

RESOLUTION NO. 10-___

RESOLUTION RESCINDING THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) FINDINGS, STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN RELATED TO THE STAPLES RANCH DEVELOPMENT AS APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 24, 2009, AND ADOPTING REVISED CEQA FINDINGS, STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN FOR THE STAPLES RANCH DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, the Alameda County Surplus Property Authority applied for an amendment to the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan to address future development patterns and land uses on the 124 acre Staples Ranch property and annexing 165 acres into the City of Pleasanton (“Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch” or “the Project”); and

WHEREAS, in connection with that application, the City Council on February 24, 2009 (a) certified the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch Environmental Impact Report for the Project, (b) approved resolutions adopting CEQA Findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and (c) approved a resolution adopting the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch that calls for a variety of public facilities, open space, a nice center, auto retail, a continuing care facility, commercial/retail uses and the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road with two lanes of traffic in each direction over the Arroyo bridges; and

WHEREAS, a lawsuit challenging the City of Pleasanton’s approval of the Project was filed on March 27, 2009; and

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2009, the City Council decided to assess whether it should further amend the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch to adopt a short-term configuration of Stoneridge Drive which would reduce the total number of lanes by one in each direction over the Arroyo bridges; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared and released in October 2009 a Draft Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch EIR Supplement (Draft SEIR) to address concerns raised in the lawsuit and the potential short-term configuration of Stoneridge Drive over the Arroyo bridges, which Draft SEIR was received at the State Clearinghouse on October 29, 2009, and the City provided the proper legal notice of completion and the availability of the Draft SEIR; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing on December 9, 2009 to accept oral comments on the Draft SEIR during the public review period; and

WHEREAS, the City has accepted and responded to written comments, as well as to the oral comments made on December 9, 2009, to the Draft SEIR received from public agencies having jurisdiction by law, persons having special expertise with respect to environmental impacts involved, and other persons and organizations having an interest in the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR was prepared for the Project and consists of the Draft SEIR, comments and recommendations received on the Draft SEIR, and the responses to comments raised regarding environmental issues in the review and consultation process; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on May 26, 2010, the Planning Commission considered all public testimony, relevant exhibits, and recommendations of City staff concerning these matters, found that the Draft Final SEIR was complete and adequate for the Project and recommended that the City Council certify the Final SEIR; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on August 24, 2010, the City Council, having considered the previously certified Final EIR adopted on February 24, 2009, all public testimony, relevant exhibits and recommendations of staff and the Planning Commission, certified the Final SEIR for the Project.

WHEREAS, in light of that action, the CEQA Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that were adopted in City Council Resolution Nos. 09-265 and 267 should be rescinded and revised CEQA Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, as set forth on the attached Exhibits 1 and 2, are consistent with the Final EIR (adopted on February 24, 2009) and the Final SEIR (adopted on August 24, 2010) and should be adopted.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PLEASANTON DOES RESOLVE, DECLARE, DETERMINE, AND ORDER THE FOLLOWING:

SECTION 1. Rescinds Resolution Nos. 09-265 and 09-267.

SECTION 2. Adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference, for the Project.

SECTION 3. Adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, attached as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference, for the Project.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Pleasanton at a special meeting held on August 24, 2010.

I, Karen Diaz, City Clerk of the City of Pleasanton, California, certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the City Council at a special meeting held on the 24th day of August, 2010, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:

Karen Diaz, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Jonathan P. Lowell, City Attorney

EXHIBIT 1

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CEQA FINDINGS WITH THE PREFERRED PROJECT

PREFERRED PROJECT

If the Preferred Project is selected, the proposed changes to the CEQA Findings set forth in the June 15, 2010 Agenda Report are shown in Track Changes on the attached pages.

**FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SUPPLEMENT FOR THE STONERIDGE
DRIVE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT/STAPLES RANCH EIR**

INTRODUCTION

The Alameda County Surplus Property Authority (ACSPA or “Project Sponsor”) has proposed to amend the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan to revise land use designations, circulation improvements, and financial obligations for the Staples Ranch site. The City of Pleasanton (the City) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and has prepared an environmental impact report (EIR) for ACSPA’s proposed project. The EIR analyzed the proposed project and alternatives to the project including a no project alternative, an existing specific plan alternative, an ice center alternative, and an open space alternative. The City certified this EIR on February 24, 2009 and later approved the Ice Center Alternative with a four-lane extension of Stoneridge Drive. A lawsuit was filed challenging the City’s approval. In response to the lawsuit and to assess a two-lane constrained extension of Stoneridge Drive alternative, the City prepared an EIR Supplement (SEIR). The SEIR contains a revised analysis of the proposed project and also analyzes two additional alternatives: the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative and the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative. The settlement agreement provides that, after certifying the SEIR, the City may either 1) take no further action on the EIR and project approvals, or 2) reconsider certain CEQA related approvals as well as the project approvals in light of the information presented in the EIR and the SEIR, together with any other information that has been submitted into the administrative record. The City has chosen the latter course.

In light of the information presented in the EIR and SEIR and the administrative record, the City Council on August May __, 2010 certified the SEIR, rescinded its CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and now adopts revised CEQA Findings and a revised Statement of Overriding Considerations. Based thereon, the City Council intends to rescind its other project approvals, adopt revised project approvals, rescind the Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan and then adopt a revised Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan.

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR]) and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code require the lead agency to adopt findings for each potentially significant environmental impact disclosed in an EIR/SEIR. Specifically, for each significant impact, the lead agency must make one or more of the following three findings:

- Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR;

Exhibit 1

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and should be adopted by that agency; or
- Specific economic, social, legal, technological, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR infeasible.

In addition to making a finding for each potentially significant impact, if the lead agency approves a project without mitigating all of the significant impacts, it must prepare a statement of overriding considerations, in which it balances the benefits of the project against the unavoidable environmental risks. The statement of overriding considerations must explain the social, economic, or other reasons for approving the project despite its environmental impacts (14 CCR 15093, Pub. Res. Code 21081).

This document contains the findings and statement of overriding considerations based on the EIR, SEIR, and administrative record for the approval of an alternative to the proposed project (a minor modification of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative) and reflects the City's independent judgment.

This document incorporates by reference the project EIR and SEIR. Where the SEIR and EIR conflict, the information in the SEIR controls. The EIR, SEIR and other portions of the administrative record are available for review at:

Community Development Department
 200 Old Bernal Avenue ~~(see footnote)~~¹
 City of Pleasanton
 Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802
 Contact: Robin Giffin, Senior Planner
 (925) 931-5612

PROPOSED PROJECT

The City Council certified the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch Final EIR on February 24, 2009. The Final EIR analyzed the proposed project and alternatives to the project including a no project alternative, an existing specific plan alternative, an ice center alternative, and an open space alternative. The proposed project in the Final EIR reflected the Alameda County Surplus Property Authority (ACSPA or "Project Sponsor") proposal to amend the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan to revise land use designations, circulation improvements, and financial obligations for the Staples Ranch site. Staples Ranch, owned by the ACSPA, is an approximately 124-acre site of undeveloped land within the 293-acre Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan area. The proposed project seeks to modify the land use plan for the Staples Ranch site to allow for an auto mall, a senior continuing care community, a commercial center,

¹ ~~200 Old Bernal Avenue is being remodeled. During the remodel, the EIR, SEIR and other portions of the administrative record are available at 157 Main Street, Pleasanton, CA, 94566-0802.~~

a community park and a neighborhood park/stormwater detention facility. The proposed project in the Final EIR is identical to the proposed project in the SEIR.

The proposed project would eliminate the quarry truck tunnels called for in the 1989 Specific Plan and modify the Specific Plan to reflect the improvements described in the September 2007 Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement between Livermore, Pleasanton, Alameda County, the ACSPA, and Vulcan Materials.

Under the proposed project, four lanes of Stoneridge Drive would not be extended through Staples Ranch to El Charro Road until some point in the future. Over the short term, a single two-lane bridge would extend over the Arroyo Mocho, and two lanes of Stoneridge Drive would provide access to the westerly portion of Staples Ranch. The eastern portion of the property would be accessed via a four-lane road connecting to El Charro Road, and no through-traffic would be permitted between the two portions of the property, other than emergency vehicles and possibly buses.

The proposed project also includes annexing approximately 165 acres to Pleasanton, consisting of the unincorporated portion of Staples Ranch and adjacent road and flood control right of way, and receiving additional entitlements including, but not limited to, planned unit development (PUD) rezoning and PUD development plans for each of the project developments, a tentative map and final subdivision map(s), public improvement plans, and a development agreement between the ACSPA and the City of Pleasanton.

