

CITY OF PIEDMONT CALIFORNIA



Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Piedmont Safer Streets Plan

Notice is hereby given that the City of Piedmont has completed a Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the proposed Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) Plan in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) plan updates and supersedes the City's 2014 Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). While the PSS plan continues to evaluate the City's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, an additional emphasis to traffic safety is included. The PSS plan would be operative citywide, and represents a comprehensive effort that will be used to guide, prioritize, and implement a network of quality pedestrian and bicycle facilities to improve mobility, connectivity, public health, physical activity, and recreational opportunities. The Plan provides for both near-term and long-term investment infrastructure solutions to support PSS's vision and goals, as well as programmatic, education, and enforcement recommendations. The Final Draft PSS plan document is available at https://p1cdn4static.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_13659739/File/Government/Departments/Planning%20Division/General%20Plan/PSS_final%20draft%20plan_Oct.%202028,%202021.pdf

The Initial Study prepared by the City was undertaken for the purpose of deciding whether the project might have a significant effect on the environment. On the basis of the Initial Study, City staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, has prepared a Draft Negative Declaration.

The draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration is available for review on the City's [website](#) (full link below), and at the front desk of Piedmont City Hall (120 Vista Avenue, in Piedmont). Comments on the document may be submitted in writing. Written comments will be accepted until 5:00 pm, **Monday, November 22, 2021**, and should be emailed or sent to:

Gopika Nair, Associate Planner
City of Piedmont
120 Vista Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611
gnair@piedmont.ca.gov

Link to the Initial Study:

https://p1cdn4static.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_13659739/File/Government/Departments/Planning%20Division/General%20Plan/CEQA/CEQA%20inital%20study.pdf

The Piedmont City Council is scheduled to consider the Negative Declaration at its regularly scheduled meeting on December 6, 2021. The meeting will begin at 6.00 pm and will be held virtually. If the City Council finds that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, it may adopt the Negative Declaration at that time.

Initial Study / Negative Declaration for the

Piedmont Safer Streets Plan

Report Prepared by:

Lead Agency

Gopika Nair
Associate Planner
gnair@piedmont.ca.gov
510-420-3054

Project Consultant

Niko Letunic, Project Manager
Eisen | Letunic

City of Piedmont, California
October 2021

Contents

Introduction 2

Declaration 3

Initial Study

Background 4

Project description 6

Environmental factors potentially affected 8

Determination 9

Environmental checklist 10

 I. Aesthetics 10

 II. Agricultural resources 11

 III. Air quality 12

 IV. Biological resources 14

 V. Cultural resources 17

 VI. Geology and soils 19

 VII. Greenhouse gas emissions 21

 VIII. Hazards and hazardous materials 22

 IX. Hydrology and water quality 24

 X. Land use and planning 27

 XI. Mineral resources 29

 XII. Noise 30

 XIII. Population and housing 32

 XIV. Public services 33

 XV. Recreation 36

 XVI. Transportation / traffic 37

 XVII. Utilities and service systems 41

 XVIII. Mandatory findings of significance 43

Introduction

This document presents the Initial Study checklist and Negative Declaration for the Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) plan. The city adopted its first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) in 2014. The new PSS plan is a focused, strategic update that revisits and revises key sections of the original PBMP, in particular the recommended improvements. A significant difference is that the PSS plan incorporates a broader traffic safety component, to address the community's concerns about traffic safety in general, not just those related to walking or biking. As a result, the updated plan formulates recommendations both general and location-specific to improve the traffic safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

A comprehensive, long-range planning effort such as the PSS plan is considered a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For this reason, an evaluation of potential environmental impacts stemming from the PSS plan is required by state law. The City of Piedmont is the CEQA lead agency for the project. The City has prepared this Initial Study to provide other agencies and the public with information about potential environmental impacts and measures to mitigate any impacts. This document has been prepared in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines, found in Title 14 of the California Administrative Code, under Division 6, Chapter 3. The City Council adopted a Negative Declaration for the PBMP in November 2014.

Declaration

Project Name

Piedmont Safer Streets Plan

Project Location

The project is coterminous with the City boundaries of Piedmont and includes all land within the city limits. Piedmont is located 2 miles northeast of Downtown Oakland and 10 miles east of San Francisco. The City is 1.7 square miles and is surrounded on all sides by Oakland.

Summary description of project

The project is Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) Plan. The Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) plan updates and replaces the City's 2014 Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). While the PSS plan continues to evaluate the City's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, an additional emphasis on traffic safety is included. The PSS plan represents a comprehensive citywide effort that will be used to guide, prioritize, and implement a network of quality pedestrian and bicycle facilities to improve mobility, connectivity, public health, physical activity, and recreational opportunities. The Plan provides for both near-term and long-term investment infrastructure solutions to support PSS's vision and goals, as well as programmatic, education, and enforcement recommendations.

Findings

It is hereby determined that, based on the information contained in the attached Initial Study, the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and, therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. An electronic copy of the Final Draft of the Piedmont Safer Streets plan can be found on City's website:

https://p1cdn4static.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_13659739/File/Government/Departments/Planning%20Division/General%20Plan/PSS_final%20draft%20plan_Oct.%2028,%202021.pdf

Date

October 29, 2021



Kevin Jackson, Director of Planning & Building
City of Piedmont

Background

1. Project name

Piedmont Safer Streets Plan

2. Lead agency name and address

City of Piedmont
Department of Planning and Building
120 Vista Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611

3. Project sponsor's name and address

Same as lead agency

4. Contact person and phone number

Gopika Nair, Associate Planner
Department of Planning and Building
120 Vista Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611
gnair@piedmont.ca.gov
(510) 420-3054

5. Project location

The project is coterminous with the City boundaries of Piedmont and includes all land within the city limits. Piedmont is located 2 miles northeast of Downtown Oakland and 10 miles east of San Francisco. The City is 1.7 square miles and is surrounded on all sides by Oakland (Figure 1).

6. General Plan designation

Because the project applies to all land in the city, it encompasses all Piedmont General Plan designations.

7. Zoning

Because the project applies to all land in the city, it encompasses all Piedmont zoning designations.

