Initial Study/Addendum
City of San Ramon General Plan 2035
City of San Ramon, Contra Costa County, California

State Clearinghouse No. 2000082002

Prepared for:
City of San Ramon
Community Development Department
2401 Crow Canyon Road
San Ramon, CA 94583
925.973.2560

Contact: Lauren Barr, Senior Planner

Prepared by:
FirstCarbon Solutions
1350 Treat Boulevard, Suite 380
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
925.357.2562

Contact: Mary Bean, Project Director
Grant Gruber, Project Manager

November 25, 2014

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction 1
1.1 - Initial Study/Environmental Checklist 1
1.2 - Environmental Analysis and Conclusions 1
1.2.1 - Findings 2
1.2.2 - Conclusions 2
1.3 - Mitigation Monitoring Program 3

Section 2: Project Description 5
2.1 - Location and Setting 5
2.2 - Project Background 5
2.2.1 - City of San Ramon General Plan 2030 5
2.3 - Project Characteristics 5
2.3.1 - Project Summary 5

Section 3: CEQA Checklist 9
3.1 - Explanation of Checklist Evaluation Categories 9
(1) Conclusion in FEIR and Related Documents 9
(2) Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts? 9
(3) New Circumstances Involving New Impacts? 9
(4) New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification? 9
(5) FEIR Mitigation Measures Implemented or Address Impacts 10
3.2 - Discussion and Mitigation Sections 10
(1) Discussion 10
(2) FEIR Mitigation Measures 10
(3) Conclusions 10
3.3 - Non-Applicable Issues 11
I. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare 12
II. Agricultural Resources 15
III. Air Quality 18
IV. Biological Resources 23
V. Cultural Resources 27
VI. Geology and Soils 30
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 34
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 36
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality 40
X. Land Use 45
XI. Mineral Resources 47
XII. Noise 48
XIII. Population and Housing 52
XIV. Public Services 54
XIV. Recreation 57
XV. Transportation 59
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems 63
XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance 66

List of Tables

Table 1: City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 Summary.....6
Table 2: General Plan 2035 Buildout Estimates.....7

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This Addendum, checklist, and attached supporting documents have been prepared to determine whether and to what extent the City of San Ramon General Plan 2030 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) remains sufficient to address the potential impacts of the proposed City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 (project), or whether additional documentation is required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.).

1.1 - Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166, and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, subd. (a), the attached initial study/checklist has been prepared to evaluate the project. The attached initial study/checklist uses the standard environmental checklist categories provided in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, but provides answer columns for evaluation consistent with the considerations listed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, subd. (a).

1.2 - Environmental Analysis and Conclusions

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (a) provides that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or ND have occurred (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164, subd. (a)).

An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or ND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (c)). The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the Final EIR prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (d)). An agency must also include a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or ND pursuant to Section 15162 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (e)).

Consequently, once an EIR or ND has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR or ND is required under CEQA unless, based on substantial evidence:

1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR . . . due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; [1]
2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR [or ND] . . . due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

[1] CEQA Guidelines Section 15382 defines "significant effect on the environment" as " . . . a substantial, or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance . . ." (see also Public Resources Code, Section 21068).

3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR [or ND] was certified as complete . . . shows any of the following:
   a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR [or ND] or negative declaration;
   b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR [or ND];
   c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR [or ND] would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162, subd. (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21166).

This addendum, checklist and attached documents constitute substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR or ND is not required prior to approval of the above-referenced permits by responsible and trustee agencies, and provides the required documentation under CEQA.

1.2.1 - Findings

There are no substantial changes proposed by the City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 or in the circumstances in which the project will be undertaken that require major revisions of the existing EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR or ND, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. As illustrated herein, the project is consistent with the FEIR and would involve only minor changes.

1.2.2 - Conclusions

The San Ramon City Council may approve the City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 project based on this Addendum. The impacts of the proposed project remain within the impacts previously analyzed in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061, subd. (b)(3)).

The current proposed project does not require any revisions to the EIR. No new significant information or changes in circumstances surrounding the project have occurred since the certification of the FEIR. The previous analysis completed for the City of San Ramon General Plan 2030 under CEQA and included in the EIR therefore remains adequate under CEQA. However, the City will remain obligated to comply with all applicable mitigation measures contained within the EIR for the City of San Ramon General Plan 2030.

1.3 - Mitigation Monitoring Program

As required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, subd. (a)(1), a mitigation monitoring and reporting program has been prepared for the project in order to monitor the implementation of the mitigation measures that have been adopted for the project. Any long-term monitoring of mitigation measures imposed on the overall development will be implemented through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

SECTION 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 - Location and Setting

The project site consists of the City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 Planning Area, which consists of the San Ramon city limits and surrounding unincorporated areas of southern Contra Costa County, California. The Planning Area encompasses 23,297 acres or 36.4 square miles, bounded by Alameda County (west), the Town of Danville and unincorporated Contra Costa County (north), unincorporated Contra Costa County (east), and Alameda County/City of Dublin (south). The Planning Area is located on the Diablo, California United States Geological Survey 7.5-Minute topographic quadrangle map, Township 2 South, Range 1 West, Section 15 (Latitude 37° 46' 00" North; Longitude 121° 56' 00" West).

Within the Planning Area are the city limits, Sphere of Influence, and Urban Growth Boundary(UGB). The current city limits total 11,973 acres (18.4 square miles) and represent the corporate limits of the City of San Ramon. The proposed Sphere of Influence totals 19,639 acres (30.7 square miles) and encompasses both the city limits and unincorporated areas that are within the future, probable limits of the City. The proposed UBG totals 13,706 acres (21.4 square miles) and encompasses existing urban development or undeveloped areas adjacent to urban development anticipated to be developed over the life of the General Plan. Note that the General Plan is legally binding within the city limits and advisory outside of the city limits.

As of January 1, 2014, the California Department of Finance estimated the City of San Ramon to have a population of 77,270.

2.2 - Project Background

2.2.1 - City of San Ramon General Plan 2030

The City of San Ramon General Plan 2030—the City's current long-range planning document—was adopted by the San Ramon City Council in April 2011. The General Plan 2030 consisted of a comprehensive update to General Plan 2020, and added or amended the following components: (1) a new Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Element; (2) re-designation of the North Camino Ramon Area to "Mixed Use" and the addition of policies that contemplated higher-density, transit- and pedestrian-oriented mixed uses; (3) revisions to policy language; and (4) minor text and mapping updates to reflect changes that have occurred since the last update. CEQA coverage for the General Plan 2030 was provided by the General Plan 2030 EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000082002), which was certified by the San Ramon City Council in July 2010.