Because many of the original Specific Plan infrastructure requirements have either been constructed or will be funded by other sources, the proposed project would also modify the list of infrastructure improvements and funding sources. The proposed project will require the Project Sponsor to be responsible for the following public improvements, including, but not limited to:

- dedication of right of way and improvements in the form of a four-lane extension of Stoneridge Drive from its current terminus east of Trevor Parkway to El Charro Road, including turn lanes and two, two-lane bridges over the Arroyo Mocho;
- dedication of 17 acres to the City for a community park; and
- El Charro Road improvements between I-580 and the Stoneridge Drive/Jack London Boulevard intersection to accommodate the design contemplated in the 2007 Pre-Development Cooperation and Cost Sharing Agreements.

PREFERRED PROJECT

The City Council is now considering the adoption of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative in the SEIR, with ~~one~~ phasing modifications, and which in these CEQA Findings is referred to as the “preferred project” as opposed to the “proposed project” referred to in the EIR/SEIR.

The SEIR analyzed two additional alternatives than the EIR: the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative and the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative. The Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative differs from the proposed project by including the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road and a four-rink ice center on a portion of the proposed community park. The Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative differs from the proposed project by including the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road initially with the Stoneridge Drive bridges striped to one lane in each direction and then to two lanes in each direction after certain regional roadway improvements are made.

Description of Preferred Project. The preferred project is a phasing modification of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, which is described in the SEIR. Details of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative can be found on pages 55-56 of the SEIR.

The preferred project differs from the Four-Lane Concurrent Alternative by temporarily placing a gate(s) or barrier(s) along Stoneridge Drive so as to inhibit through traffic to and from El Charro Road and by not requiring the Stoneridge Drive bridges to be striped with two lanes in each direction when Stoneridge Drive is initially fully extended. The preferred project, however, will allow access to the Auto Mall site from the east and the west during the time the gates/barriers are in place and will require the Stoneridge Drive extension to El Charro Road to be opened without any gates or barriers when Jack London Boulevard as a two lane road is extended to El Charro Road. The preferred project also assumes the Stoneridge Drive bridges will be restriped with two lanes in each direction at some point in the future. The City may, from time to time, move the gate or barrier to accommodate site development and activities provided it continue to be installed preventing through traffic to and from El Charro Road via Stoneridge Drive. Thus, both the preferred project and the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative will both eventually restripe the Stoneridge Drive bridges with two lanes in each direction. Under the preferred project, this date will be determined by the City Council but in no event earlier than two years after Stoneridge Drive has been opened to through traffic with the Stoneridge Drive bridges striped for one travel lane in each direction. Prior to restriping the Stoneridge Drive bridges to two lanes in each direction, the City shall evaluate traffic data, solicit community input and schedule a public hearing for review and consideration. either when certain regional traffic improvements have been completed or when the City Council in its discretion determines the bridges should be so restriped; ~~u~~Under the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, Stoneridge Drive would be opened to through traffic initially and the two lanes in each direction would occur initially, regardless of the timing and

completion of regional traffic improvements, such as the extension of Jack London Boulevard. The preferred project would maintain the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan policy of requiring the construction of the full two bridge, four lane extension of Stoneridge Drive from Trevor Parkway to El Charro Road Hence, the preferred project is similar to the project approved by the City Council in February 2009. The preferred project differs from the proposed project by including the full four lane extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road initially with the Stoneridge Drive bridges striped to one lane in each direction –and the inclusion of an ice center on a portion of the community park but it is similar to the proposed project in that there will be temporarily a gate(s) or barrier(s) on Stoneridge Drive to prevent through traffic to and from El Charro Road.

Benefits of the Preferred Project Alternative. The preferred project is superior to the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative because it provides more flexibility to the City Council with regard to ~~to~~ management its roadways. That is, under the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, Stoneridge Drive would be opened to through traffic and required to be striped initially for two lanes in each direction, regardless of whether regional traffic improvements were completed or whether the City Council felt striping the bridges for two lanes in each direction was then currently warranted. The preferred project, by contrast, allows the City Council to gauge changing traffic conditions, the efforts of the City's regional partners to support funding and construction timing of regional improvements that benefit Pleasanton, and community concerns. The preferred project therefore requires the City Council to open Stoneridge Drive to through traffic as a two lane road only when Jack London Boulevard has been extended to El Charro Road as a two lane road (with four lanes at its intersection with El Charro intersection and with its intersection at Isabel Drive). It also allows the City Council to make a determination to restripe the Stoneridge Drive bridges to two lanes in each direction but only after two years from the time Stoneridge Drive has been opened to through traffic with the Stoneridge Drive bridges striped for one travel lane in each direction, even if all the regional improvements have not been completed, thereby vesting the City Council with the freedom to exercise its discretion about how best to manage Pleasanton's roadways.

All impacts of the preferred project have been analyzed in the EIR/SEIR. The Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative analyzes all impacts associated with Stoneridge Drive (including Stoneridge Drive being opened to through traffic and the Stoneridge Drive bridges) being striped with two lanes in each direction). The EIR also analyses the impacts related to Stoneridge Drive not being open to through traffic. Although the SEIR also analyzes the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative (which, as a practical matter, the preferred project will mirror for some period of time after the gate/barricade has been removed), the CEQA Findings, the Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan track the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative because the preferred project alternative anticipates the restriping of Stoneridge Drive bridges to two lanes in each direction at some point in the future and therefore the impacts and related mitigation associated with the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, rather than the Two-Lane Constrained

Extension Alternative, reflect the greatest impacts that will result from the preferred project (see SEIR at 123).

PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

The City distributed an initial Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR on June 13, 2006, for agency and public review. The purpose of the NOP was to announce the City's intention to prepare and distribute a Draft EIR on the proposed project and to solicit comments on the scope and issues that should be considered in preparing the EIR. The initial NOP comment period closed on August 7, 2006. The NOP was subsequently updated and redistributed on March 26, 2007. The updated NOP comment period closed on April 30, 2007.

A public scoping meeting was also held by the City on April 11, 2007. The scoping meeting provided the public with an opportunity to orally present their concerns about the proposed project. Comments were received through the combined NOP and public scoping process.

Based partially on the NOP and public scoping process, the City prepared a Draft EIR (DEIR) that was published on April 16, 2008. The CEQA-mandated 45-day public review period began on April 16, 2008 and ended on June 4, 2008. In addition to the comments received at a public hearing conducted by the City Planning Commission on May 14, 2008, comment letters were submitted by various public agencies and organizations.

Responses to all comments received were prepared and included in the Final EIR (Responses to Comments document), published in August, 2008, which was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the guidelines for implementation of CEQA.

On February 24, 2009, the City Council made minor revisions to the EIR, certified the Final EIR and, in addition to making CEQA findings and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, approved a project that extended Stoneridge Drive consistent with the General Plan and the existing Specific Plan.

In June 2009, the City Council authorized the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report Supplement (SEIR) to address issues that were raised in litigation that followed the City's certification of the EIR and approval of the project in February 2009 and to evaluate a new alternative, the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative.

The Draft SEIR was published on October 30, 2009, and was also distributed for public review and comments. The public review period for the Draft SEIR ended on December 30, 2009. (The original review period was to end on December 17, 2009 but it was extended by the City of Pleasanton). The document was reviewed by various State, regional, and local agencies, as well as by interested organizations and individuals. Twenty-five comment letters were received. A public meeting was also held at Pleasanton City Hall on December 9, 2009 to obtain oral comments on the Draft SEIR. During the public meeting, oral comments were received from eight members of the public, including Planning Commissioners.

The Final SEIR (Response to Comments) was published May __, 2010. On May 26, 2010 the Planning Commission considered the Final SEIR and recommended that the City Council adopt it. On ~~August~~ ~~June~~ __, 2010, the City Council certified the SEIR.

Although not part of the CEQA public review process, there is another public review process that is related to this project. In the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan, Program 1.6 provides that before Stoneridge Drive is opened to through traffic, Pleasanton must reach agreement with its regional partners concerning a strategic approach and funding plan for relieving traffic congestion in the Tri-Valley. This agreement will be embodied in a policy/plan adopted by the City Council following a public hearing. The policy/plan will include a plan which prioritizes funding for certain regional improvements and will require completion of a regional arterial network.