8. Summary description of project

The project is the Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) Plan. The PSS plan updates and replaces the City's 2014 Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). While the PSS plan continues to evaluate the City's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, an additional emphasis on traffic safety is included. The PSS plan represents a comprehensive citywide effort that will be used to guide, prioritize, and implement a network of quality pedestrian and bicycle facilities to improve mobility, connectivity, public health, physical activity, and recreational opportunities. The Plan provides for both near-term and long-term investment infrastructure solutions to support PSS's vision and goals, as well as programmatic and education recommendations.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting

Piedmont is situated in the heart of the San Francisco Bay Area, in northern Alameda County (see the map on page 5). It straddles a long, low ridge located west of the Oakland-Berkeley Hills. The city is built on rolling hills cut by numerous canyons that slope southwesterly toward San Francisco Bay. Elevation ranges from about 40 feet above sea level to 704 feet above sea level. One of Piedmont's most unique geographic features is that it is completely surrounded by the City of Oakland. The city is abutted by the Oakland neighborhoods of Trestle Glen and Crocker Highlands on the southwest; Oakmore on the south; Montclair on the east; Upper Rockridge/Claremont Pines on the north; Piedmont Avenue on the northwest; and Rose Garden/Grand Lake on the west. Of the six areas listed above, the first four (SW, S, E, N) are comprised of single family detached neighborhoods. These areas are hilly and wooded and contain irregular parcel shapes

and curvilinear streets. The remaining two abutting areas (NW and W) are more urban in character, containing a mix of densities and housing types. The Rose Garden, Piedmont Avenue and Grand Lake districts include large numbers of apartments, 2-8 plexes, and flats, as well as older single-family homes. These areas also include neighborhood shopping districts.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required

None



Project Description

The project is the Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) plan. The city adopted its first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation—Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) in 2014. The new plan (PSS plan) is a focused, strategic update that revisits and revises key sections of the original PBMP, in particular the recommended improvements. A significant difference is that the PSS plan incorporates a broad traffic safety component, to address the community's concerns about traffic safety in general, not just those related to walking or biking. As a result, the updated plan formulates recommendations both general and location-specific to improve the traffic safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

Context

Interest in safer and more convenient walking and bicycling—for both recreation and transportation—has increased in Piedmont in recent years. In response to this interest, the City in 2014 adopted a Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) for improving conditions for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the city. The proposed Piedmont Safer Streets (PSS) Plan is in response to the Alameda County Transportation Commission's requirement that jurisdictions in the county update their bicycle and pedestrian master plans generally every five years.

Similar to the PBMP, the PSS is structured to capture the planning context, community needs assessment, recommendations, prioritization and implementation; with supplementary data analysis, programs and policy research. The PSS planning process was meant to provide a comprehensive framework for assessing and responding to the community's needs related to walking, biking and traffic safety. The objectives were to (i) determine Piedmonters' feedback on the installed or constructed improvements from the projects listed in the PBMP, (ii) identify a realistic, affordable and effective set of improvements for the next ten years that will make walking and biking in Piedmont safer, easier and more popular, and (iii) include recommendations that address Piedmonters' top concern: traffic safety.

The PSS builds on other local planning efforts, particularly the City's General Plan, American with Disabilities Act Right-of-Way Transition Plan, Climate Action Plan 2.0, Environmental Task Force Recommendations and Complete Streets policy. The Complete Streets policy, adopted in November 2012, spells out the City's commitment to develop its transportation system so that it is safe and convenient for all users and modes, including pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, transit riders, emergency responders, persons with disabilities, seniors and children, among others.

To guide City staff and the project consultant in developing the plan, the City Council appointed a Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) with expertise and/or interest in biking. During the past twelve months, the PBAC has held 6 duly noticed virtual public hearings, consistently receiving public testimony and comments from the public, and providing comment and direction to staff and the consultant.

Summary of project

To get the PSS plan to its current stage, City staff along with the project consultant drafted a work plan consisting of seven main tasks or phases.

- Task 1: Project Launch (*August 2020-September 2020*)
- Task 2: Planning Context and Existing Conditions (*September 2020-November 2020*)
- Task 3: Community Needs Assessment (*November 2020-January 2021*)
- Task 4: Action Plan (*January 2021- April 2021*)
- Task 5 & Task 6: Recommendation, Implementation and Public Comment (*April 2021-August 2021*)
- Task 7: Plan Document (*August 2021 -Present*)

Throughout the planning process, City staff encouraged public participation by issuing several press releases, publishing newsletters, providing public notifications, and dropping social media posts. The plan and all associated documents were made available electronically for review and regular updates about the plan's progress were posted on the project website.

PSS plan recommendations

To address the community's concerns expressed throughout the Piedmont Safer Streets planning process, the plan recommends four main projects, as well as a set of additional, smaller-scale recommendations. These are described below.

Enhanced street crossings at key locations

One of the most common community needs, expressed through the PSS needs assessment process was unsafe conditions at crosswalks—especially for children—resulting from drivers failing to see or yield to pedestrians. To address this concern, a range of crosswalk enhancements would be installed at priority locations. These crossings would feature a range of improvements, including striped crosswalks, sidewalk bulb-outs or extensions (which reduce the curb radius, making drivers slow down as they turn the corner), advanced yield or stop lines (which encourage drivers to stop further back from the crossing), flashing crossing signs, pedestrian refuges or islands in the middle of the street, flashing radar speed signs on the approaches, and specially colored and textured pavement. The design of a particular crossing would be determined in consultation with affected neighbors. Depending on the intersection, street crossings would be improved on one or more of the cross streets, and on one or both approaches of the street. The PBMP included projects at 27 key locations as high priority street crossing enhancements. Six of these projects have been completed and one was replaced with a different location. A map showing the 21 resulting locations is included in the Plan.

Designated citywide bikeway network

The PBMP designated the citywide bikeway (10 miles of street and off-street paths) to be high priority. The bikeway network consists of a combination of bike paths, bike lanes and bike routes. The PSS plan carries this forward with minor revisions (now 12 miles of street and off-street paths) based on the comments received. A map showing the proposed bikeway network is included in the PSS plan.

Highland Avenue reconfiguration study

Arguably, the City’s “main street” is the wider central stretch of Highland Avenue from Park Way to and around Piedmont Park, because it connects the northwestern and southeastern halves of the City to each other and to the civic center. Every year, the avenue hosts the City’s Independence Day parade, an event loved and well attended. Due to its connectivity to the schools (including schools on Magnolia Avenue), the PSS plan recommends that this corridor receive a detailed traffic study. The City is looking to fulfill three objectives from the study: consideration of a road diet on the segment from Park Way to Vista Avenue with a focus on potential impacts of a road diet on traffic; the reconfiguration of the “bend” (roughly from Vista Avenue to Piedmont Court); and an exploration of strategies to alleviate congestion within the Civic Center on Highland as well as Magnolia Avenue.

The Highland Avenue road diet was also a high priority project listed in the PBMP. Due to the limited amount of grants available to the City and the prioritization of the Grand Avenue road diet and bike lane installation, the Highland Avenue road diet was not completed. From November 20, 2020, through January 3, 2021, the City held several public engagement opportunities including: a digital workshop (on December 9, 2020), Online survey and pinnable map. City received over 2,500 individual responses. A little over 50% of the survey responders, support the project.

Neighborhood traffic calming program

Vehicular speeding appears to be the top concern of all comments received. From the review on past installations, residents have not favored the low-cost installations to reduce speeding. Instead, a more attractive and permanent solution is preferred. A number of cities in the Bay Area have adopted neighborhood traffic calming programs through which residents can petition for traffic calming measures. City staff believes that adopting a similar program for Piedmont on a neighborhood scale would help address the traffic concerns and assist City staff in prioritizing projects. The program, when implemented, would be supported by data collection and evaluation, public feedback, and serve as a learning mechanism for contextual (area specific) traffic calming measures. This recommendation was not included in the PBMP because that plan did not include a traffic safety component.