2.3 - Project Characteristics

2.3.1 - Project Summary

The proposed General Plan 2035 update largely maintains the land use concepts and policy language set forth in General Plan 2030 with updates to city demographic, state-mandated Housing Element

update for the 2015–2023 Housing Element cycle, and minor policy language revisions, narrative text and mapping updates to reflect changes that have occurred since the last update. Table 1 summarizes the changes to each General Plan element.

Table 1: City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 Summary

Element	Summary of Changes
1 – Introduction	Text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements
2 – Economic Development	Implementing Policy 2.3-I-1 revised to reflect current status of Economic Development Strategic Plan; Implementing Policy 2.3-I-11 revised to reflect loss of RDA as a tool for Crow Canyon Specific Plan (no land use changes proposed); Policy 2.3-I-18 revised to reflect adopted status of North Camino Ramon Specific Plan; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
3 – Growth Management	Text revisions to update numbers, removed library performance standard and relocated library policy discuss to Public Facilities Element, make minor clarifications and maintain consistency with General Plan elements.
4 – Land Use	Implementing Policy 4.6-I-3 revised to identify 2022 as the horizon year for Urban Growth Boundary to coincide with the next housing cycle; Implementing Policies 4.6-I-19 and 4.6-I-20 revised to clarify definitions and standards of mixed use; Implementing Policy 4.7-I-2 revised to update planning objectives for Crow Canyon Specific Plan; Implementing Policy 4.7-I-4 revised to reflect adopted status of North Camino Ramon Specific Plan; Implementing Policy 4.7-I-5 revised to reflect proposal for San Ramon City Center Project; Implementing Policy 4.8-I-12 revised to acknowledge water conservation standards currently in effect; Implementing Policy 4.8-I-17 revised to clarify sun access plane standards; Figures 4-1 and 4-2 updated; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
5 – Traffic and Circulation	Implementing Policy 5.4-I-3 revised to reflect status of planned roadway improvements; Implementing Policy 5.5-I-6 revised to clarify parking restrictions around California High School; list of bike routes updated; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
6 – Parks and Recreation	Implementing Policies 6.5-I-1, 6.5-I-11, 6.5-I-16, and 6.5-I-17 revised to clarify parkland requirements; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
7 – Public Facilities and Utilities	Implementing Policy 7.1-I-1 revised to reflect current concept for San Ramon Library; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.

Table 1 (cont.): City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 Summary

Element	Summary of Changes
8 – Open Space and Conservation	Implementing Policies 8.3-I-14 and 8.3-I-16 revised to clarify slope preservation standards; Implementing Policies 8.4-I-4 and 8.4-I-5 revised to clarify responsibilities of Open Space Advisory Committee.
9 – Safety	No changes
10 – Noise	No changes
11 – Housing	Update Housing Opportunity Sites (27 total); Implementing Policies 11.1-I-6, 11.1-I-9, and 11.1-I-18 revised to clarify affordable housing policies; New policies 11.1-I-21 through 11.1-I-26 added to address senior housing and workforce housing; update program language to reflect items that have been completed; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
12 – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	Add discussion on Toxic Air Contaminants and Sensitive Receptors; Implementing Policies 12.3-I-3, 12.3-I-4, 12.5-I-1, 12.6-I-5, 12.7.I-5, 12.8-I-2, 12.8-I-3, 12.8-I-5 revised to clarify requirements for analysis of toxic air contaminants and greenhouse gases and expand emissions reduction strategies including Electric Vehicle infrastructure and reclaimed water usage ; text revisions to update numbers, make minor clarifications, and maintain consistency with other General Plan elements.
Source: City of San Ramon, 2014.	

The City of San Ramon General Plan 2035 buildout numbers for population, dwelling units, employment, employed residents, and jobs/housing ratio are summarized in Table 2. The buildout numbers in Table 2 are primarily based on estimates provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Table 2: General Plan 2035 Buildout Estimates

Category	General Plan 2035 Buildout Estimate
Population	96,174
Dwelling Units	35,385
Employment	57,667
Employed Residents	47,164
Jobs/Housing Ratio	1.22
Source: City of San Ramon, 2014.	

SECTION 3: CEQA CHECKLIST

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any changed condition (e.g., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result (e.g., a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162).

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A "no" answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed with mitigation measures in the Final EIR prepared for the Project. These environmental categories might be answered with a "no" in the checklist, since the proposed project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the certified MND.

3.1 - Explanation of Checklist Evaluation Categories

(1) Conclusion in FEIR and Related Documents

This column summarizes the conclusion of the FEIR relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

(2) Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, subd. (a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised Project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the FEIR, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

(3) New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, subd. (a)(2), this column indicates whether there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the FEIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

(4) New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, subd. (a)(3)(A-D), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

(A) The Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR [or ND];

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than show in the previous EIR [or ND];

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerable different from those analyzed in the previous EIR [or ND] would substantially reduce one or more significant effect of the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

If the additional analysis completed as part of this environmental review were to find that the conclusions of the FEIR remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, or additional mitigation is not necessary, then the question would be answered "no" and no additional environmental document would be required.

(5) FEIR Mitigation Measures Implemented or Address Impacts

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, subd. (a)(3), this column indicates whether the FEIR provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. These mitigation measures will be implemented with the construction of the Project; a "yes" response will be provided in either instance. If "NA" is indicated, the final EIR and this initial study conclude that the impact does not occur with this Project or is not significant; therefore, no additional mitigation measures are needed.

3.2 - Discussion and Mitigation Sections

(1) Discussion

A discussion of the elements of the checklist is provided under each environmental category in order to clarify the answers. The discussion provides information about the particular environmental issue, how the Project relates to the issue, and the status of any mitigation that may be required or that has already been implemented.

(2) FEIR Mitigation Measures

Applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR that apply to the project are listed under each environmental category.

(3) Conclusions

A discussion of the conclusion relating to the analysis is contained in each section.

3.3 - Non-Applicable Issues

General Plan 2030 proposed adjustments the Urban Growth Boundary and Sphere of Influence to encompass a portion of the Tassajara Valley (both boundaries) and Norris Canyon Estates (Urban Growth Boundary only). Accordingly, a considerable amount of the analysis contained in General Plan 2030 EIR focused on the proposed boundary adjustments. Following the loss of Measure W in 2010, the boundary adjustments were not pursued.