FINDINGS FOR ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN THE EIR

During the preparation of the EIR and the SEIR for the proposed project, the City evaluated several alternatives. A description and a finding for each alternative, other than the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative and the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative, are presented below.

No Project Alternative (No Build)

Description

The existing Project Area would remain as it currently exists. None of the project components (i.e., auto mall, senior continuing care community, commercial center, community park, and neighborhood park/detention basin) would be constructed. With the No Project Alternative, the existing Project Area would remain undeveloped, thereby failing to satisfy the project objective to develop the site with economically beneficial land uses. It is unlikely that the Project Area would remain undeveloped far into the future, since development of the area has already been approved as part of the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan; however, in the short term for the purposes of this alternative, the area would remain unbuilt.

Finding: Infeasible

By preventing development of the Project Area, the No Project Alternative would avoid or substantially reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the approved project to aesthetics and visual quality, air quality, noise and traffic.

This alternative is infeasible, however, because it is inconsistent with the City's planning goals. A no build alternative would fail to make responsible use of a site that has been planned by the City for urban uses for 20 years. It would not comply with the direction of Pleasanton's General Plan for urban uses of the project site and would fail to substantially implement a Specific Plan that has already been approved by the City.

The No Project Alternative is also infeasible because it is inconsistent with the objectives of either the proposed project or the preferred project, both of which include, among others, guiding the development of the Staples Ranch site with a mix of economically beneficial uses, retaining existing auto sales businesses within the City, providing senior continuing care amenities, and providing community recreational facilities.

Existing Specific Plan Alternative

Description

Under the Existing Specific Plan Alternative, the land uses that were approved as part of the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan (1989 Specific Plan) for the Project Area would be developed. Of the 124 acres that comprise the Staples Ranch site, 1.5 acres that lie within the City of Pleasanton would remain zoned as PUD-Medium Density Residential, but this area would be developed with a portion of the community park. No residential units would be constructed under this alternative. The remaining 122.5 acres of undeveloped land in unincorporated Alameda County would be annexed into the City. The land use designations for this area, according to the 1989 Specific Plan, include Service Commercial and Light Industrial, Retail and Service Commercial, and Community Park.

This alternative differs from the preferred project in that it would not include the senior continuing care community, it does not specify the development of an auto mall, does not include the joint neighborhood park/storm water detention facility or ice center and would allow Stoneridge Drive to be widened to six lanes if traffic demand warranted such widening.

Finding: Infeasible

The environmental impacts of the Existing Specific Plan Alternative would have slightly greater impacts than the preferred project. This alternative would result in substantially more traffic than projected for the preferred project and cause additional significant impacts not identified for the preferred project. In particular:

Air: This alternative would result in considerably more vehicular trips than the preferred project (roughly 60% more), and exceed the BAAQMD thresholds for criteria air pollutants. The resultant emissions would be a significant and unavoidable air quality impact, with air emissions substantially greater than predicted for the preferred project.

Hazards: Because the Existing Specific Plan Alternative would have the potential to accommodate more retail, service commercial, and light industrial uses, which typically involve greater amounts of hazardous materials and waste, than the preferred project, there may be a slightly greater potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials. Nevertheless, this greater potential for accidental releases would be subject to mitigation following

the same procedures, protocols, and regulations that were identified for the preferred project.

Noise: The Existing Specific Plan Alternative would greatly increase the number of daily trips compared to the preferred project and would result in significant noise level increases.

Traffic: Overall trip generation would increase substantially with the Existing Specific Plan Alternative, compared to the preferred project. This alternative would adversely affect one additional intersection compared to cumulative conditions with the preferred project; namely, the intersection of Johnson Drive at Stoneridge Drive, although the impacts at this intersection can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

On the other hand, because this alternative would not include a residential component, impacts identified in the SEIR and EIR related to residents (e.g., exposure to sensitive receptors to TACs, and exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards) would not occur.

Moreover, as indicated in the SEIR and EIR, the Existing Specific Plan Alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the preferred project's significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics and visual quality, air quality, noise and traffic. These impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Existing Specific Plan Alternative were adopted by the City.

Finding: Infeasible

The Existing Specific Plan Alternative is infeasible because it is inconsistent with the project objectives to provide a site (a) for a senior continuing care community that will help meet the City's and the surrounding community's expanding need for senior housing and care opportunities, (b) to retain existing auto sales within the City by providing for an auto mall site, and (c) to provide for a joint neighborhood park/storm water detention facility.

The Existing Specific Plan Alternative is also inconsistent with the objective of the preferred project to acknowledge substantial changes in land use conditions and the introduction of new infrastructure improvements and agreements that were unknown at the time the 1989 Specific Plan was adopted. Specifically, this alternative would not:

- Reflect changes in surrounding land uses not contemplated in 1989, including cessation of the Kaiser/Hanson quarry operations, establishment of the Livermore Airport Protection Area, and adoption/implementation of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan to the north and Livermore's El Charro Specific Plan to the east.
- Reflect changes to the timing, funding, and specific design of major infrastructure improvements since the adoption of the 1989 Specific Plan, including completion of the Arroyo Mocho improvements in 2004, the

El Charro Road Pre-Development and Cooperation and the Cost-Sharing Agreements of 2007, and the City of Dublin's I-580 interchange improvements which began in 2008.

- Be consistent with the City's planning policies embodied in the El Charro Road Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement (2007) and the Cost-Sharing Agreement (2007). Specifically, the El Charro Road improvements agreed upon in the Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement are very different from those envisioned in the 1989 Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan, which called for separate quarry-truck tunnels in both directions under the proposed Jack London/Stoneridge Drive/El Charro Road intersection. The tunnel plan has since been deemed infeasible, both from an engineering and financial standpoint. The Pre-Development and Cooperation Agreement replaces the tunnel plan with a new improvement plan which minimizes the need for quarry trucks to change lanes between the Jack London Boulevard/El Charro Road intersection and I-580.

The Existing Specific Plan Alternative is also infeasible because it is inconsistent with the City's goals and policies regarding the Community Park. On June 10, 2008, the City Council approved a conceptual Staples Ranch Park Master Plan for the Community Park. The Master Plan represented the results of an extensive community planning process begun in October 2006. On September 2, 2008, the City adopted core objectives concerning the proposed uses of the Community Park. The Existing Specific Plan Alternative would be inconsistent with the Master Plan's objective for the Community Park to include an ice skating facility.

The Existing Specific Plan Alternative is also infeasible because it does not provide the significantly greater social and economical benefits to the City associated with an ice skating facility. Thus, the Existing Specific Plan Alternative fails to provide the following economic and social benefits:

- A City sales tax revenue that would increase when visitors come from out of town to ice center special events and do business at local hotels, stores, and restaurants.
- Retail sales tax dollars that would be generated by the ice center restaurant and retail shop.
- The funds offered by the ice center developer to construct a substantial share of the remainder of the 17 acre Community Park.
- The social benefits resulting from the preferred project related to the relating to health, education, recreation, family life, and special needs provided by a variety of ice skating activities, including:
 - Public skating sessions

- Public school physical education classes and possible future competitive team practices and games
- City Park and Recreation Department programs
- Private class skating lessons
- Youth and adult hockey practices and games for men, women, boys, and girls
- Figure skating
- Speed skating
- Curling
- Synchronized skating
- Ice dancing
- Olympic level figure skating instruction and practice
- Approximately six annual weekend special events such as hockey tournaments and figure skating competitions
- Special needs programs for physically and developmentally disabled children
- Disabled hockey program providing sled hockey for disabled persons
- Lessons and programs for community organizations
- Birthday and company parties
- Ice reservation booking priority and Pleasanton resident discount fees (similar to the City's Callippe Preserve Golf Course offerings currently extended by the City to Pleasanton residents)

Ice Center Alternative

Description

The Ice Center Alternative is identical to the proposed project, except that it would include an approximately 138,500-square-foot ice center on a portion of the proposed community park. The ice center site, like the remainder of the community park, would be pre-zoned PUD-P. The facility, including related parking, would use about 8 acres of the proposed 17-acre community park. The ice center would be approximately 45 feet tall and contain up to four National Hockey League-size ice rinks. The rinks are

intended for amateur ice hockey leagues (adult and youth), figure skating, broomball, curling, speed skating, ice dancing, as well as public skating. The EIR assumes that the ice center would have seating for up to 2,200 spectators and could employ approximately 29 full-time-equivalent staff; however, the ice center developers have indicated that they may reduce seating to 1,400. The ice center facility would feature an in-house pro shop, large meeting and party spaces, and a full service restaurant/bar. It is anticipated that the ice center may have approximately six special events a year which may require shuttle bus service to the site. In all other site plan, development program, access, and open space/amenity features, the Ice Center Alternative would mirror that of the proposed project.