City staff and the project consultant studied both “vertical” and “horizontal” treatments to slow cars. The “vertical” treatments momentarily raise cars from street level such as speed humps, speed bumps, speed cushions, raised crosswalks, speed tables and rumble strips. The “horizontal” treatments include sidewalk bulbouts, traffic circles, mini roundabouts, median islands, tree wells in parking lane and narrowed travel lane.

Additional recommendations

Recommendations described in this section of the PSS plan highlight smaller-scale suggestions and ideas received from the public and other recommendations that have potential to enhance conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and improve traffic safety.

Adopt a Vision Zero policy

A typical Vision Zero policy commits a city to collecting and analyzing collision data; formulating and implementing countermeasures to prevent all collisions; prioritizing community engagement in developing solutions; setting a clear time frame to achieve zero traffic deaths and serious injuries; and reporting on progress and challenges.

Promote and support community-based traffic safety campaigns

Given the City's strong civic culture, one possibility is for the City to promote and provide logistical and policy support for community-based traffic safety campaigns. Such campaigns could be coordinated by residents, neighborhood groups or a Council-appointed body like PBAC. There are phone apps that reward users for safe driving, by monitoring certain safety-related aspects of driving behavior and vehicle performance such as speeding, quick acceleration, hard-braking and fast cornering. These apps have participation programs for employers and schools. The types of campaigns outlined in the plan are additional tools worth exploring that might make a contribution toward a safer driving culture in the City.

Create an online "fix-it" request form and Geographic Information System (GIS) portal

These recommendations encourage the City to offer residents an efficient way to make maintenance requests and view existing zoning and land use maps. A GIS portal is an interactive tool map typically seen on city websites allowing users to look up their address and its properties such as zoning, parcel information, permit history; or review city maps such as bikeway network, sewer map, right-of-way map, trail map, sidewalk map and locations of stop sign.

Adopt a transportation demand management program

Transportation demand management (TDM) is a set of strategies used by governments or employers to encourage alternatives to solo driving, particularly during rush hour, intended to reduce car trips, gas emissions and collisions. While the PSS plan focuses on walking, biking and traffic safety, the crucial role of public transit cannot be overlooked. Importantly, the last mile to and from transit centers is recommended to have better pedestrian and bike connectivity.

Piedmont's 2019 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory shows that "transportation and mobile sources" contributed almost half (49%) of the community's in-territory GHG emissions. To help address this situation, it is recommended that the City adopt a TDM program outlining guidelines to assist staff in implementing TDM strategies and actions. The program could include guidelines such as installing a shower in workplaces, providing incentives to multi-family housing developers and providing bike-supportive amenities.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

Environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. None of these impacts have been determined to be either "potentially significant" or "potentially significant impact unless mitigation is incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the pages that follow.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and hazardous materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/water quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land use/planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/service systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse gases | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory findings of significance |

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.**
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date

October 29, 2021



Kevin Jackson, Director of Planning and Building
City of Piedmont

Environmental Checklist

The Environmental Checklist and discussion that follows is based on questions provided in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The questions focus on individual concerns within 18 different broad environmental categories such as air quality, cultural resources, land use, and traffic. The CEQA guidelines provide direction for preparing checklist responses. Each question in the checklist requires a “yes” or “no” reply indicating whether or not the project will have a potentially significant environmental impact of a certain type.

The checklist table provides other possible replies to the questions, including one which indicates the project would have a “less than significant” impact, and another which indicates that the project *could* have a significant impact but that the impact can be avoided if mitigation measures are applied. The “less than significant” impacts correspond to those where relevant information, reports or studies demonstrate that the impacts would not exceed a threshold of significance established by the lead agency. Impacts that are “less than significant with mitigation” include those where it can be demonstrated that the incorporation of clearly defined mitigation measures into the project would avoid impacts or reduce them to less than significant levels.

I. Aesthetics

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Piedmont has a distinct urban form shaped by its topography, views, tree canopy, street pattern, architecture, and residential land use pattern. Its image and aesthetics are principally defined by relatively large single-family homes constructed during the early 20th century. Its neighborhoods epitomize the best aspects of that era—quality craftsmanship, attention to detail in residential design, eclectic and varied architecture, attractive and spacious front and rear yards, pedestrian-oriented streets with sidewalks, large street trees, and a traditional development scale.

The “lower” part of the city tends to be denser and more uniform than the “upper” part, with a more traditional street grid. In the upper parts of the city, streets follow natural contours, creating a more suburban and organic development pattern. The City’s identity is also strongly shaped by public and private schools, houses of worship, and parks—these uses are important focal points for Piedmont neighborhoods. Memorable visual landmarks include the Oakland Avenue Bridge, the Civic Center complex, the Exedra at Piedmont Park, Piedmont Community Hall, the alley of trees along Oakland Avenue and Wildwood Avenue (between Crocker and Highland Avenues), and the city’s churches and schools. Other important landmarks visible from Piedmont include the Oakland and San Francisco skylines, Lake Merritt and San Francisco Bay, the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges, and the Oakland Hills.

The City’s topography and elevation provides for an array of views and vistas. Much of the city is situated on a gentle rise ascending from the East Bay “flatlands” to the Oakland Hills. Homes on this ascent frequently have partial or full westerly views taking in San Francisco, Downtown Oakland, San Francisco Bay, the bridges, and the coastal hills. These views become more dramatic and panoramic at the higher elevations, with fewer obstructions. Short-range views are also important, with many homes looking out over wooded canyons such as Indian Gulch or eastward toward the wooded ridges of the Montclair hills.

Discussion

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*
- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*
- c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

The PSS plan recommends a number of physical improvements that would have a visual presence. The recommendations include sidewalk bulbouts or extensions, creation of landscaped traffic island, bike lanes and other street markings, and traffic calming measures such as speed humps, posting bike route signs, speed cushions, stop signs and sharrows, among others. These improvements either are of a minor-enough size or scale, would be regulated through the Municipal Code or design review process, or are of such a nature that they would not be expected to:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- b) Substantially damage scenic resources; or
- c) Substantially degrade Piedmont’s existing visual character or quality.

- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Crossing enhancements recommended in the PSS plan could include lighted flashing signs or in-pavement flashing lights at certain crosswalks. These light sources are sufficiently minor or would be regulated through the Municipal Code and/or design review process so that they would not have a substantial adverse effect on day or nighttime views.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

II. Agricultural Resources

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location and nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

The entire City of Piedmont is classified as “Urban and Built Up Land” according to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the State Department of Conservation (2018). There is no agricultural zoning in the City and there are no Williamson Act contracts.