General Plan 2035 does not propose any adjustments to either the Urban Growth Boundary or Sphere of Influence and, therefore, General Plan 2030 EIR's conclusions in this regard do not apply. Thus, in the interests of avoiding confusion, this Addendum does not address the General Plan 2030 EIR's conclusions regarding the boundary adjustments, as they are non-applicable to General Plan 2035.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
I. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare					
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant Impact t	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have any adverse effect on scenic vista.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have any adverse effect on scenic vista.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have any adverse effect on scenic vista.	None
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	None
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially degrade visual character.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially degrade visual character.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not substantially degrade visual character.	None
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create new sources of substantial light and glare.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create new sources of substantial light and glare.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create new sources of substantial light and glare.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR concluded that impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant because General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designation within the city limits and Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities within the City jurisdiction would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of visual resources.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for substantial adverse impacts to scenic vistas. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR noted that Interstate 680 (I-680) is an "Officially Designated" State Scenic Highway within the Planning Area and views of surrounding ridgelines and hillsides were generally available from freeway. As analyzed in the FEIR, the General Plan 2030 (2010) did not contemplate any significant changes to land uses within the I-680 viewshed. Impacts on State Scenic Highways were identified to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for adverse impacts to scenic resources within view of State Scenic Highway. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR concluded that impacts on visual character would be less than significant because General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designation within the city limits and Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities within the City would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of visual resources.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for substantial adverse changes to visual character. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR analysis found that lighting impacts associated with the higher-density, mixed-use development contemplated by the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan would maintain existing levels of light and glare. Additionally, the FEIR stated that General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designations within the existing Planning Area, resulting in no new sources of light and glare. Any future land use activities within the Planning Areawould be subject to regulatory process and environmental review. No substantial light and glare impacts were identified.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for the introduction of new substantial sources of light and glare. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on aesthetics, light, and glare.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
II. Agricultural Resources					
Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	None
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.	None
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with forest zoning.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with forest zoning.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with forest zoning.	None
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert forest land to non-forest use.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert forest land to non-forest use.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not convert forest land to non-forest use.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result changes to the environment that result in the conversion of agricultural or forest land.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result changes to the environment that result in the conversion of agricultural or forest land.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result changes to the environment that result in the conversion of agricultural or forest land.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR disclosed that there were 3,216 acres of Important Farmland within the Planning Area consisting of 127 acres of Prime Farmland, 10 acres of Unique Farmland, and 3,054 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. With the exception of a commercial nursery located within a PG&E tower line easement that is designated as "Unique Farmland," none of this acreage is located within the San Ramon city limits. Impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR disclosed that there are 3,236 acres of Williamson Act contracted lands within the Planning Area; however, none of this acreage is within the San Ramon city limits. Impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for the cancellation of Williamson Act contracts or conflicts with agricultural zoning. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The Planning Area does not contain any land zoned as forest land. This condition precludes the possibility of conflicts with forest zoning. No impact would occur.

d) The Planning Area does not contain any forest land. This condition precludes the possibility of converting forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

e) The FEIR disclosed that there were 3,216 acres of Important Farmland within the Planning Area, with almost all of the acreage located outside the San Ramon city limits. As such, the FEIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan 2030 would not result in pressures to prematurely convert farmland to non-agricultural uses.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for premature conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on agricultural resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
III. Air Quality					
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Significant Unavoidable Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create any new inconsistencies with an applicable air quality plan beyond what was previously disclosed.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create any new inconsistencies with an applicable air quality plan beyond what was previously disclosed.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create any new inconsistencies with an applicable air quality plan beyond what was previously disclosed.	None
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	None
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	None
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create objectionable odors.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create objectionable odors.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create objectionable odors.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR analyzed General Plan 2030 consistency with the control measures in the Bay Area Ozone Strategy to determine conflict with applicable Air Quality Plan. The FEIR also analyzed the projected vehicle miles traveled or vehicle trips increase for the General Plan with the projected population increase. The FEIR concluded that although vehicle miles traveled would decline over the life of the General Plan, the discrepancy between the City of San Ramon General Plan's and Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG's) growth projections was considered a significant impact. Thus, the additional growth contemplated by the General Plan 2030 that is beyond the ABAG 2030 projections may present inconsistencies with regional air quality planning efforts. Until the ABAG forecasts are revised for consistency with the General Plan 2030's projections, the residual significance of this impact will remain significant and unavoidable. Conflict with applicable air quality plans was determined to be potentially significant and no mitigation was available.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in a substantial increase in air pollutant emissions. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with conflicts with an air quality plan. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR analyzed that construction activities associated with development activities contemplated by the General Plan would result in short-term construction impacts to air quality resulting from fugitive dust and other particulate matter, as well as exhaust emissions generated by earthmoving activities and operation of grading equipment for any future development. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 establishes Implementing

Policy 12.3-I-3, which requires analysis of air quality impacts using the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines. This document sets guidance for evaluating and mitigating construction-related ROG, NO_x, PM_{10} exhaust, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions; therefore, this policy would ensure that construction emissions are evaluated and mitigated. As such, impacts were identified to be less than significant.

The FEIR analyzed the General Plan 2030's operational air quality impacts, which included mobile source emissions such as daily vehicle trips and consistency with the current Air Quality Plan control measures. Table 3.3-8 of the FEIR demonstrated consistency with the current Air Quality Plan control measures. In addition, the General Plan 2030 included numerous measures promoting compact development, infill, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, pedestrian-oriented development, transit use, and transportation demand management that result in lower vehicle miles traveled. The San Ramon Climate Action Plan prepared as part of the General Plan 2030 includes a list of all policies that support reductions in vehicle miles traveled to achieve the City's greenhouse gas reduction target of 15 percent lower than 2008 emissions and operational criteria pollutant emissions. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 meets the BAAQMD significance criteria and would not substantially contribute to an existing violation of the ozone and particulate standards. Less than significant impacts were identified.