Finding: Infeasible

The Ice Center Alternative ~~is similar to~~ ~~differs from~~ the preferred project in that, like the preferred project, it has a gated ~~emergency~~ vehicle access separating Stoneridge Drive from “Auto Mall Place” rather than a four-lane extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road. The Ice Center Alternative differs from the preferred project because with the Ice Center Alternative opening although Stoneridge Drive is tied to a number of regional improvements, rather than just the extension of Jack London Boulevard as a two lane road and the bridges over the Arroyo Mocho would be built as two projects separated by a number of years, would be extended at some point in the future.

The Ice Center Alternative would have ~~similar~~~~fewer~~ noise and traffic impacts than the preferred project because of the delay of the extension of Stoneridge Drive until some point in the future. However, the Ice Center Alternative would result in slightly higher biological resources, construction noise and water quality impacts as a result of constructing the bridges over the Arroyo Mocho as two separate projects separated over a number of years rather than concurrently as with the preferred project.

The City finds the Ice Center Alternative infeasible because it is inconsistent with regional growth goals and policies regarding the timely construction of roadway arterials in the Tri-Valley Area. ~~For example, LAFCo has informed the City that a full extension of Stoneridge Drive would be more consistent with regional growth goals and policies.~~ The Ice Center Alternative is also inconsistent with the City’s General Plan policy of coordinating regional transportation improvements with other local jurisdictions and local agencies.

The City also finds the Ice Center Alternative infeasible because it does not afford the City sufficient discretion related to the timing of Stoneridge Drive being opened to through traffic. This would prevent the City from weighing benefits of no through traffic on Stoneridge Drive with the detriment the potentially long term lack of the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road until all the enumerated regional improvements are completed (rather than the single improvement as required by the preferred project). The City would be prevented from acting on information that may related to the impact that the lack of through traffic has on the ease of access by Pleasanton residents to the community park component of the project or the required travel distance for residents of the continuing care facility and surrounding neighborhood south of the Arroyo Mocho

~~to access the Auto Mall and Retail/Commercial components of the project. of the uncertainty of when Stoneridge Drive would be opened to through traffic and the because the continuing lack of the full extension of Stoneridge Drive will reduce lower the ease of access by Pleasanton residents to the community park component of the project and will. Further, the lack of the full extension of Stoneridge Drive would increase the travel distance for residents of the continuing care facility and surrounding neighborhood south of the Arroyo Mocho to access the Auto Mall and Retail/Commercial components of the project.~~

Proposed Project

The proposed project has the same land uses as the preferred project except that it does not include an ice center facility in the community park. ~~it~~ it also delays the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road to some point in the future ~~but; and~~ would build the two bridges over the Arroyo Mocho as separate projects separated by a number of years.

Finding: Infeasible

The proposed project would have generally similar impacts as the preferred project. It would have slightly lower air quality and water supply impacts in comparison with the preferred project as a result of it not containing an ice center. The proposed project would have similar fewer noise and traffic impacts in the short-term as than the preferred project because of the delay of the extension of Stoneridge Drive until some point in the future. The proposed project, however, would significantly impact two more intersections than the preferred project during the time that Stoneridge is opened to through traffic and is striped for one lane in each direction and would significantly impact one more intersection once Stoneridge is striped for two lanes in each direction. The proposed project would significantly impact one more roadway segment under the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency's standards during the time that Stoneridge Drive is opened to through traffic and is striped for one lane in each direction but would significantly impact four fewer roadway segments once Stoneridge is striped for two lanes in each direction. The proposed project, moreover, would result in slightly higher biological resources, construction noise and water quality impacts as a result of constructing the bridges over the Arroyo Mocho as two separate projects potentially separated over a number of years rather than concurrently as with the preferred project.

The City finds the proposed project infeasible because it is inconsistent with regional growth goals and policies regarding the timely construction of roadway arterials in the Tri-Valley Area. The proposed project, ~~in the near term, is also inconsistent with the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan and~~ is inconsistent with the City's General Plan policy of coordinating regional transportation improvements with other local jurisdictions and local agencies.

The City also finds the proposed project infeasible because of the lack of certainty when Stoneridge Drive would be opened it does not afford the City sufficient discretion related to the timing of Stoneridge Drive being opened to through traffic. This would prevent

~~the City from weighing benefits of no through traffic on Stoneridge Drive with the detriment the potentially long term lack of the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road until all the enumerated regional improvements are completed (rather than the single improvement as required by the preferred project). The City would be prevented from acting on information that may related to the impact that the lack of through traffic has on the ease of access by Pleasanton residents to the community park component of the project or the required travel distance for residents of the continuing care facility and surrounding neighborhood south of the Arroyo Mocho to access the Auto Mall and Retail/Commercial components of the project. to through traffic and the because the continuing lack of the full extension of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road in the short term will reduce lower the ease of access by Pleasanton residents to the community park component of the project and. Further, the lack of extension of Stoneridge Drive would increase the travel distance for residents of the continuing care facility and surrounding neighborhood south of the Arroyo Mocho to access the Auto Mall and Retail/Commercial components of the project.~~ The proposed project is also infeasible because it is inconsistent with the City's goals and policies regarding the Community Park. On June 10, 2008, the City Council approved a conceptual Staples Ranch Park Master Plan for the Community Park. The Master Plan represented the results of an extensive community planning process begun in October 2006. On September 2, 2008, the City adopted core objectives concerning the proposed uses of the Community Park. The proposed project would be inconsistent with the Master Plan's objective for the Community Park to include an ice skating facility.

The proposed project is also infeasible because it does not provide the significantly greater social and economical benefits to the City associated with an ice skating facility. Thus, the proposed project fails to provide the following economic and social benefits:

- A City sales tax revenue that would increase when visitors come from out of town to ice center special events and do business at local hotels, stores, and restaurants.
- Retail sales tax dollars that would be generated by the ice center restaurant and retail shop.
- The funds offered by the ice center developer to construct a substantial share of the remainder of the 17 acre Community Park.
- The social benefits resulting from the preferred project related to the relating to health, education, recreation, family life, and special needs provided by a variety of ice skating activities, including:
 - Public skating sessions
 - Public school physical education classes and possible future competitive team practices and games
 - City Park and Recreation Department programs

- Private class skating lessons
- Youth and adult hockey practices and games for men, women, boys, and girls
- Figure skating
- Speed skating
- Curling
- Synchronized skating
- Ice dancing
- Olympic level figure skating instruction and practice
- Approximately six annual weekend special events such as hockey tournaments and figure skating competitions
- Special needs programs for physically and developmentally disabled children
- Disabled hockey program providing sled hockey for disabled persons
- Lessons and programs for community organizations
- Birthday and company parties
- Ice reservation booking priority and Pleasanton resident discount fees (similar to the City's Callippe Preserve Golf Course offerings currently extended by the City to Pleasanton residents)

Open Space Alternative

Description

The Open Space Alternative is identical to the proposed project, except that the community park would be primarily open space and would not include lighted sports fields, tennis courts, and similar features. The community park in the Open Space Alternative would contain open space with native landscaping, trails, and possibly related amenities such as staging area parking, restrooms, benches, picnic areas, informational kiosks and signage, and decorative water features such as wetlands or a fountain/pond designed as public art. It is anticipated that the trails could be multi-use trails for dog walkers, bicyclists, joggers, and others, and the open space could be used for activities such as picnics, kite flying, and playing catch. The site would be pre-zoned PUD-P. The location of trails and related features have not been determined and it should be assumed that they could be anywhere on the community park site.

Finding: Infeasible

The Open Space Alternative would have slightly fewer water supply, water quality, visual, noise, air quality and traffic impacts, and would likely create more opportunities for wildlife habitat than the preferred project. The majority of the preferred project's impacts in these categories, however, will be avoided or substantially lessened by mitigation measures. Moreover, the Open Space Alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen the preferred project's significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics and visual quality, air quality, noise, and traffic. These impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Open Space Alternative were adopted by the City.