Discussion

- a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use?*
- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*
- c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location and nature, could result in conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural use?*

None of the above apply, as in Piedmont there is no:

- a) and c) Prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance; or
- b) Agricultural uses or zoning or Williamson Act contract.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

III. Air Quality

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Piedmont is located in the San Francisco Bay Air Basin (SFBAB) and is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD has the primary responsibility for ensuring that the SFBAB attains and maintains compliance with federal and state ambient air quality standards. Although Piedmont does not have major emission sources such as smokestacks or freeways, it is impacted by air pollution from stationary, area-wide, and mobile sources. Piedmont also contributes to regional air quality problems as residents and employees drive cars, use gas-powered equipment and electricity, burn wood, barbecue, and perform other routine household activities.

Under federal and state standards, the SFBAB is considered a non-attainment area for ozone and fine inhalable particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). The ozone violations typically occurred in the inland valleys (Concord, Livermore, etc.), where the summer heat is more intense and air circulation is less influenced by the marine layer. The SFBAB is considered to be in attainment with the federal standards for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead. The SFBAB is in attainment with state standards for all other criteria pollutants. In 2005, the BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area Ozone Strategy, a plan to bring the region into compliance with state and federal ozone standards.

The BAAQMD is currently updating its existing CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance for air quality impacts. The last update to the thresholds was adopted in June 2010 (revised May 2017). The Guidelines address air quality standards for ozone and PM from the State of California and the U.S. EPA. In addition, greenhouse gas thresholds were developed to ensure that the Bay Area meets the State's plan to address climate change.

Almost all land uses within Piedmont, including the city's residential areas, parks, and schools, are considered sensitive receptors, meaning that they are vulnerable to air quality impacts. However, the minimal non-residential land uses in the city reduces the exposure to pollution sources such as CO and most toxic air contaminants. In fact, the only facilities in Piedmont with BAAQMD permits are the two gasoline stations and the City Corporation Yard.

Discussion

- a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*
- c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*
- d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

The PSS plan does not involve any elements or components that would result in substantial air quality impacts (as might happen, for example, from new industrial development or from large increases in driving as a result of new large-scale residential development). The PSS plan does propose a project that would result in alterations to car traffic: the road diet on a portion of Highland Avenue (see pages 42-43 of the PSS plan for a description of the projects). As described in more detail in Section XVI, "Transportation / Traffic," the effects of this project on traffic flow would be minor. Traffic congestion would not be increased to such an extent that congestion-related air emissions would cause the projects to:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant; or
- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

In fact, the recommendations in the PSS plan are meant to make it easier for people to walk and bike in Piedmont, which would have a beneficial effect on air quality by reducing overall air emissions from cars.

- e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature—such as new residential development, for example—that would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

IV. Biological Resources

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Native habitat

Despite Piedmont's urban character, the city has an abundance of trees, shrubs, and ground cover, and supports a diverse array of "urban" wildlife such as deer, raccoon, squirrels, mice, and birds. The city's vegetation provides important aesthetic, psychological, and environmental benefits; its wildlife is part of an ecosystem that extends deep into the East Bay Hills.

Prior to the city's development, Piedmont's hills were covered with native grasses. Stands of oaks and redwoods dotted the slopes, and riparian woodlands followed the stream courses. Habitat was altered by cattle grazing and farming in the 1800s, and changed again as the city was urbanized. Much of the native habitat was replaced by private yards and gardens by the 1920s. However, a substantial amount of vegetation was retained on the city's larger lots and in some of its parks. Over the past century, this habitat has been altered by invasive plants such as eucalyptus and Monterey pine, and by the planting of street trees and non-native plants and ornamental shrubs throughout the city.

The major habitat types in the city are woodlands and urban land. Other habitat types, including grassland and wetlands are present to a much more limited extent. Woodlands are generally located in Piedmont Park, on the steep terrain along the city's stream courses, and on larger lots in the city's Estate Zone. Plant composition varies with moisture levels, sunlight, and soil conditions. The stream gullies and canyon slopes typically support species such as California Bay, Coast Live Oak, Black Oak, California Buckeye, Bigleaf Maple, Western Sycamore, redwoods, and various types of alder and willow. Shrubs such as poison oak, coffee berry, wax myrtle, and thimbleberry are also present, along with invasive plants such as acacia, Himalayan blackberry, and French broom. In some cases, eucalyptus have invaded and crowded out native species. Wildlife in these areas includes black-tailed deer, opossum, raccoon, striped skunk, fox squirrel, deer mouse, bats, alligator lizards, and various types of skinks and salamanders. Numerous bird species also are present.

Most of the city's native habitat has been altered by human activity, resulting in a mosaic of lawns, gardens, street trees, ornamental shrubs, and remnant native oaks, redwoods, other trees in private backyards. This habitat type is generally referred to as "Urban Land" and constitutes most of the city. However, even in these areas, the tree canopy is substantial. Wildlife in Piedmont's urban areas includes the same species that inhabit the woodland areas. Much smaller areas of Piedmont are comprised of grassland and wetland. Grassland is limited to Mountain View Cemetery on the northern edge of the city. Native grasses here have largely been overtaken by the invasive grasses that were first introduced when the area was used for cattle grazing in the 1800s. A variety of oat grasses, rye grasses, forbs, herbs, and bromes are common. Wildlife is similar to the woodland species, but may also include additional snakes and lizards, as well as birds such as turkey vultures and red-tailed hawks.

Wetlands

Wetlands are areas that are periodically or permanently saturated with water. The US Fish and Wildlife Service's Habitat Assessment Branch maintains a digitized inventory of wetlands across the United States. Their on-line wetland mapping tool indicates "*Freshwater Forested Shrub Forested Wetland*" on a narrow five-acre area along Indian Gulch to the rear of residences in the 100 block of St. James Drive, the unit block of LaSalle, and the 200 block of Indian Road. Tyson Lake and the EBMUD Reservoir Site (on Scenic) are both classified by the USFWS as freshwater ponds. No other areas in the city of Piedmont appear in the inventory. Typical wildlife species in the forested wetlands along streams in Oakland and Piedmont include frogs, newts, snails, and water insects.

Although wetlands in Piedmont are very limited in extent, they are governed by a complex set of state and federal regulations designed to discourage their alteration and mitigate impacts of their disturbance. The US Army Corps of Engineers requires permits for structures within these areas, and the California Department of Fish and Game requires Stream Alteration Agreements for projects which would obstruct the flow of water in a river or stream with a fish or wildlife resource.

Special-status species

Special status species are those which have been identified by the federal and/or state governments and various conservation organizations as requiring protection due to their rarity, scarcity, or danger of extinction. When the City of Piedmont makes decisions affecting land use and development, it must determine whether the project might impact any listed species or their habitat. State and federal law prohibit the approval of projects which would significantly impact any federally listed species without first specifying appropriate mitigation measures.