The FEIR analyzed impacts that could result from carbon monoxide hot spots. The FEIR concluded that according to the BAAQMD Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to localized CO concentrations. As shown in Table 3.3-11 of the FEIR, the project meets the screening criteria for CO emissions and would result in a less than significant impact. The FEIR also concluded that estimated 1-hour and 8-hour average CO concentrations in combination with background concentrations (unmitigated) were below the state and national ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the mobile emissions of CO from implementation of General Plan 2030 (2010) were not anticipated to contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation of CO. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in a substantial increase in air pollutant emissions. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with violations of an air quality standard. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines indicate that any project that creates a significant individual air quality impact would also have a cumulatively considerable impact on regional air quality. As discussed above, the General Plan 2030 is not consistent with the Clean Air Plan. Therefore, the project presents a significant impact according to this criterion. The geographic scope for cumulative criteria pollution from air quality impacts was identified as the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, because that is the area in which the air pollutants generated by the sources within the basin circulate and are often trapped. As discussed in the FEIR, the Basin is in nonattainment for ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, which means that the

background levels of those pollutants are at times higher than the ambient air quality standards.
The General Plan 2030 may not be considered consistent with the Clean Air Plan, which is due to differences in growth projections between the City and ABAG. Although the policies of the General Plan 2030 serve to partially mitigate this impact, no additional mitigation measures were available to ensure that the General Plan would not cause cumulative air quality impacts. Accordingly, the FEIR concluded that this would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the General Plan 2030.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in a substantial increase in air pollutant emissions. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with cumulatively considerable air quality impacts. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR analyzed air quality impacts to sensitive receptors from toxic air contaminants (TACs), naturally occurring asbestos, asbestos during demolition activities, and lead paint. The FEIR concluded that implementation of General Plan 2030 Policy 12.5.I.1 would ensure that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial toxic air contaminants. As discussed in the FEIR, a review of the map containing areas more likely to have rock formations containing naturally occurring asbestos in California indicated that the Planning Area was not in an area that is likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. The nearest location of naturally occurring asbestos was east of Alamo. Therefore, it was concluded that naturally occurring asbestos is not present in large quantities in the City. Asbestos during demolition activities is subject to BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing). The FEIR concluded that by complying with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 and thereby minimizing the release of airborne asbestos emissions, demolition activity would not result in a significant impact to air quality. The FEIR analyzed that under the rule, contractors performing renovation, repair, and painting projects that disturb lead-based paint in future development built before 1978, must be certified and must follow specific work practices to prevent lead contamination. Accordingly, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in a substantial increase in air toxic emissions such that sensitive receptors would exposed to unhealthful emissions. Updates to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Element provides for policy revisions related to mobile Toxic Air Contaminates (TAC). In addition to the background discussion on TAC, a Citywide screening map with of those areas that require additional study has been proposed to identify and mitigate potential impacts to sensitive receptors. The scope of revisions and new policy languagepreclude the potential for new impacts on sensitive receptors. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged for the proposed General Plan 2035.

e) The FEIR analysis found that implementation of the General Plan 2030 would be guided by the City's Zoning Ordinance and the BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines Zoning Ordinance, as an implementing tool of the General Plan contains performance standards intended to minimize the impacts associated with objectionable odors. Accordingly, impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could that could potentially result in the introduction of new sources of objectionable odors not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with objectionable odors. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on air quality.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
IV. Biological Resources					
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact special status species.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact special status species.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact special status species.	None
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.	None
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Less than significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not interfere with wildlife or fish movement.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not interfere with wildlife or fish movement.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not interfere with wildlife or fish movement.	None
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any local biological policies or ordinances.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any local biological policies or ordinances.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any local biological policies or ordinances.	None
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR concluded that impacts on special status species would be less than significant because General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designation within the city limits and Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of biological resources.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on special-status species. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR indicated that sensitive natural communities and riparian habitat generally occurred within Bollinger Canyon, the Westside foothills, the Dougherty Valley, and the Tassajara Valley. The FEIR concluded that, based on the existing regulatory requirements and the policies contained within the proposed General Plan 2030, there is certainty that future development and land use activities contemplated by the General Plan 2030 would not have significant impacts on sensitive natural communities and riparian habitat.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on sensitive natural communities and riparian habitat. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR indicated that federally protected wetlands were generally located within Bollinger Canyon, the Westside foothills, the Dougherty Valley, and the Tassajara Valley. The FEIR concluded that impacts on wetlands would be less than significant because General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designation within the city limits and Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of biological resources.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on federally protected wetlands. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR noted that wildlife movement corridors within the Planning Area consisted of drainages, arroyos, and ridgelines. The FEIR concluded that impacts on wildlife movement corridors would be less than significant because General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designation within the city limits and Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of biological resources.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on wildlife movement. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

e) The FEIR concluded that the General Plan guides preparation of subsequent specific plans and that Municipal Code updates must be consistent with the policies established in the General Plan. As such, the proposed General Plan 2030 was determined to be internally consistent with the City's existing and proposed local policies protecting biological resources. Less than significant impacts were identified.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on conflicts with local biological ordinances and policies. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

f) The Planning Area is not within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. This condition precludes the possibility of conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on biological resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
V. Cultural Resources					
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on a historical resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not cause an adverse impact on a historical resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not cause an adverse impact on a historical resource.	None
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on an archaeological resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on an archaeological resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on an archaeological resource.	None
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on a paleontological resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on a paleontological resource.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have an adverse impact on a paleontological resource.	None
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not disturb any human remains.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not disturb any human remains.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not disturb any human remains.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR analysis found that the Planning Area contains only one federal and state listed historic resource: Forest Homes Farms Historical Park. This resource is a city park and is protected in perpetuity. The FEIR analysis also discussed impacts on El Nido Property, which is proposed to be re-designated from Parks to Multiple Family-High Density, and the buildings within the North Camino Ramon area, some of which may be 45 years or older and would be re-designated to mixed use. The FEIR concluded that the proposed re-designation would not alter the El Nido House, and any development proposals for this property will be required to comply with General Plan policy, which requires that new

development evaluate impacts on potential historic resources and mitigate if necessary. The FEIR also concluded that North Camino Ramon land use map amendment would not alter any structures. The development of the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan and associated environmental review process will address the presence of any resources that may meet historic eligibility.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on historical resources. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR concluded that the area within the existing Planning Area andcity limits is predominantly developed and has been previously disturbed by past earthwork activities. Thus, it is doubtful that undiscovered archaeological resources would be encountered as part of development activities within the existing city limits. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of cultural resources..