The Open Space Alternative is also infeasible because it is inconsistent with the City's goals and policies regarding the Community Park. On June 10, 2008, the City Council approved a conceptual Staples Ranch Park Master Plan for the Community Park. The Master Plan represented the results of an extensive community planning process begun in October 2006. On September 2, 2008, the City adopted core objectives concerning the proposed uses of the Community Park. The Master Plan and the core objectives contemplate active recreational uses of the Community Park, including sports fields, tennis courts, and an ice skating facility. The Open Space Alternative is infeasible because it conflicts with the active recreation goals and policies of the City by limiting the Community Park to passive uses that do not include sports fields, tennis courts or an ice skating facility. The Open Space Alternative would therefore fail to provide the economic and social benefits associated with an ice center facility identified in the Existing Specific Plan Alternative findings above.

SEIR Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative

The Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative is similar to the preferred project in that it would stripe Stoneridge Drive traffic lanes so that two traffic lanes would cross each bridge in each direction. It is different, however, than the preferred project because it contemplates Stoneridge Drive being open to through traffic initially and the traffic lanes over each bridge to be striped initially to allow two lanes of traffic in each direction.

Finding: Infeasible

The Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative would initially have slightly greater noise and traffic impacts than the preferred project due to the Stoneridge Drive being opened to through traffic initially and the Stoneridge bridges being striped initially with two lanes of traffic in each direction.

The City finds the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, without the phasing modification, infeasible because it fails to provide the City the flexibility it desires in managing its roadways. Concerns have been expressed by some members of the community about the impacts that will exist when Stoneridge Drive is opened to through traffic and when the bridges over Stoneridge Drive are restriped to allow two traffic lanes in each direction. The Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative, without the

phasing modification, would prevent the City from exercising its discretion as to when Stoneridge Drive should be open to through traffic and when the bridges over Stoneridge Drive should have two lanes of traffic in each direction after consideration of changing traffic conditions, the efforts of the City's regional partners to support funding and construction timing of regional improvements that benefit City, and community concerns.

SEIR Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative

The Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative is similar to the preferred project in that, once Stoneridge Drive is opened to through traffic, it would temporarily stripe Stoneridge Drive traffic lanes so that only one traffic lane would cross each bridge in each direction. It is different, however, than the preferred project because it would initially allow Stoneridge Drive to be opened to through traffic and would allow the traffic lanes over each bridge to be restriped to allow two lanes of traffic in each direction only when certain regional traffic improvements had been completed.

Finding: Infeasible

The Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative would initially have slightly greater ~~the same~~ impacts than the preferred project due to Stoneridge Drive initially being opened to through traffic. The Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative would have the same impacts as the preferred project once Stoneridge Drive was opened to through traffic due to the Stoneridge Drive bridges being striped with one lane in each direction. Because, however, the bridges would remain striped for one traffic lane in each direction until certain regional traffic improvements are completed, the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative, would have fewer impacts (such as traffic and noise) than the preferred project if the City Council, in its discretion under the preferred project, decides to restripe the bridges before those regional improvements are completed.. The cumulative impacts of the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative (which does contemplate the eventual restriping of the Stoneridge Drive bridges for two lanes of traffic in each direction), however, would be the same as the preferred project.

The City finds the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative infeasible because it fails to provide the City the flexibility it desires in managing its roadways. Concerns have been expressed by some members of the community about the impacts that will exist in other parts of the community if the full, four lane extension of Stoneridge Drive is not implemented. The Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative would tie the City Council's hands by events out of its control and would prevent the City from exercising its discretion as to when Stoneridge Drive should have two traffic lanes in each direction after Stoneridge Drive has been opened to through traffic for two years and after consideration of changing traffic conditions, the efforts of the City's regional partners to support funding and construction timing of regional improvements that benefit Pleasanton, and community concerns.

Alternative Project Site

An alternative location was not assessed because such an analysis is not warranted for a specific plan project, and, as stated in the EIR, the Project Sponsor does not own other, comparable property within the City of Pleasanton's sphere of influence.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

The impacts of the Open Space Alternative would be slightly less than those of the preferred project. The Open Space Alternative would have slightly fewer water supply, water quality, visual, noise, air quality, and traffic impacts, and would likely create more opportunities for wildlife habitat than the preferred project.

The No Project (No Build) Alternative is considered a no project alternative, and CEQA requires the identification of an alternative other than the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative (see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

As explained on Draft SEIR page 123 and EIR pages 5-50-51, the Open Space Alternative would result in slightly fewer impacts than the preferred project, the proposed project, the Ice Center Alternative, and the Existing Specific Plan Alternative. Therefore, the Open Space Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the preferred project and to the other alternatives.

FINDINGS DEMONSTRATING WHY RECIRCULATION IS NOT REQUIRED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR but before certification. New information includes: (i) changes to the project; (ii) changes in the environmental setting; or (iii) additional data or other information. Section 15088.5 further provides that "[n]ew information added to an EIR is not 'significant' unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement."

Approval of the preferred project and the minor refinements thereto as presented in the Final SEIR would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe environmental impacts than as set forth in the Draft SEIR. Accordingly, recirculation of the SEIR is not required in light of these project refinements.

Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft and Final EIRs, and Draft and Final SEIRs and in the administrative record as well as the requirements under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and interpretive judicial authority regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, the City hereby finds that no new significant information was added to the SEIR following public review, and thus recirculation of the SEIR is not required by CEQA.

FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR AS SUPPLEMENTED BY THE SEIR

This section presents the preferred project's significant environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures. Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR]) and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code require a lead agency to adopt findings for each significant environmental impact disclosed in an EIR. These requirements are set forth on page 1 of this document.

Below are the findings for the significant impacts identified in the EIR as supplemented by the SEIR for the preferred project. The SEIR identified several differences in the environmental effects of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative and the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative compared to the proposed project. However, as described above, these differences do not provide a sufficient basis to conclude that either the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative or the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative presents significantly greater environmental impacts than the proposed project. Because the City adopts all of the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR and SEIR for each significant environmental impact and because the EIR and SEIR conclude that these mitigation measures will avoid or substantially lessen each of the identified significant impacts, with the exception of aesthetic and visual resources, air quality, noise, climate change and traffic impacts (the significant and unavoidable impacts of which are also discussed in the EIR and SEIR), thorough descriptions of each impact and each associated mitigation measure are not repeated below but can be obtained from the EIR and SEIR.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

1. Effect on scenic resources and visual character of the site

Finding. Development of the proposed land uses within the Project Area would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the existing visual character by changing the site from rural open space to urban development.

There are no measures available to mitigate the loss of the rural character of the Project Area, short of leaving large portions of the area undeveloped, which would be incompatible with the project

objectives. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

Draft SEIR, p. 59; DEIR, p. 3.1-11

2. Light and/or glare effects

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Refer a conceptual lighting plan to the Alameda County ALUC for its review prior to consideration of all PUD development plans, per MM VQ-3.1.
- Refer a conceptual lighting plan to the FAA, if requested by the FAA, prior to consideration of all PUD development plans, per MM VQ-3.1.
- Prepare a lighting plan, which shall include drawings and/or manufacturer's specification sheets showing the size and types of light fixtures proposed for the exterior areas. The light fixtures and their locations shall be subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director prior to the issuance of a building permit, per MM VQ-3.1.
- Design the lighting system of the auto mall to minimize light and glare impacts, per MM VQ-3.2.
- Ensure that all interior lighting in all buildings without residences be turned off during non-operational evening hours, with the exception of lighting needed for security reasons, per MM VQ-3.3.
- Prepare a lighting plan and specifications for the community and neighborhood parks to minimize light and glare impacts, per MM VQ-3.4.

Draft SEIR, pp. 59-60; DEIR, p. 3.1-24, and FEIR, p. 4-8

Air Quality

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

Generation of construction related emissions

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Implement dust control measures, per AQ-2.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 60; DEIR, p. 3.2-12

3. Impacts on an existing regional air quality

Finding. The preferred project would result in operational emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 that exceed the significance threshold of 80 pounds/day. This would have a significant impact on existing regional air quality. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP; however, even with implementation, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

Develop and implement a plan including both mobile and stationary measures to reduce operational air emissions to the maximum extent practicable, per MM AQ-3.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 60-61; DEIR, p. 3.2-13

4. Potential to expose future on-site residents to substantial Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Conduct a health risk assessment for persons who would occupy the proposed residential units within 500 feet of the closest ultimate travel lane adjacent to the Staples Ranch site as such travel lane is assumed under Caltrans' ultimate freeway expansion plans for I-580, per MM AQ-5.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 62-63; DEIR, p. 3.2-17

Biological Resources

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

Impact on the California red-legged frog

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Conduct preconstruction surveys for the California red-legged frog, per MM BIO-2.1.
- Implement ground disturbance restrictions associated with construction near the Arroyo Mocho, per MM BIO-2.2.
- Conduct construction monitoring for the California red-legged frog, per MM BIO-2.3.
- Conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction crews before construction activities within the Arroyo Mocho begin, per MM BIO-2.4.