The Department of Fish and Game maintains the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB), which indicates where special status species are known to be present and where such species may be present based on habitat conditions. As part of the General Plan Update, the data base was consulted to determine the extent of such species in the Piedmont area. The only species listed in Piedmont is the silver-haired bat, a coastal forest dweller that feeds over streams, ponds, and open brushy areas. The bat was last observed in Piedmont in October 1920. There are no plant species within the Piedmont City limits indicated on the CNDDDB.

Additional CNDDDB plant and animal species are listed in Oakland, around Lake Merritt, Lake Temescal, and in the hills above Montclair. These include:

- Western pond turtle, which was observed at Lake Temescal at an unknown date and which requires aquatic vegetation, sandy banks or grassy open fields for egg-laying.
- California red-legged frog, which was last observed near Thornhill Drive in 1931 and which requires permanent sources of deep water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation.

- Bay checkerspot butterfly, which was observed in the 1970s near Joaquin Miller Park but is now presumed extirpated in this area due to loss of habitat (serpentine grasslands).
- Pallid bat, observed in the Redwood Regional Park area in 1932 and requiring dry open habitat with rocky areas.
- Hoary bat, last observed near Redwood Road in 1949, and requiring dense foliage and a mosaic of habitat types.
- Alameda whipsnake, which has been observed at various locations in the Oakland Hills, particularly on south-facing slopes and ravines where a mosaic of oak trees and grasslands are present.
- Golden eagle, last observed in Sibley Regional Park in 1993 and requiring cliff-walled canyons and large trees.
- Cooper's hawk, which was observed in East Oakland (along a creek below Leona Quarry) in 2006, and which nests in riparian canyon bottoms and live oaks.

The most likely areas where any of these species might be present in Piedmont would be around Tyson Lake, in deep ravines such as Indian Gulch, and along the edges of Mountain View Cemetery. These areas tend to be the least disturbed by human intrusion.

The CNDDDB lists a large number of special status plants in Oakland, most along the crest of the Hills (near Skyline Drive) and in the Joaquin Miller Park vicinity. Many of these plants are associated with serpentine soils and rock outcroppings, conditions not found in Piedmont. Others typically occur in chaparral or coastal scrub areas, which are likewise not present in Piedmont.

Discussion

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?*
- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service?*
- 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?*
- 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?*

Because the PSS plan proposes only minor physical projects—rather than, for example, an increase in development intensity, or redesignation of open space or natural areas for development—the Plan would not be expected to:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on any special-status species;
 - Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community;
 - Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands; or
 - Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

The PSS plan does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?*

This does not apply, as no portion of Piedmont is covered by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Native Americans inhabited the East Bay Plain for hundreds of years before European settlers arrived. The area around Piedmont was populated by the Ohlone (also known as the Muwekma or Costanoan) Tribe. Evidence of their presence includes shell mounds, arrowheads, tools, skeletons, and ornaments occasionally unearthed in settlement sites. Most Ohlone settlements were located along the shoreline and local creeks.

The California Native American Heritage Commission was contacted in 2008 as part of the General Plan Update. Members of four different tribal groups in the Bay Area were subsequently contacted, and a representative of the Ohlone-Muwekma tribe provided a written response to the City's inquiry regarding the presence of Native American resources in Piedmont. It was confirmed that there are no documented resources, and that the nearest settlements were along Temescal Creek in North Oakland and along Trestle Glen near Lake Merritt.

In 1820, the Spanish governor of California granted title to more than 40,000 acres in the Central East Bay to Don Luis Maria Peralta. The land grant, known as the Rancho San Antonio, was subdivided in 1842 and distributed to Peralta's four sons. The area from Piedmont to the north was owned by Jose Domingo Peralta; the area from Piedmont to the south, including most of Oakland, was owned by Vincente Peralta. Following the California gold rush of 1849 and California's admittance to the Union in 1851, the Peralta Ranchos were further subdivided and developed. There are no known historic resources from the pre-statehood period in Piedmont.

The earliest known settlements in Piedmont date from 1852 when Walter Blair purchased 600 acres of land (more than half of modern-day Piedmont) from the Peraltas for \$1.25 an acre. Blair established a dairy on what is now Highland Avenue, started a quarry on present-day Dracena Park, built a hotel on what would become Piedmont Park, and created a 75-acre amusement park in Moraga Canyon featuring picnicking, pony rides, and live entertainment. Blair's Piedmont Springs Hotel became a get-away for wealthy San Franciscans, drawn by the curative powers of natural spring waters. None of these resources remain today, although the former hotel site is within Piedmont Park and is commemorated with a historic marker and trail.

Initial subdivision of land in Piedmont took place in 1877, when a 67-parcel tract was created by the Piedmont Land Company. Development in the City proceeded at a very slow pace through the time of the 1906 earthquake, although Piedmont was home to a number of notable residents, including Jack London. Following the earthquake, Piedmont's population increased ten-fold in just one year, reaching 1,000 residents by 1907. Incorporation was put before local voters on January 26, 1907 and was narrowly approved. A second election in September 1907 confirmed the decision.

Incorporation was followed by the construction of new schools, churches, municipal buildings, and a downtown commercial center. Architect Albert Farr figured heavily in these efforts, designing many of the city's most prominent buildings. Farr designed the combined City Hall/ Fire Department in 1910, the Oakland Avenue Bridge (1910), and Piedmont Community Church, all of which still stand today. He also designed the City's first school on Bonita Avenue (later replaced by Havens Elementary) and a commercial center on Vista at Highland. Electric streetcar service was expanded to Piedmont during these years, with three lines connecting the city to Oakland, Berkeley, and the San Francisco ferry terminals.

Many of the earliest homes were built near the Highland Avenue streetcar line and the Bonita Avenue and Lake Avenue Schools. While bungalows were built in Lower Piedmont, grand and elegant mansions in a variety of architectural styles were constructed along Sea View Avenue, and in the blocks around Crocker Avenue and Hampton Road. Prominent architects like Julia Morgan, John Hudson Thomas, Bernard Maybeck, Charles Peter Weeks, William Knowles, Charles Sumner Greene and Newsom and Newsom created a legacy of fine residential design in the city. Piedmont was home to many of the Bay Area's most prominent businessmen and socialites.

Today, about two-thirds of the homes in Piedmont are more than 70 years old. Older buildings in the city are generally well protected due to the far-reaching scope of the City's design review program. The Planning Commission reviews major structural alterations to all buildings—historic or not—subject to design criteria that consider style, massing, materials, and other aspects of architectural compatibility. In addition, zoning requirements which limit floor area ratio and lot coverage tend to discourage “teardowns” and other actions that could lead to the demolition and replacement of older homes.

Piedmont has one structure on the National Register—the Wetmore house at 342 Bonita Avenue. The house is adjacent to City Hall and is the oldest residence in the city. There are no listed California Historic Landmarks, State of California Registered properties, or California Points of Historic Interest in Piedmont.