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on archaeological resources. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR concluded that the area within the existing Planning Area and city limits is predominantly developed and has been previously disturbed by past earthwork activities or preserved as open space. Thus, it is doubtful that undiscovered paleontological resources would be encountered as part of development activities within the existing urbanized or developable areas. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of cultural resources

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on paleontological. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR concluded that much of the area within the existing Planning Area and city limits is predominantly developed and has been previously disturbed by past earthwork activities. Thus, it is doubtful that undiscovered burial sites would be encountered as part of development activities within the existing urbanized and developable areas of the Planning Area. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of cultural resources

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts on human remains or burial sites. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on cultural resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
VI. Geology and Soils					
Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to fault rupture.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to fault rupture.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to fault rupture.	None
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to strong seismic ground shaking.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to strong seismic ground shaking.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to strong seismic ground shaking.	None
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	None
iv) Landslides?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to landslides.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to landslides.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to landslides.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase exposure to risks associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	None
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to risks associated with expansive soil.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to risks associated with expansive soil.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to risks associated with expansive soil.	None
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR analysis found that the Planning Area contains an active earthquake fault, areas susceptible to liquefaction, and areas susceptible to landsliding. Existing development within the Planning Area has mitigated the potential for adverse impacts from seismic hazards through fault setbacks, compliance with building code requirements, and the use of

Geologic Hazard Abatement Districts (GHADs) or other similar mechanisms that establish open space preserves for areas unsuitable for development. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 establishes several policies that concern mitigation of seismic hazards and set forth requirements for evaluating susceptibility to seismic hazards during the planning process and identifying appropriate measures to reduce risk to acceptable levels. Therefore, impacts due to seismic hazards were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with seismic hazards. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR analyzed project impacts on soil erosion and geologic stability and concluded that generally, most of the areas within the UGB are not susceptible to significant erosion or impacts from unstable geologic units because of gentle slopes. Areas that may be susceptible to significant erosion have mitigated the potential through use of grading, retaining walls, landscaping, or the creation of GHADs or other similar mechanisms. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with abating hazards associated with geology and soils.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with erosion or sedimentation. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR analysis found that the Planning Area contains areas susceptible to liquefaction, liquefaction-related phenomena, and landsliding. Existing development within the Planning Area has mitigated the potential for adverse impacts from unstable geologic units and soils through compliance with building code requirements and the use of GHADs or other similar mechanisms that establish open space preserves for areas unsuitable for development. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with abating hazards associated with geology and soils

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with unstable geologic units or soils. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR concluded that areas within the Planning Area that may be susceptible to substantial shrink-swell potential have mitigated the potential impacts through use of grading, retaining walls, landscaping, or the creation of GHADs or other similar mechanisms.

Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with abating hazards associated with geology and soils.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with expansive soils. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

e) Existing urban development within the Planning Area is currently served with sanitary sewer service provided by either Central Contra Costa Sanitary District or Dublin San Ramon Services District. New urban development that occurs within the Planning Area would be required to served with sanitary sewer service. No new septic systems or alternative wastewater systems are contemplated by General Plan 2035. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on geology and soils.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions beyond levels previously disclosed.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions beyond levels previously disclosed.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions beyond levels previously disclosed.	None
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted greenhouse gas reduction plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted greenhouse gas reduction plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted greenhouse gas reduction plan.	None

Discussion

a,b) The FEIR analysis included an analysis of greenhouse gas emissions by using the Clean Air Program (CAP) approach. The City adopted the CAP at the same time it certified the FEIR on July 19, 2010. The FEIR analysis found that the CAP provided the means to show that the City will reduce its emissions to an appropriate reduction target to ensure that the City does not conflict with the goals of AB 32, and to show that the City is doing its part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to reduce negative climate change impacts. The FEIR concluded that, based on the existing regulatory requirement and the policies contained within the proposed General Plan 2030 and CAP strategy, there is certainty that future development and land use activities contemplated by the General Plan 2030 (2010) would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The City updated the greenhouse gas emissions inventory as part of General Plan 2035 and added policies to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Element that addressed electric vehicle infrastructure and non-potable and recycled water use. These actions are consistent with the emissions reduction objectives set forth in the CAP. Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than significant.

The FEIR analysis included an analysis of climate change due to development and land use activities contemplated by the General Plan 2030. Impacts associated with increased susceptibility to wildland fires, exposure to sea level rise, and need for additional water resources were all found to be less than significant due to the characteristics of the Planning Area.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any boundary changes or significant land use modifications within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts in this regard. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on greenhouse gases.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards through the use of hazardous materials.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards through the use of hazardous materials.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards through the use of hazardous materials.	None
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	None
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.	None
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and,	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards to the	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards to the	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create significant hazards to the	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		public associated with hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	public associated with hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	public associated with hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	
e) Be located within two miles of a public airport or private use airport and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	None
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not create aviation safety hazards.	None
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	None
h) Be located in an area designated as having a high, extreme, or severe fire hazard, or otherwise expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to wildland fire hazards.	None

Discussion

a,b) The FEIR analysis found that the Planning Area contains close to 100 reported users of hazardous materials. Generally, nearly all users handle, store, and dispose of hazardous materials in accordance with federal and state regulations such that public safety is not exposed to undue risk. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designations within the existing Planning Area.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in the increased use of hazardous materials not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR analysis found that there were 21 clean-up sites listed within the Planning Area boundaries. These sites included sites listed on databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Of the 21 clean-up sites, 19 were associated with leaking underground storage tanks. Most of the sites were listed as closed, indicating that they have been remediated to the satisfaction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designations within the existing Planning Area.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in the increased use of hazardous materials not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with potential exposure associated with hazardous materials sites listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR analysis included impacts on schools due to implementation of the proposed project. As discussed in the FEIR, nearly all of the schools within the Planning Area are more than 0.25 mile from the types of commercial and industrial land uses that use hazardous materials.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in the increased use of hazardous materials not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with exposure of schools to hazardous materials. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

e) The closest airport to the Planning Area is Livermore Municipal Airport, located 4 miles to the southeast. Therefore, development and land use activities contemplated by General Plan 2035 would not expose persons residing or working in the Planning Area to aviation safety hazards. No impacts would occur.

f) There are no private airstrips within the Planning Area. Therefore, development and land use activities contemplated by General Plan 2035 would not expose persons residing or working in the Planning Area to aviation safety hazards. No impacts would occur.

