, June 2005

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	---	------------------------------	-----------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in a manner not contemplated in the General Plan either directly (for example by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure), such that additional infrastructure is required but the impacts of such were not previously considered or analyzed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in excess of that contained in the City's Housing Element?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in excess of that contained in the City's Housing Element?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Explanation:

Comments to XII (a), (b), and (c). No Impact

The proposed project includes the installation of lighting standards for the athletic fields. The proposed project does not include an increase in the student enrollment or indirectly the addition of housing units in Oakland. Therefore, the project is consistent with the growth projections contemplated in the Housing Element of the General Plan. The site has no residential use and therefore, the project would not displace any existing housing or people.

Sources:

City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Housing Element, June 2004
 City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element, March 1998

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - - Would the project:

a) 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 following public services:					
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	--	------------------------------	-----------

Explanation:

Comments to XIII (a). (i-v) No Impact

The proposed project includes the installation of lighting standards for the athletic fields. Therefore there would be no required increase in the demand for fire and police protection. The proposed project does not include an increase in the student enrollment and will not necessitate that new school facilities be constructed. The proposed project is located in an urban area already served by existing parks and open spaces. The addition of the lighting will encourage more use of the school's existing athletic fields and recreational opportunities. For these reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need significant impacts to existing public services.

XIV. RECREATION - - Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) 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 type="checkbox"/> | X |

Explanation:

Comments to XIV (a) and (b). No Impact

The proposed project is located in an urban area already served by existing parks, recreational facilities, and other urban open spaces. The nearest recreational facility are the 24 acre King Estate Open Space (with the Holly Redeemer College), and the 100 acre Oakland Zoo located within the 543 acre Knowland Park. These resources are within 1 mile of the project site and currently provide recreational uses to the project area. The addition of the proposed lighting will encourage increased use of the school's existing athletic fields and create additional recreational opportunities for students.

The project will likely increase the number of users on-site but is not anticipated to increase the number of users at the off-site locations noted above. Because of the limited number of potential users generated by the project, it is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to public recreational facilities, nor require the construction or expansion of additional public recreational facilities.

Sources:

- Field Surveys
- Project Plans

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - - Would the project:

Project Impacts

Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the 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), or change the condition of an existing street (i.e.) street closures, changing direction of travel) in a manner that would substantially impact access or traffic load capacity of the street system?

Specifically:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) At a study, signalized intersection which is located outside the Downtown area, the project would cause the level of service (LOS) to degrade to worse than LOS D (i.e., E)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) At a study, signalized intersection outside the Downtown area where the level of service is LOS E, the project would cause the total intersection average vehicle delay to increase by four (4) or more seconds, or degrade to worse than LOS E (i.e., F)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) At a study, signalized intersection for all areas where the level of service is LOS E, the project would cause an increase in the average delay for any of the critical movements of six (6) seconds or more, or degrade to worse than LOS E (i.e., F)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) At a study, signalized intersection for all areas where the level of service is LOS F, the project would cause (a) the total intersection average vehicle delay to increase by two (2) or more seconds, or (b) an increase in average delay for any of the critical movements of four (4) seconds or more; or (c) the volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio exceeds three (3) percent (but only if the delay values cannot be measured accurately)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) At a study, unsignalized intersection, the project would add ten (10) or more vehicles and after project completion satisfy the Caltrans peak hour volume warrant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a Congestion Management Program (CMP) required analysis, (i.e., projects that generate 100 or more Metropolitan Transportation System to operate at LOS F or increase the V/C ratio by more than three (3) percent for a roadway segment that would operate at LOS F without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Thresholds					
g) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Substantially increase traffic hazards due to motor vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians 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 type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Result in less than two emergency access routes for streets exceeding 600 feet in length, unless otherwise determined by the Fire Chief, or his/her designee, in specific instances due to climatic, geographic topographic, or other conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Fundamentally conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle routes, pedestrian safety)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Cumulative Impacts

A project’s contribution to cumulative impacts is considered “considerable” (i.e., significant) when the project exceeds at least one of the intersection-related thresholds listed above in threshold #a through #g for years 2015 or 2030.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

Explanation:

Comments to XI (g), (h), (i), and (j): No Impact

The proposed project includes the installation of lighting standards. The project does not involve any change to air traffic patterns or the existing street and circulation pattern. The project does not involve the construction of roads that are less than 600’ in length. The project does not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation.

Comments to XI (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f): Less than Significant

The proposed project site is currently functioning as an existing set of athletic fields providing both practice facilities and a venue for events (games). The fields also provide a venue for occasional non-athletic events. The addition of the proposed light standards will enhance the utility of the facility but will not significantly increase the current levels of use. Games will be played for the most part in the same fashion and at the same times as they always have. The primary use of the lighting system will be to allow safety and practicality to the practice schedules for the various athletic teams (football, baseball, soccer, lacrosse, etc.). The current activities associated with the fields at Bishop O’Dowd High School represent a “current baseline” of street services as well as the maximum levels of service that can be expected at the existing intersections and for streets. Therefore, staff considers the projects impacts on traffic to be less than significant.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - - Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Require or result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Exceed water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and require or result in					

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
construction of water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments and require or result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and require or result in construction of landfill facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Violate applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Violate applicable federal, state and local statutes and regulations relating to energy standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Result in a determination by the energy provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments and require or result in construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Explanation:

Comments to XVI (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h). No Impact

The proposed project includes the installation of lighting standards for the athletic fields. The proposed project does not include an increase in the student enrollment and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require or result in the construction of new storm drainage facilities. The project site is already served by East Bay Municipal District. The nighttime use of the fields would not require the construction of new water or wastewater facilities. Although the nighttime use of the fields is not expected to increase solid waste, the nearest landfill has additional capacity and will not violate any applicable standards. The proposed project would not violate applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to energy standards. The project would be required to meet current state and local standards regarding energy consumption. The project would require typical utility connections and would tap into the existing system. Due to the small size of the project, the project-generated demand for electricity would be small in the context of the overall demand within Oakland and the state, and would not in and of itself require a major expansion of power facilities. For these reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need significant impacts to utilities and service systems.

Sources:

East Bay Municipal Utility District, Urban Water Management Plan 2005
 City of Oakland, Sewer and Storm Drain Maps
 Project Plans

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Standard Condition of Approval	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

This project creates no impacts to fish, wildlife or plant or animal community. The project will not have any cumulative impacts or cause substantial adverse effects. All Potentially Significant Impacts can be reduced to Less than Significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measures and Standard Conditions of Approval.