Draft SEIR, pp. 18, 26, 65-66; Final SEIR, p. 4-4; DEIR, p. 3.3-17

5. Impact on the California tiger salamander

Finding. Based on information made available subsequent to the certification of the FEIR, the City finds that the California Tiger Salamander does not utilize the Staples Ranch Property and therefore the impacts to this species are less than significant.

Draft SEIR, pp. 17-18, 27

6. Impact on the western pond turtle or its habitat

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Conduct preconstruction surveys for the western pond turtle, per MM BIO-4.1.
- Provide exclusion fencing for the western pond turtle, per MM BIO-4.2.

Draft SEIR, pp. 18-19, 26, 65-66; Final SEIR, p. 4-4; DEIR, p. 3.3-20

7. Impacts on nesting birds or their habitat

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If active nests are found within the construction footprint, delay construction activities within a specified distance from the nest, as determined by the biologist, per MM BIO-5.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 66; DEIR, p. 3.3-21

8. Impacts on San Joaquin spearscale

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Prior to issuance of the first grading permit for all or a portion of the Staples Ranch site or the Stoneridge Drive bridges, the Alameda County Surplus Authority (ACSPA) shall permanently preserve a minimum of 1.77 acres of San Joaquin spearscale habitat in Alameda County, per MM S-BIO-1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 19-26, 65

9. Impact on riparian vegetation in the Arroyo Mocho

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFG prior to any construction activities that may result in any disturbance to stream corridors, per MM BIO-6.1.
- Erect exclusion fencing around the spearscale mitigation area on the north bank of the Arroyo Mocho, per MM BIO-6.2.
- Replace the vegetation within the Arroyo Mocho that is removed during construction in accordance with a revegetation plan to be prepared, per MM BIO-6.3.

Draft SEIR, p. 66; DEIR, p. 3.3-22

10. Impact to State and the U.S waters

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Compensate for impacts to jurisdictional waters to ensure no net loss of habitat function and values, per MM BIO-7.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 66; DEIR, p. 3.3-24

11. Interference with the movement of native or migratory terrestrial wildlife

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less- than-significant level:

- Minimize light spillover with devices that will direct lighting away from the Arroyo Mocho, per MM BIO-8.1.
- Incorporate wildlife habitat into landscaping plans for community and neighborhood parks, per MM BIO-8.2.

DEIR, p. 3.3-25

12. Potential to conflict with the provisions of the City of Pleasanton tree preservation policies or ordinances

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Conduct a tree appraisal using a City-approved arborist prior to consideration of all PUD development plans, per MM BIO-9.1.
- Provide tree replacement and submit a proposed tree preservation plan that indicates how the loss of affected heritage trees shall be mitigated and how heritage trees will be preserved, per MM BIO-9.2.

DEIR, p. 3.3-26

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

Impacts relating to the accidental release of unknown hazardous materials

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Prevent the disruption of on-site utilities by contacting the Underground Service Alert (USA), identifying the location of natural gas pipelines, and developing an emergency response plan prior to construction, per MM HZ-2.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 66-67; DEIR, p. 3.4-16

13. Impacts from new hazards, associated with light and glare at the Staples Ranch site, to aircraft utilizing the Livermore Municipal Airport

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Implementation of Mitigation Measures VQ-3.1 through VQ-3.4 [see mitigation measures listed above for Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Impact 2 - Light and Glare], which would require preparation of a lighting plan for the Staples Ranch site, and would reduce the potential for safety impacts from light and glare at the Staples Ranch site.

Draft SEIR, pp. 59-60, 66-67; DEIR, p. 3.4-18

Hydrology and Water Quality

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

Potential degradation of surface water quality from runoff during construction and operation of the project

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Implement a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan with targeted pollutant removal rates, per MM HY-1.1 in the MMRP.

- Implement an Integrated Pest Management Plan and Pesticide Management Program to minimize the risk of pollutants associated with landscape establishment and maintenance practices in surface water runoff and infiltration to groundwater, per MM HY-1.2.

Draft SEIR, pp. 67-69; DEIR, p. 3.5-25

14. Potential to alter runoff characteristics, leading to more erosion

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

- Maintain the detention basin and performance goals covering system inspections, maintenance, technical training of staff, and funding mechanisms, per MM HY-3.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 67-69; DEIR, p. 3.5-36

15. Construction of residences and structures within a FEMA 100-year flood hazard area

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Prior to construction, obtain flood hazard areas updates from FEMA (Conditional Letter of Map Revision), per MM HY-4.1.
- Defer certificates of occupancy until implementation of the Livermore Flood Protection Improvements, as defined by the FEMA Conditional Letter of Map Revision (as part of El Charro Specific Plan), per MM HY-4.2.

Draft SEIR, p. 69; DEIR, p. 3.5-39

Land Use and Planning

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

16. Potential to exceed the average density for commercial uses

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Provide additional amenities, such as enhancements to a neighborhood or community park, or an enhancement of trails in the Project Area, per MM LU-4.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 70; DEIR, p. 3.6-24

17. Potential to result in more complaints about the Livermore Airport aircraft operations

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Require continuing care community airport disclosures, deed riders, and noise complaint procedures, per MM LU-5.1
- Require a deed rider or aviation easement on other development projects, per MM LU-5.2.
- Require that deed riders/disclosures about the Livermore Municipal Airport be consistent with Business and Professions Code Section 11010 and Civil Code Sections 1102.6, 1103.4, and 1353, per MM LU-5.1 and LU 5.2.

Draft SEIR, p. 70; DEIR, p. 3.6-26, and FOR, p. 4-11

Noise

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

18. Noise levels for occupants of the Staples Ranch site in excess of standards established in the Pleasanton General Plan:

Finding.

- Provide exterior-to-interior noise reduction features for residential, retail, and commercial structures to meet City interior noise level standards of 45 dBA, per MM NO-1.1.
- Provide exterior-to-interior noise reduction features to meet single-event noise level standards (L_{max}), below 50 dBA in all rooms where people will sleep and 55 dBA in all other habitable rooms, per MM NO-1.2.
- Provide exterior noise reduction features by I-580 to meet the City's exterior noise level standard of 60 L_{dn} at the senior continuing care community villas and outdoor recreation areas. Prior to approval of PUD plans, the

developer of the senior continuing care community shall submit a noise analysis prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant to the City that demonstrates, to the extent feasible, that all proposed outdoor recreation areas will meet the City's standard of 60 Ldn. Noise reduction features may include wrapping of the proposed soundwall by the western and eastern property lines, and an increase in the I-580 soundwall height to compensate for the decrease in berm height by the western boundary, per MM NO-1.3.

- In the community park, limit areas within the 65 CNEL contour to open space and trails. The use of trails shall be limited within the 65 CNEL contour, per MM NO-1.4.
- Limit noise levels from auto mall car wash stations to 60 dBA at the continuing care community facility. At the auto mall, all car washes shall be located and designed such that noise from the car washes, including the vacuuming areas, shall not exceed 60 dBA at any habitable structure, per MM NO-1.5.

Draft SEIR, pp. 70-73; DEIR, p. 3.7-21

19. Potential for groundborne vibration due to project construction activities

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Reduce potential pile driving vibration effects on nearby structures below the structural damage threshold. To mitigate potential pile-driving vibration impacts, a site-specific engineering assessment shall be completed under the supervision of a qualified vibration consultant to assure that there would be no potential for structural damage to nearby existing buildings, based on a vibration damage threshold for a peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.20 inches per second. This plan shall be submitted for review and approval of the City Engineer prior to approval of the bridge plans to ensure that maximum feasible vibration reduction is achieved, per MM NO-2.1.
- Notify neighbors within 300 feet of the bridge project construction area at least 30 days in advance of any pile-driving activities about the estimated duration of the activity and prepare a list of measures to track and respond to

complaints pertaining to bridge construction, per MM NO-2.2.