g) The FEIR indicated that the City maintains an Emergency Operations Plan that addresses emergency response and evacuation procedures during events such as earthquakes, hazardous materials incidents, floods, national emergencies, wildfires, and landscapes. Development and land use activities contemplated by the General Plan 2030 were compatible with the Emergency Operations Plan and, therefore, would not impair or interfere with the emergency response and evacuation. Impacts were identified to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially interfere with emergency response or evacuation. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with emergency response or evacuation. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

h) The FEIR disclosed that "Very High" wildfire risk areas exist at the northern end of Bollinger Canyon and "High" wildfire risk areas exist in the eastern portion of the Dougherty Valley and all portions of the Tassajara Valley. The balance of the Planning Area is classified as a "Moderate" wildfire risk area. Additionally, future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with abating wildland fire hazards.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with potential exposure associated with wildland fires. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on hazards and hazardous materials.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality					
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	None
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not would not deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not would not deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not would not deplete groundwater resources or impair groundwater recharge.	None
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.	None
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.	rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.	rate of runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase the rate of runoff in a manner that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems.	None
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade water quality.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade water quality.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade water quality.	None
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.	None
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.	None
i) Expose people or structures to significant risk or loss, injury or death	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		expose persons or structures to flooding from levee or dam failure.	expose persons or structures to flooding from levee or dam failure.	expose persons or structures to flooding from levee or dam failure.	
j) Inundation of by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflow inundation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflow inundation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons or structures to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflow inundation.	None

Discussion

a, f) The FEIR analysis found that the future development contemplated by the implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 may result in construction activities that could have the potential to create polluted runoff. These pollutants could be conveyed offsite potentially affect the water quality within the local streams and the San Francisco Bay. The FEIR noted that General Plan 2030 establishes several policies that require participation in clean water programs, monitoring waterways to prevent degradation, and the continued implementation of the City of San Ramon Stormwater Management Program.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with water quality. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR noted that the urbanized portions of the Planning Area are served by East Bay Municipal Utility District and Dublin-San Ramon Services District and do not rely on groundwater wells. Additionally, the FEIR concluded that within the Planning Area, groundwater recharge primarily occurs within stream channels. Groundwater occurs at shallow depths within the Planning Area; therefore, there is little to no need for groundwater recharge facilities to replenish groundwater supplies. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with groundwater. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR concluded that erosion or siltation impacts would not be significant as a result of implementation of the General Plan 2030. Future development and land use activities would be subject to General Plan 2030 policies including provisions associated with protection of water quality, as well as federal and state water quality permitting requirements.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with erosion or siltation. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d,e) The FEIR noted that developed land uses within the city limits are generally served by municipal storm drainage facilities consisting of curb, gutter, inlets, piping, detention basins, outfalls, and related facilities. Land uses outside the city limits are generally served by natural drainage features or minimally improved systems. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 established several policies that require the preparation of hydrological studies, the provision of storm drainage facilities, limiting the release of runoff from new development, and the establishment of landscape and maintenance guidelines for detention basins.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with drainage. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

g-h) The FEIR disclosed that 100-year flood hazard areas are generally located within the stream channel within the San Ramon city limits. An exception is in southern San Ramon along South San Ramon Creek, where the 100-year flood hazard area extends outside of the stream channel. Outside of the city limits (e.g., in Bollinger Canyon and the Tassajara Valley), the 100-year special flood hazard area often extends beyond the stream channels, reflecting the unimproved or minimally improved nature of the drainages. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 established several policies that require the preparation of hydrological studies, the provision of storm drainage facilities, dissemination of flood insurance rate maps, limiting the release of runoff from new development, locating buildings outside of the 100-year special flood hazard area, and the establishment of landscape and maintenance guidelines for detention basins.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with 100-year flood hazards. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

i-j) The Planning Area is not protected by any levees and is not within the dam failure inundation area of any water impoundment facilities. Additionally, the Planning Area is approximately 29 miles from the Pacific Ocean, a condition that precludes inundation by tsunami. Finally, the Planning Area has not historically experienced mudflows. These

conditions preclude inundation by levee or dam failure, tsunami, seiche, or mudflow. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on hydrology and water quality.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
X. Land Use					
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not divide an established community.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not divide an established community.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not divide an established community.	None
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.	None
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR analysis indicated that the land use changes contemplated by General Plan 2030 would not create any land use compatibility conflicts or divide an established community due to the limited scope of the changes and the characteristics of the Planning Area.

The proposed General Plan 2035 proposes only minor changes to land use designations (i.e., changing the Courtyard site from "Mixed Use" to ""Retail Shopping" and updating the list of Housing Opportunity Sites") and does not significantly alter development patterns or land use activities. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with division of an established. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR evaluated consistency of the proposed project with applicable plans and requirements. As discussed in the FEIR, the San Ramon General Plan includes the seven elements mandated by Government Code Section 65300, as well as optional elements. The General Plan 2030 also included a new Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Element. These elements will be submitted for review and approval by applicable state agencies in conformance with General Plan law. As identified in the FEIR, the UGB adjustment and review of Ordinance 197 were placed for voter consideration on the November 2010 ballot pursuant to the provisions of General Plan policies. Consequently, the proposed General Plan 2030 was determined to be internally consistent with this existing policy.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with conflicts with an adopted land use plan. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The Planning Area is not within the boundaries of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of impacts. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on land use.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XI. Mineral Resources					
Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	None

Discussion

a-b) The FEIR concluded that the Planning Area does not support mineral extraction and does not contain any mineral resource zones or other areas designated as containing known mineral resources. The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development in areas not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with mineral resources.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on mineral resources.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XII. Noise					
Would the project:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards.	None
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration.	None
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	None
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	None.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not expose persons to excessive aviation noise.	None.