Discussion

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec 15064.5?*
- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec 15064.5?*
- c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*
- d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The PSS plan proposes only minor physical projects—rather than, for example, an increase in development intensity, or redesignation of open space or natural areas for development. For these reasons, the PSS plan would not be expected to:

- a) and b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource;
- c) Destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- d) Disturb any human remains.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Piedmont is located in a geologically active part of California. Like other cities in the East Bay, the city is part of the Coast Ranges geomorphic province. The area's geology is dominated by the intersection of the Pacific and North American tectonic plates, two components of the earth's crust which are moving in opposite directions. Over time, the stresses and forces between these plates have defined the terrain of the Bay Area, including San Francisco Bay itself. In the Bay Area, seismicity is controlled by the San Andreas Fault system, which is dominated by the San Andreas, Calaveras, and Hayward Faults. The San Andreas Fault traverses San Mateo County, about 15 miles west of Piedmont. The Calaveras Fault lies on the edge of the Diablo Range, about 15 miles to the east. The main trace of the Hayward Fault runs about 0.25 miles east of Piedmont, along an alignment that roughly parallels State Highway 13. The Fault extends from Point Pinole (San Pablo Bay) more than 40 miles south to Milpitas. The Hayward Fault presents the greatest threat to the city, although a large earthquake on any of the region's faults could cause significant damage and impact the entire region.

Historically, the region's most destructive earthquakes have been associated with the Hayward and San Andreas Faults. The last catastrophic quake on the Hayward Fault occurred in 1868 and was estimated to be magnitude 7.0. Piedmont was rural at the time, but there was extensive damage reported in Oakland, San Leandro, Berkeley, and Hayward. The San Andreas Fault produced the devastating 1906 San Francisco earthquake (magnitude 8.0) and was associated with the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (magnitude 6.9-7.1). Earthquakes of Magnitude 5.0 or greater have occurred on the Calaveras Fault in 1984 (Morgan Hill) and 2007 (North San Jose). According to the 2014 Working Group on Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP), there is a 62 percent chance that the Bay Area will experience an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater between 2014 and 2045. The probability for the Hayward Fault alone is 27 percent—the single highest risk among the Bay Area faults.

There are a variety of different hazards associated with earthquakes. Surface rupture is not regarded as a local hazard because there are no active fault lines within the city. Liquefaction hazards are relatively low and are limited to a former streambed now covered by Grand Avenue in Lower Piedmont. Ground shaking is the City's greatest seismic hazard, due to the City's proximity to the Hayward Fault. Other geologic hazards include differential settlement, lateral spreading and lurching, and ground subsidence. These hazards are relatively low in Piedmont and are primarily associated with bay mud or valley floor areas.

The Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) earthquake mapping scenarios indicate a 6.9 quake on the Hayward Fault would produce very strong to violent shaking in most of the City. Shaking would be equivalent to Modified Mercalli Index VIII or IX, which could produce collapse of unreinforced masonry structures, significant damage to reinforced structures, fall of stucco and masonry walls, collapse of chimneys and tanks, unbolted frame houses moving from their foundations, and cracks in wet ground and on steep slopes. Serious damage to reservoirs and tanks and cracking of underground pipes would be likely. Based on underlying geologic material, shaking could be amplified in the western (flatter) parts of the city where the depth to bedrock is greater. ABAG models also indicate that a 7.2 earthquake on the San Andreas Fault would produce moderate to strong ground shaking in the City, while a 6.2 quake on the Central Calaveras Fault would produce light to moderate shaking.

Parts of Piedmont are also susceptible to landslides, which may be seismically induced or triggered by heavy rains. The greatest risks are usually on steep slopes with weak or shallow soils, and along the sides of canyons where surface water and groundwater are concentrated. The greatest risks in Piedmont are in Moraga Canyon, along Trestle Glen and Indian Gulch, in Piedmont Park, in the Wildwood Gardens area, along Park Boulevard, and on the steep hillsides on the Montclair side of Piedmont.

Two soil types are predominant in the City. The first consists of alluvial deposits created by years of erosion from the East Bay hills. These soils are characterized by layers of silt and clay. They have high levels of nutrients and low erosion potential. In Piedmont, these are known as "Urban Land/ Tierra" and are predominant in the western part of the city below the 200' contour line. The second type consists of residuum from sandstone and shale. These soils are shallower and less fertile and tend to be more prone to erosion. They include Xerorthents-Millholm, Maymen-Los Gatos, and Maymen Loam. The Xerorthents-Millholm soils typically have shallow depth to bedrock, making basements impractical and expensive. Shrink-swell tends to be a problem where clay content is high, which is the case in most of the city and throughout the Bay Area. Erosion is common throughout the city, especially on steep slopes. These constraints can be mitigated through appropriate engineering, drainage, and site preparation measures, but they are still important factors in planning and design.

Discussion

- a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the 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? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.);* ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?;* iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?;* iv) *Landslides?*
- b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*
- 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?*
- 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?*

The PSS plan proposes only minor physical projects—rather than, for example, an increase in development intensity, or redesignation of open space or natural areas for development. For these reasons, it is not expected that the PSS would:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure and liquefaction or landslides;
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- c) Result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse from being located on a geologic unit or on unstable soil; or
- d) Create substantial risks to life or property from location on expansive soil.

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?*

This does not apply, as sewers are available to all areas of Piedmont.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Piedmont Climate Action Plan (CAP) 2.0 sections “Introduction and Background” and “Community Strategies” present a community-wide GHG emissions inventory for Piedmont, establish the 2005 emissions baseline, provide projections of emissions in 2030, and describe the City’s emissions reduction targets of 40% below 2005 baseline emissions by 2030 and 80% below 2005 baseline emissions by 2050. The emissions inventory identifies the sources, distribution, and amount of GHG emissions by emission sector, including building energy consumption, transportation, water and wastewater, and solid waste.

The emissions inventory was developed by the City in collaboration with ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability using methodology from the Global Protocol for Community-Scale Greenhouse Gas Inventories (GPC). The 2005 GHG emissions were calculated for both community-wide and municipal-related sources based on activity data (i.e., energy consumption, vehicle miles traveled [VMT]) for California, Alameda County, and the City of Piedmont for each emission sector. Total community-wide emissions were determined to be 48,818 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO_{2e}). Municipal-related emissions were estimated to be 1,025 MT CO_{2e}, or about 2% of the Piedmont’s total emissions.

Electricity and natural gas consumption within buildings contributed approximately 52% of Piedmont’s community-wide GHG emissions. Transportation-related activities contributed approximately 42% of Piedmont’s annual GHG emissions. Waste disposal contributed approximately 5%, and water use contributed less than 1%. For purposes of the CAP 2.0, Piedmont’s reduction targets of 40% below 2005 emissions by 2030 and 80% by 2050 apply to these baseline emissions, which include the municipal-related emissions described above.