Draft SEIR, pp. 70-73; DEIR, p. 3.7-29

20. Potential for substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during project construction.

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impacts to a less-than-significant level:

Require project developers to implement construction best management practices to reduce construction noise, per MM NO-3.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 70-73; DEIR, p. 3.7-29

21. Potential for significant increase in noise levels along Stoneridge Drive

Finding. The preferred project would result in significant noise impacts. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP; however, even with implementation, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

Repave Stoneridge Drive between Kamp Drive and Trevor Parkway with noise-attenuating pavement and replace the sound wall nearest the Stoneridge Drive bridge, per MM S-NO-1.1. Pave new portions of Stoneridge Drive with noise-attenuating pavement per MM NO-4.1.

The Project Sponsor will be responsible for the funding of the paving of the new portions of Stoneridge Drive and the construction of the sound wall. The Project Sponsor will also be responsible for the funding of repaving of Stoneridge Drive from Kamp Drive to Trevor Parkway to the maximum amount set forth in the Specific Plan Amendment (\$1.5 million for all off site traffic improvements). The City of Pleasanton will be responsible for any funding of off site improvements in excess of \$1.5 million.

Draft SEIR, pp. 70-76

Transportation and Traffic

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

22. Increased traffic and unacceptable levels of service at four Pleasanton intersections

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures identified for these four intersections are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Improve Hopyard Road at Owens Drive (#10), per MM TR-1.2.

[The improvements are included as projects in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The project developers and, to the extent so provided in the development agreement, the City of Pleasanton, shall pay traffic development fees to address this mitigation.]

- Improve Hopyard Road at Stoneridge Drive (#11), per MM TR-1.3.

[The proposed mitigations are a new turn lane and signal retiming. The improvements are included as projects in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The Project Developers and, to the extent so provided in the Development Agreement, the City of Pleasanton shall pay traffic development fees. The City of Pleasanton shall be responsible for signal retiming.] (Note that this mitigation is not needed during the time Stoneridge Drive is striped for one travel lane in each direction but is needed when Stoneridge Drive is striped for two travel lanes in each direction.)

- Improve Santa Rita Road at Stoneridge Drive (#32), per MM S-TR-2.1 and TR-1.3(a)

[The proposed mitigation includes restriping and the creation of new turn lanes. The Project Sponsor will fund this improvement to the maximum amount provided in the Specific Plan Amendment (\$1.5 million for all off site traffic improvements). The City of Pleasanton will be responsible for funding off site traffic improvements in excess of \$1.5 million.]

- Improve Santa Rita Road at Valley Avenue (#34), per MM TR-1.4.

[The proposed mitigation is to construct a second westbound left turn and either widen a northbound right-turn lane or construct a third southbound left turn. These improvements are included as projects in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The project developers and, to the extent so provided in the development agreement, the City of Pleasanton shall pay traffic development fees to address this mitigation. The proposed mitigation is also signal retiming. The City of Pleasanton shall be responsible for the signal retiming.]

Draft SEIR, pp. 76-80; DEIR, pp. 3.9-35 3.9-36; FEIR 3-20,3-22

23. Increased traffic and unacceptable levels of service at two intersections (Fallon Road at Dublin Boulevard [in Dublin] and Murrieta Blvd. and East Jack London Blvd. [in Livermore]) not within Pleasanton

Finding. The City finds that the mitigation measures for the intersection of Fallon Road and Dublin Boulevard (in Dublin) and for the intersection of Murrieta Blvd. at East Jack London Blvd. (in Livermore) are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP. Because these impacts occur outside the City's jurisdiction, unless the intersection improvements are implemented by the governing jurisdiction where the intersections are located, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

- Improve Fallon Road at Dublin Boulevard (#56) per MM TR-2.1
- Improve Murrieta Blvd. at East Jack London Blvd. (EC #13), per MM TR-2.2.
- Seek an Interagency Cooperative Agreement to fund and complete traffic mitigation measures in other jurisdictions, per MM TR-2.3.

DEIR, pp. 3.9-28; 3.9-36

24. Potential to conflict with future expansion of I-580

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Maintain adequate I-580 frontage setbacks, based on current knowledge of Caltrans' plans to expand I-580 toward the project, as part of the PUD development plan process, per MM TR-5.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 80; DEIR, p. 3.9-40

25. Potential to result in inadequate emergency access

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Provide adequate emergency vehicle access consistent with the City of Pleasanton's Circulation Element, per MM TR-7.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 88; DEIR, p. 3.9-42

26. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

- Provide acceptable bicycle and pedestrian access, per MM TR-9.1.
- Provide adequate bus and paratransit access, per MM TR-9.2

Draft SEIR, p. 88; DEIR, p. 3.9-43

27. Potential to result in an increase in construction traffic that could impact existing Pleasanton neighborhoods

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Develop a construction access plan to be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Department, per MM TR-12.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 89; DEIR, p. 3.9-46

28. Potential to exceed standards established by the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways

Finding. The preferred project would result in significant conflicts with the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency standards. (Note that during the time that Stoneridge Drive is striped for one lane of traffic in each direction, there is no conflict with these standards; the conflicts arise only when Stoneridge Drive is striped for two lanes of traffic in each direction.) The City finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP; however, even with implementation, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section:

Payment of regional Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fees, per MM S-TR-4.1.

Draft SEIR, pp. 84-86

Water Supply

Findings Regarding Significant impacts

29. Potentially significant impact on the preferred project's demand for water

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

Verify water supply prior to tentative map approval. The water supply verification must include documentation of historical water deliveries for the previous 20 years, as well as a description of reasonably foreseeable impacts of the preferred project on the availability of water resources in the region, per MM WS-1.1.

Draft SEIR, p. 89; DEIR, p. 3.10-22

Effects Found To Be Less Than Significant

Cultural Resources

Findings Regarding Impacts

1. Potential disturbance of unknown archaeological resources.

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Each project developer and the Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric archaeology, per MM CR-1.

DEIR, p. 4-33, FEIR, p. 4-12

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Findings Regarding Impacts

2. Potential impacts from geoseismic risks and soil limitations.

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than-significant level:

The Project Sponsor shall submit a master geotechnical report for the entire Staples Ranch site.

All buildings shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the top of the arroyo bank, in case there is a seismically induced bank failure, per MM TR-2.1.

DEIR, p. 4-35

Utilities

Findings Regarding Impacts

3. Increased demand for water.

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measure is feasible and has been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the impact to a less-than- significant level:

Irrigation plans shall incorporate low-flow irrigation head and/or drip irrigation with electric controllers set to water after 7:00 p.m. and before 10:00 a.m., and proper soil preparation for landscaped areas that includes a minimum of two inches of mulch and two inches of organic soil amendment, as recommended by a qualified landscape architect, per MM UT-1.

DEIR, p. 4-38

Cumulative Impacts

Findings Regarding Significant Impacts

- 1. Cumulative Aesthetics and Visual Quality impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that there are no measures available to mitigate this impact. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

DEIR, p. 4-6

- 2. Cumulative Air Quality impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of the project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts; however, this would not reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

DEIR, p. 4-7

- 3. Cumulative Biological Resources impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant.

DEIR, p. 4-9

- 4. Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant.

DEIR, p. 4-11

- 5. Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant.

DEIR, p. 4-12

6. Cumulative Noise impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of the project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts; however, this would not reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

Draft SEIR, pp. 45; DEIR, p. 4-15

7. Cumulative Transportation impacts with the preferred project and other foreseeable development.

Finding. The City finds that the following mitigation measures identified for these intersections are feasible and have been incorporated into the MMRP, thereby mitigating the cumulative impacts to a less-than significant level:

- Improve Hopyard Road at Owens Drive (#10), per MM TR-1C.

[The improvements are included as projects in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The project developers and, to the extent so provided in the development agreement, the City of Pleasanton shall pay traffic development fees to address this mitigation.]

- Improve Hopyard Road at Stoneridge Drive (#11), per MM TR-2C.

[The improvements are included as projects in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The project developers and, to the extent so provided in the development agreement, the City of Pleasanton shall pay traffic development fees to address this mitigation.]

- Improve Santa Rita Road at I-580 Eastbound off ramp/Pimlico Road (#26), per MM TR-3C. This improvement is not currently included in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The City's Traffic Development Fee is currently being updated and this improvement will be included in a new traffic fee study. Because it is anticipated that the fee update will be completed prior to the payment of fees by project developers, the payment of the revised Traffic Development Fee will mitigate this impact. If the City's Traffic Development Fee has not been updated when building permits for the preferred project are sought, the City will be responsible for this mitigation.