Discussion

a) The FEIR concluded that future construction activities would result in a substantial noise increase where noise-sensitive land uses adjoin construction sites. However, this impact would be short-term and would cease upon completion of construction. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 policies include limits on hours of operation, use of mufflers or engine shrouds, identification of truck haul routes, installation of temporary fencing or barriers, and locating staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. Consequently, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in substantial increases in noise levels. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with violations of an adopted noise standard. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR evaluated impacts of groundborne vibration due to implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030. The proposed General Plan would increase the amount of acreage that is designated mixed-use, and this re-designation would increase the potential for vibration from heavy trucks to expose persons to excessive vibration levels. The FEIR concluded that both short-term construction-related impacts and long-term operation

related impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing General Plan policies.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in substantial increases in noise levels beyond those disclosed in the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with exposure to groundborne vibration. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The FEIR evaluated the impacts on roadway noise due to proposed project. In order to quantify the traffic noise impacts along the analyzed roadways, the roadway noise contours were calculated. The FEIR indicated that existing noise levels from all analyzed roadway segments range from 50.5 to 81.0 dBA CNEL and Year 2030 noise levels would range from 50.5 to 82.2 dBA CNEL. Both existing and future traffic noise levels have the potential to expose persons to excessive noise levels. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan policies provide actions aimed at reducing impacts from traffic noise through limitation of operating hours on industrial plants, and implementation of traffic calming measures. Any future development adjacent to sensitive land uses shall be subject to additional noise study pursuant to General Plan 2030 policies. Therefore, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in substantial increases in vibration levels beyond those disclosed in the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR concluded that future construction activities would result in a substantial noise increase where noise-sensitive land uses adjoin construction sites. However, this impact would be short-term and would cease upon completion of construction. The FEIR concluded that the General Plan 2030 policies include limits on hours of operation, use of mufflers or engine shrouds, identification of truck haul routes, installation of temporary fencing or barriers, and locating staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. Consequently, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in substantial increases in noise levels beyond those disclosed in the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

e) The closest airport to the Planning Area is Livermore Municipal Airport, located 4 miles to the southeast. Therefore, development and land use activities contemplated by General Plan 2035 would not expose persons residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive aviation noise. No impacts would occur.

f) There are no private airstrips within the Planning Area. Therefore, development and land use activities contemplated by General Plan 2035 would not expose persons residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive aviation noise. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on noise.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XIII. Population and Housing					
Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Significant and Unavoidable Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not induce substantial population growth beyond what was previously disclosed by General Plan 2030.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not induce substantial population growth beyond what was previously disclosed by General Plan 2030.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not induce substantial population growth beyond what was previously disclosed by General Plan 2030.	None
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	None
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	**No.** The proposed project would not result in removal of the existing dwelling units.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR found that the General Plan 2030 has the potential to induce direct and indirect population growth, which is considered substantial if it exceeds projections contained in local or regional planning documents and population forecasts. In this case, the applicable planning and population forecast documents were the ABAG Projections 2009. General Plan 2030's population projections exceeded ABAG's projections. The FEIR states that ABAG's regional projections do not always reflect jurisdictional-level factors associated with growth potential or timing and, thus, may underestimate or overestimate growth at the local level. Regardless, until the ABAG forecasts are revised for consistency with the General Plan 2030's projections, the residual significance of this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed General Plan 2035 contemplates a higher population than General Plan 2030, which is due to a higher person per household figure provided by the California Department of Finance. The population change largely responds to demographic changes and household characteristics of existing development already within or programed for the Planning Area This in itself does not constitute the disclosure of a new significant impact in this regard, as the population would be accommodated within existing developed areas or within areas than have been proposed for development by both General Plan 2030 and General Plan 2035. Moreover, General Plan 2035 proposes only minor changes to land use designations (i.e., changing the Courtyard site from "Mixed Use" to "Retail Shopping" and updating the list of Housing Opportunity Sites"), which would not facilitate new direct or indirect population growth beyond what was already contemplated to occur. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with growth inducement. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b,c) The proposed General Plan 2035 would largely maintain existing land use patterns within the Planning Area. Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the removal of dwelling units such that displacement of a large number of individuals would occur or replacement dwelling units would need to be developed elsewhere. This condition precludes the possibility of impacts. No impacts would occur.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on population and housing.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XIV. Public Services					
Would the project:					
a) Fire protection?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	None
b) Police protection?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	None
c) Schools?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded school facilities.	None
d) Parks?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None
e) Other public facilities?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded other public facilities.	None

Discussion

a) The San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District currently serves the Planning Area with fire protection and emergency medical services. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate fire protection would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded fire protection facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The San Ramon Police Department currently serves the City of San Ramon with police protection services, while the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department serves the unincorporated areas of Planning Area. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate police protection would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded police protection facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The San Ramon Valley Unified School District currently serves the Planning Area with K-12 education. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate educational facilities and services would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded school facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The City of San Ramon and East Bay Regional Parks District maintains parks and recreational facilities within the Planning Area. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate parks and recreational facilities would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not

previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded parks and recreational facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

e) The City of San Ramon and the County of Contra Costa maintains community and library facilities within the Planning Area. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate library facilities would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded community and library facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on public services.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XIV. Recreation					
Would the project:					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less Than Significant Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the deterioration of existing park lands.	None
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in a need for new or expanded park facilities.	None

Discussion

a,b) The City of San Ramon and East Bay Regional Parks District maintains parks and recreational facilities within the Planning Area. The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 policies concerning the provision of adequate parks and recreational facilities would apply to future development and land use activities that occur within the Planning Area and serve to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in direct or indirect population growth not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with new or expanded parks and recreational facilities. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on recreation.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XV. Transportation					
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion at local intersections.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion at local intersections.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion at local intersections.	None
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for the designated roads or highways?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion on I-680.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion on I-680.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not generate more trips that previously disclosed in the FEIR and, therefore, would not exacerbate congestion on I-680.	None
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have the potential to alter air traffic patterns.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have the potential to alter air traffic patterns.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have the potential to alter air traffic patterns.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not increase hazards due to a design feature.	None
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate emergency access.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate emergency access.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate emergency access.	None
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not adversely impact public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.	None

Discussion

a) The FEIR evaluated whether the San Ramon General Plan 2030 would result in potentially significant environmental impacts as it relates to transportation. Analysis of the land use allowed under the proposed General Plan 2030 was quantitatively evaluated for traffic levels of service and qualitatively evaluated for other significance criteria. The FEIR included findings for cumulative traffic projections that were based on land use projections representing the year 2030.