Total community-wide emissions for 2019 were determined to be 34,197 MT CO_{2e}, whereas municipal emissions were 1,139 MT CO_{2e}, about 3% of the City’s total emissions. Piedmont GHG emissions levels were also projected for the year 2030 to determine the emission reductions needed to achieve the City’s goal. Projections were calculated on a ‘business as usual’ scenario, which assumes that emission trends as a result of California’s policy goals continue, but that Piedmont does not pursue any local climate action measures. Under this scenario, Piedmont’s GHG emissions are expected to decrease to 32,557 MT CO_{2e} by 2030, a 33% decrease. One of Piedmont’s GHG reduction goals is 40 percent below 2005 emission levels by

2030. Based on the 2030 projection, the City will need to reduce its GHG emissions to 29,291 MT CO₂e by 2030, a reduction of 3,266 MT CO₂e below currently anticipated future emissions.

Discussion

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a size, scale or nature to generate greenhouse gas emissions with a significant impact on the environment. In fact, the projects proposed in the PSS plan would be expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging some people to walk or bike instead of drive. Additionally, the PSS plan recommends adoption of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to assist governments or employers to encourage alternatives to solo driving, particularly during rush hour, intended to reduce car trips, gas emissions and collisions; and focus improvements on the last mile to and from the transit centers/stops.

b) *Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?*

The PSS plan does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation designed to reduce emission of greenhouse gases. However, the PSS plan aligns with the goals in the CAP 2.0.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) If 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Affected Environment

Hazardous materials include substances that are flammable, corrosive, explosive, radioactive, infectious, thermally unstable, and poisonous. Although such substances are typically associated with industrial land uses and processes—which do not exist in Piedmont—they are also found at gas stations, medical offices, and public buildings—which do exist in Piedmont. Hazardous materials are also used in most households, and may include cleaning solvents, paint, motor oil, pesticides, plastics, and various common household chemicals.

Hazardous material issues are commonly associated with storage, handling, transportation, and disposal. There may also be issues associated with hazardous building materials such as asbestos, lead and mercury. Naturally occurring hazards such as mold may also be an issue in some structures. More recently, the disposal of electronic waste such as computers, televisions, and fluorescent lamps has become a concern. The City of Piedmont implements a number of programs to reduce these hazards, including e-waste collection, battery recycling, and stormwater discharge controls. Household hazardous waste disposal centers have been established in Oakland and in Hayward.

Many state and federal laws have been enacted to protect the public from the dangers associated with hazardous materials. The State Department of Toxic Substances Control and US Environmental Protection Agency have the primary responsibilities. Other state agencies with jurisdiction over hazardous materials include the State Water Resources Control Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Caltrans, and the California Department of Health Services (DHS). Programs implemented by these agencies address underground storage tanks, clean-up of contaminated sites, toxic substance investigations, hazardous materials permitting, hazardous materials transport, and many other aspects of hazardous material use. Piedmont participates in these programs to the extent appropriate.

The Department of Toxic Substances Control maintains data bases indicating permitted hazardous materials sites, as well as clean-up sites and other sites where corrective actions have occurred. No clean-up sites are identified in the City of Piedmont. DTSC also maintains inventories of leaking underground fuel tanks. Two active sites are noted in Piedmont, both associated with gas stations. Monitoring of groundwater occurs at both of these sites (on Highland Avenue and Grand Avenue).

Discussion

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- 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?*
- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*
- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature associated with hazardous materials. The PSS plan does propose enhancements at street crossings such as sidewalk “bulbouts” or extension that would change the design of

certain intersections. However, these enhancements would be designed with input from the Fire and Police Departments so as not to impair emergency responders. For these reasons, it is not expected that the PSS plan would:

- a) and b) Create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials;
 - c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
 - g) Impair implementation of or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
 - h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.
- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*
- 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*
- 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?*

The above do not apply, as:

- d) There are no sites in Piedmont included on a Section 65962.5 list of hazardous materials sites;
- e) No portion of Piedmont is within an airport land use plan area and there are no airports within two miles of the City; and
- f) There are no private airstrips within or near Piedmont.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Affected Environment

Like the rest of the East Bay Plain, Piedmont is traversed by small creeks generally flowing from east to west toward San Francisco Bay. Key drainage courses in the City include Indian Gulch (Trestle Glen), Wildwood Greek, Bushy Dell Creek (in Piedmont Park), Pleasant Valley Creek (originates in Dracena Park), Cemetery Creek (Moraga Canyon). The creeks include sections that are undisturbed and flow freely, and other sections that have been buried in storm drains. Most of the runoff from the city flows to Lake Merritt (in Oakland), and the City represents about one-quarter of the lake's watershed. Untreated stormwater runoff is a major source of pollution in the lake, as it includes oil, pesticides, animal waste, fertilizer and debris.

Piedmont is also underlain by an aquifer, a permeable layer of rock and soil which stores water that has percolated into the ground. Water in the aquifer is contained in scattered unconnected pockets of permeable soil called "lenses." Water enters the aquifer through recharge areas where the soil tends to be sandy and porous, such as streambeds. In most parts of Piedmont, the upper level of the aquifer, or water table, is more than 20 feet below the ground. Although early settlers relied on wells into the aquifer for drinking water, the City is now served by a public water supply and only a few functioning wells remain.

The only surface water body in Piedmont is Tyson Lake, a privately owned and maintained lake near La Salle Avenue at the Oakland city limits. The lake is retained by an earthen dam and has a surface area of 1.3 acres. It has a mean depth of 18 feet and a volume of 3,000,000 gallons of water.

Water Quality

Since 1991, the City of Piedmont has been a co-permittee in Alameda County's NPDES permit. This is a federally mandated permit which regulates non-stormwater discharges to the storm drain systems throughout Alameda County and its 14 incorporated cities. The goal is to prohibit non-stormwater discharges to the storm drain system and implement controls to reduce stormwater pollutants. Under the permit, the applicants are required to develop, implement, and periodically update stormwater management programs. Piedmont participates in this program and implements a number of measures to improve regional water quality.

Water quality in the East Bay is monitored by the San Francisco Estuary Institute to evaluate the effectiveness of the Alameda County Clean Water Program (ACCWP). There are no monitoring stations in Piedmont and no specific hot spots have been identified in the city. All of the creeks in Piedmont flow into Lake Merritt in Oakland and from there into the San Francisco Bay. Regular water quality testing is conducted in Lake Merritt. Public Works Department staff completes regular reports to

the ACCWP and also coordinates the ACCWP's local outreach efforts. These efforts have included a citywide storm drain stenciling campaign to discourage illicit discharges, installation of trash capture devices and trash recycling stations with signage to capture accumulated debris and promote recycling, and collaboration with local schools and community organizations to disseminate information on proper waste disposal and water conservation.

Piedmont has adopted a stormwater management ordinance to regulate discharges to the storm drainage system and implement pollution control measures (Chapter 30 of the Municipal Code). The ordinance prohibits non-stormwater discharges to the storm drain system and also bans illicit connections to the system. It requires implementation of best management practices when undertaking activities relating to the storm drainage system. The ordinance also includes provisions for watercourse protection, including a prohibition on altering the flow of water in a drainage course. In addition, Piedmont has a Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan that guides the identification, prioritization, implementation, tracking, and reporting of green infrastructure projects in the City. The Plan also sets targets for reducing water quality impacts and identifies targets for retrofitting impervious surfaces with green infrastructure.