- Improve West Las Positas at Stoneridge Drive (#30), per MM TR-4C.

[This improvement is not currently included in the City's Traffic Development Fee. The City's Traffic Development Fee is currently being updated and this improvement will be included in a new traffic fee study. Because it is anticipated that the fee update will be completed prior to the payment of fees by project developers, the payment of the revised Traffic Development Fee will mitigate this impact. If the City's Traffic Development Fee has not been updated when building permits for the preferred project are sought, the City will be responsible for this mitigation.]

- Improve Santa Rita Road at Valley Avenue (#34), per MM TR-5C.

[Mitigation measure TR-5C has been incorporated into mitigation measure TR-1.4 to reflect the full extension of Stoneridge Drive as part of the preferred project. Mitigation Measure TR-1.4 will therefore also reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.]

- Improve El Charro at I-580 EB Off (#51), per MM TR-6C.

[This project is not included in the Phase 1 Interchange Improvements to be constructed by the City of Dublin. This improvement has been identified in the City of Livermore's El Charro Specific Plan EIR. As provided in the Cost Sharing Agreement dated September 4, 2007 between the Cities of Pleasanton and Livermore and the Surplus Property Authority of Alameda County, if the City of Livermore has not constructed the modification to the Caltrans 1-580/Fallon Road Interchange Modification (Project #04-257604) that is identified in this EIR, the City of Pleasanton will be responsible to construct the modification. With the construction of these improvements, this impact will be mitigated.]

8. Increased traffic and unacceptable levels of service at intersections not within Pleasanton.

Finding. The City finds that mitigation measures identified for three intersections, Dougherty Road at Dublin Boulevard (#D1), Fallon Road at Dublin Boulevard (#56) and Tassajara Road at Central Parkway (#60), are feasible but the City of Dublin has stated that the mitigation for the intersection at Dougherty Road and Dublin Boulevard is not feasible. The mitigation measures for Fallon Road and Dublin Boulevard and Tassajara Road and Central Parkway

have been incorporated into the MMRP. Because of the infeasibility of certain mitigation measures and/or unless the intersection improvements are implemented by the governing jurisdiction where the intersections are located, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section. The feasible mitigation measures are:

- *Improve Fallon Road at Dublin Boulevard (#56), per MM TR 8C.*
- *Improve Tassajara Road at Central Parkway (#60), per MM TR-9C.*
- *Seek an Interagency Cooperative Agreement to fund and complete traffic mitigation measures in other jurisdictions, per MM TR-11 C.*

DEIR, p. 4-18 and FEIR, p. 3-69

9. Cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of climate change.

Finding. The City finds that implementation of the project level mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts; however, this would not reduce the preferred project's contribution to this cumulative impact to less than significant. A statement of overriding considerations for this impact is made in the following section.

Draft SEIR, pp. 38-45, 63-65

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City has determined to approve the preferred project, the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension (with phasing modifications)~~a hybrid of the Four-Lane Concurrent Extension Alternative and the Two-Lane Constrained Extension Alternative~~, because it provides greater social and economic benefits than the proposed project without creating significantly greater environmental impacts. This statement of overriding considerations presents the City's determination that the preferred project's broader public and environmental objectives outweigh the anticipated significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the project, as identified in the CEQA Findings, the SEIR and the EIR.

Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts of the Preferred Project

The CEQA Findings, the SEIR and EIR identify the following significant and unavoidable impacts of the preferred project:

- Aesthetics and Visual Quality - as a result of conversion of the Staples Ranch site from undeveloped to developed land and the loss of the rural character of the Project Area.
- Air Quality - as a result of emissions of ozone precursors (reactive organic gases and oxides of nitrogen) and particulate matter from mobile and stationary sources, above thresholds used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).
- Climate Change - the preferred project would result in a cumulatively considerable and unavoidable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of climate change.
- Noise - under the noise significance threshold of the Pleasanton General Plan 2005-2025, this impact remains a significant and unavoidable impact under project conditions and a considerable and unavoidable impact under cumulative conditions.
- Traffic - as a result of increased project trips at two study area intersections outside the jurisdiction of Pleasanton under project conditions, and two intersections outside the jurisdiction of Pleasanton under cumulative conditions, this impact remains significant if the other jurisdictions decide not to implement the proposed mitigation measures. In addition, under cumulative conditions, there is a significant impact at the intersection of Dublin Boulevard at Dougherty Road (#D1), also outside the jurisdiction of the City of Pleasanton; the City of Dublin has stated, however, that the mitigation for this intersection is infeasible. Also, under project conditions, during the time Stoneridge Drive is striped one lane in each direction, the preferred project will not exceed any Alameda County Congestion Management Agency's standards for arterial roadway

segments. Once, however, Stoneridge Drive is striped for two lanes in each direction, the preferred project would exceed the Alameda County's Congestion Management Agency's standards for several arterial roadway segments, although it would also improve four arterial roadway segments that currently are failing.

Required Statement of Overriding Considerations

The City will mitigate the impacts described above to the extent feasible (see previous section). However, these measures will not reduce the above impacts to less-than significant levels.

The City has examined reasonable project alternatives, including the proposed project. The City has found that the proposed project, the Existing Specific Plan Alternative, the No Project Alternative and the Open Space Alternative would not achieve the core project objectives and/or would not significantly reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the preferred project and/or be consistent with City planning policies and goals. Each alternative has been discussed above.

The City has determined to approve the preferred project. In preparing this statement of overriding considerations, the City has balanced the benefits of the preferred project against its unavoidable environmental impacts. Although implementation of the preferred project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to the loss of the rural character of the project, air emissions above the thresholds used by the BAAQMD, climate change, noise, and increased traffic congestion at intersections outside Pleasanton, the City finds that the benefits of the project to the community are overriding considerations when weighed against the environmental impacts listed above. Adoption of the preferred project will allow the following community goals to be achieved, and, thus, the City finds that the potential benefits outweigh the environmental risks of the preferred project:

1. Retain existing auto sales businesses within the City of Pleasanton by providing a large, convenient and highly visible site for an auto mall that will facilitate newer and larger facilities necessary to meet automobile franchise requirements.
2. Provide a site for a senior continuing care community that will help meet Pleasanton's and the surrounding community's expanding need for senior housing and living opportunities, while providing a buffer between the adjacent existing residential neighborhoods to the west and the planned auto mall to the east.
3. Provide a convenient, flexible, and efficient location for additional commercial development that can take advantage of excellent freeway access and the developing El Charro Road commercial corridor.
4. Provide a 17-acre community park site with an ice center to the City that may be used for a variety of active and/or passive recreational uses, may offer multiple potential access points, and takes advantage of the adjacent Arroyo Mocho,

which offers opportunities for regional trail connections and passive nature-based recreation.

5. Provide a 5-acre neighborhood park that offers both recreational opportunities and on-site stormwater detention to meet State and local hydro-modification requirements.
6. Develop a circulation system that provides convenient vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access to and through the Staples Ranch site, in substantial conformance with the General Plan, without adversely affecting existing residential neighborhoods in the City.
7. Design landscaping to create an attractive eastern entrance to the City, enhance the pedestrian environment, provide buffers between potentially incompatible land uses, and provide on-site stormwater treatment to reduce environmental impacts.
8. A City sales tax revenue increase when visitors come from out of town to ice center special events and do business at local hotels, stores, and restaurants.
9. Retail sales tax dollars would be generated by the ice center restaurant and retail shop.
10. The ice center developer has offered to contribute to and construct a substantial share of the remainder of the 17 acre Community Park.
11. Social benefits resulting from the preferred project would include the introduction of many activities to the community relating to health, education, recreation, family life, and special needs provided by a variety of ice skating activities, including:
 - Public skating sessions
 - Public school physical education classes and possible future competitive team practices and games
 - City Park and Recreation Department programs
 - Private class skating lessons
 - Youth and adult hockey practices and games for men, women, boys, and girls
 - Figure skating
 - Speed skating
 - Curling

- Synchronized skating
- Ice dancing
- Olympic level figure skating instruction and practice
- Approximately six annual weekend special events such as hockey tournaments and figure skating competitions
- Special needs programs for physically and developmentally disabled children
- Disabled hockey program providing sled hockey for disabled persons
- Lessons and programs for community organizations
- Birthday and company parties
- Ice reservation booking priority and Pleasanton resident discount fees (similar to the City's Callippe Preserve Golf Course offerings currently extended by the City to Pleasanton residents)

{end}