The FEIR analyzed intersection levels of service (LOS) representing the AM and PM peak hours for buildout of the General Plan 2030 cumulatively with regional development to the year 2030 and summarized them in Table 3.13-16 of the FEIR. The FEIR further concluded that new development projects would be required to mitigate for impacts on transportation facilities. The General Plan 2030 contains Implementing Policies that set forth performance standards, identify necessary roadway improvements, and require that traffic mitigation fees be assessed to new residential and commercial development. Therefore, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 proposes only minor changes to land use designations (i.e., changing the Courtyard site from "Mixed Use" to "Retail Shopping" and updating the list of Housing Opportunity Sites"), which would not facilitate new trip generation beyond what was already contemplated to occur. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with intersection operations. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) The FEIR evaluated freeway performance for cumulative conditions under the General Plan 2030 (2010) buildout. As discussed in the FEIR, development contemplated by the General Plan 2030 (2010) would contribute trips to the I-680 corridor, which is forecast to operate below the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO) in Year 2030. Note that the development contemplated by the General Plan 2030 (2010) itself does not cause facilities to operate below acceptable levels; rather, it contributes to unacceptable operation. The FEIR concluded that with implementation of General Plan Implementing Policies that require new development to mitigate for traffic impacts, impacts would be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 proposes only minor changes to land use designations (i.e., changing the Courtyard site from "Mixed Use" to "Retail Shopping" and updating the list of Housing Opportunity Sites"), which would not facilitate new trip generation beyond what was already contemplated to occur. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with conflicts with a congestion management plan. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The closest airport to the Planning Area is Livermore Municipal Airport, located 4 miles to the southeast. Therefore, development and land use activities contemplated by General Plan 2035 would not have the potential to alter air traffic patterns. No impacts would occur.

d) The FEIR concluded that General Plan 2030 Implementing Policies 5.1-I-4 through 5.1-I-7 would ensure that roadway safety hazards are not created through required implementation of City standards in transportation, and development design and implementation of safety programs. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with roadway safety. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

d) The FEIR's analysis regarding emergency response concluded that maintenance of the City's level of service standard would ensure that emergency service response time remains at an adequate level. In addition, General Plan 2030 (2010) Implementing Policies 3.1-I-1, 3.3-I-1, 3.3-I-2, 5.1-I-1, and 5.3-I-7 would ensure that adequate emergency response is provided by requiring adequate traffic service levels and minimization of traffic congestion. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

   The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated

by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with emergency response. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

f) The FEIR analyzed whether the proposed project would conflict with plans for or access to public transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. The FEIR concluded that the land uses allowed under the General Plan 2030 will create a demand for public transportation. The General Plan 2030 allows for a combination of lower-density development patterns and higher-density, mixed-use development in central locations. General Plan 2030 policies and the City's agreements with the approved developments (such as the Dougherty Valley Area) would require any new development to include bus service or other public transportation service under the Initial Level of Development and mitigate any project-specific local or regional impact to maintain City's adopted General Plan policies. In addition, General Plan 2030 (2010) contains Implementing Policies 3.4-I-3 through 3.4-I-6, 5.5-I-3 through 5.5-I-5, 5.5-I-9 through 5.5-I-12, and 5.5-6-1 through 5.5-6-12, which would ensure continued accessibility to public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of travel.

The proposed General Plan 2035 proposes only minor text changes to clarify bicycle routes within the Planning Area; all other policies pertaining to public transit, bicycles and pedestrians would remain unchanged. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with public transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on transportation.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems					
Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.	None
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	None
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities.	None
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not require additional entitlements for water supply.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not require additional entitlements for water supply.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not require additional entitlements for water supply.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
e) Result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	No Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would in result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would in result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would in result in inadequate wastewater treatment capacity.	None
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate landfill capacity.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate landfill capacity.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in inadequate landfill capacity.	None
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in non-compliance with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in non-compliance with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not result in non-compliance with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	None

Discussion

a,e) Central Contra Costa Sanitation District and Dublin-San Ramon Services District provide wastewater collection and treatment service to the City of San Ramon. Re-designation of parcels within the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan would be subject to the Specific Plan's policies. The specific plan process for any future development would ensure that impacts on wastewater would be less than significant.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with wastewater. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b,d) East Bay Municipal Utility District and Dublin-San Ramon Services District provide potable water service to the City of San Ramon. Both water agencies project adequate supplies under various hydrologic conditions through 2030. The FEIR analysis found that the General

Plan 2030 would largely maintain existing land use patterns and designations within the existing Planning Area. The one significant land use designation change within the city limits is the re-designation of parcels within the proposed North Camino Ramon Specific Plan boundaries to "Mixed Use." This re-designation is intended to achieve consistency with the objective of the Specific Plan, which is to facilitate higher-density mixed uses within this area. EBMUD currently serves the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan area, and the re-designation itself would not change the status of existing service levels. The FEIR concluded that preparation of the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan would guide future development and land use activities in this area and address water supply sources.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with water supply. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The City of San Ramon and the County of Contra Costa maintain storm drainage facilities within the Planning Area. The FEIR analyzed that any future development would require construction of adequate storm drain facilities. Implementing Policies 9.4-I-1-2 through 9.4-I-1-3 require preparation of hydrological studies, the provision of storm drainage facilities, and the establishment of landscape and maintenance guidelines for detention basins.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with storm drainage. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

f,g) The FEIR concluded that impacts to solid waste would be less than significant. The North Camino Ramon Specific Plan process would address impacts from re-designation of higher density land uses by guiding future development and land use activities in this area as well as address solid waste and recycling.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts associated with solid waste. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on utilities and service systems.

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance					
Would the project:					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	None
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	None

Environmental Issue Area	Conclusion in FEIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	FEIR Mitigation Measures
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings?	Less Than Significant Impact	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	**No.** Implementation of General Plan 2035 would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	None

Discussion

a) As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources section, General Plan 2030 would have a less than significant impact on all biological resources topics. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, General Plan 2030 would have a less than significant impact on all cultural resources topics. As such, implementation of General Plan 2030 would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

The proposed General Plan 2035 does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

b) As discussed in the preceding sections, the potential impacts of implementation of General Plan 2030 would not substantially increase with implementation of General Plan 2035 because the later plan because the later plan does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

c) The preceding sections of this addendum discuss various types of impacts that could have adverse effects on human beings, including:
- Dust and air pollutants during project construction activities (Section III, Air Quality)
- Operational emissions (Section III, Air Quality)
- Increase in greenhouse gas emissions (Section VII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

Each type of impact with the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated, and this addendum concludes that these potential impacts would not substantially increase with implementation of General Plan 2035 because it does not propose any land use or policy changes within the Planning Area that could potentially result in development not previously contemplated by the FEIR. This precludes the potential for new impacts. As such, the conclusions set forth in the FEIR remain unchanged.

FEIR Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the FEIR remain unchanged when considering implementation of General Plan 2035 on mandatory findings of significance.