Flooding

There are no FEMA-designated flood plains in Piedmont. The city's creeks carry relatively small volumes of runoff and do not pose flood threats to property. Heavy rainstorms may produce temporarily ponding around storm drains, but these events are short in duration and do not typically result in property damage.

Flooding could potentially result from the failure of Tyson Dam or the collapse of the East Bay Municipal Utility District reservoir tanks. The probability of dam or tank failure is extremely low. Nonetheless, a worst-case scenario earthquake on the Hayward Fault could conceivably produce this outcome. Water from Tyson Lake would follow the streambed below the dam, crossing Hampton Field Park and then following LaSalle Avenue to Indian Gulch. Water from EBMUD Reservoir #1 (on Estates Drive) would traverse the streambed between Glen Alpine and SeaView, crossing Hampton Road and following St. James Drive to Indian Gulch. Piedmont Reservoir (on Blair Avenue) and Dingee Reservoirs would drain into Moraga Canyon, affecting Blair Park and the Coaches Field area.

Tyson Lake and its associated dam are below the size threshold requiring monitoring by the State Department of Water Resources Division of Dam Safety. The dam must be periodically inspected on behalf of the Tyson Lake Homeowners Association to ensure its structural stability. The probability of flooding from the EBMUD Reservoirs is greatly diminished by EBMUD's plans to decommission the Dingee reservoir, replace the Piedmont (Blair Road) reservoir with a 4.1 MG concrete tank and replace the Estates Drive reservoir with two new concrete water tanks. The Piedmont Reservoir was removed from service in 2003, in part because of seismic stability concerns.

On August 5, 2019, the Piedmont City Council adopted a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP). Hazard mitigation planning is a process for state and local governments to identify community-level policies and actions to mitigate and reduce the impacts of natural hazards. Adoption and implementation of the LHMP will help reduce the impacts of natural hazards to the citizens, property, and critical infrastructure in the City. The LHMP must be updated every five years.

Discussion

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*
- 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)?*
- 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?*
- d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration 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?*

- 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?
- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature that would create risks to water quality or associated with hydrology. For this reason, it is not expected that the PSS plan would:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
 - b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge;
 - c) and d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff;
 - 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;
 - f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality; or
 - i) and j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.
- 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?
 - h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

The above two statements do not apply, as no portion of Piedmont is within a 100-year flood hazard area.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

X. Land Use and Planning

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Single family residential uses make up 86 percent of Piedmont's land area. The remaining 14 percent consists primarily of schools, civic buildings, and parks. Commercial uses comprise less than one-third of one percent of Piedmont's land area, and there are no industrial uses. The land use pattern reflects the City's historic development as a series of residential subdivisions and the commitment to preserve Piedmont's residential character established by the City Charter more than a century ago. Land use patterns are further influenced by Piedmont's topography, street network, adjacent development patterns in Oakland, and orientation around neighborhood schools and parks. Zoning has reinforced the existing land use pattern.

The greatest concentration of non-residential uses is in Piedmont in the Civic Center area, where a mix of commercial, public, open space, church, and residential uses are present. The only other area with a concentration of non-residential uses is along Grand Avenue near the Oakland City limits, extending west to Beach School and Linda Park, and the new Piedmont Station townhouse development at 408 Linda Avenue. This is also where most of the City's multi-family housing is located. Open space uses are scattered around the City, with the highest acreage in Moraga Canyon.

Parts of the City are developed on a rectangular grid, with lots more typical of an urban neighborhood than those of a suburb. About two-thirds of the lots in the City, comprising almost half of Piedmont's total land area, are between 4,000 and 10,000 square feet. The median lot size in the City is 6,350 square feet and more than one-quarter of the city's lots are less than 5,000 square feet. The densest parts of the City are located west of Grand Avenue. The City generally becomes less dense as elevation rises, with the least dense areas located in north-central Piedmont.

Most of the city's lots—about 3,780 out of the 4,016 total—contain one single family home each. Only 22 lots in the city are developed with multi-family housing. These lots comprise three acres of land and contain 85 housing units. The average density of multiple family parcels in Piedmont is about 25 units per net acre. About 70 homes in the City are situated on “double” lots, with the main residence on one lot and the second lot used as a yard or lawn area.

Commercial uses in Piedmont are clustered in the Civic Center area and along Grand Avenue. The Civic Center area contains municipal buildings, a church, three banks, a gas station, a convenience market, and an office building occupied by real estate and professional offices. The Grand Avenue commercial area is the northern edge of a pedestrian-oriented commercial district that extends a half-mile beyond the Piedmont city limits to Oakland's Lake Merritt. Commercial uses within the Piedmont City limits are located on the blocks between Linda Avenue and Wildwood Avenue. They include a gas station, a hardware store (and adjoining building used for storage), a flooring shop, and three two-story office buildings with multiple tenants. There are five single-family homes within the commercially zoned area on Grand Avenue. These are considered legal, conforming uses.

Piedmont contains about 80 acres of park and open space land, representing about seven percent of the City's total land area. Open space in the City includes parks and undeveloped land associated with functional uses such as reservoirs and cemeteries. Parkland totals 50 acres, including about 6 acres owned and operated by the City of Oakland. Other open space lands include the Piedmont Reservoir operated by EBMUD (8.3 acres), a portion of Mountain View Cemetery (6.3 acres), and Tyson Lake (4.6 acres). Open space also includes 4.1 acres of landscaped traffic “islands” on Grand Avenue, San Carlos Avenue, Fairview Avenue, St. James Drive, and several other streets in and around the City.

Public and quasi-public uses in Piedmont include houses of worship (and associated parochial schools), public schools, civic buildings, and other municipal and utility properties. Together, these uses occupy about 40 acres of land, or five percent of the city. There are three churches and one synagogue in Piedmont, encompassing just over 6 acres. There are 25 acres of public schools, including Piedmont High School, Piedmont Middle School, Millennium High School, and three elementary schools (Beach, Havens, and Wildwood). Each site includes the school structure, ancillary parking and schoolyard areas, and a playground or athletic field owned and operated by the School District. Other civic uses include the Civic Center complex near Vista and Highland Avenues, and the Corporation Yard on Moraga Avenue. The former area contains City Hall, Fire Station, and the adjacent Veterans Memorial Building (Police Department). The latter area includes a service yard used for the storage and repair of public works equipment.

Approximately 70 of the city's roughly 4,000 parcels are vacant, totaling 21.6 acres. Vacant lots are more prevalent in the eastern third of the City, where the terrain is steeper and the lot pattern is more irregular. A majority of the vacant sites have development constraints. Some are landlocked or very steep. A majority are considered non-conforming under the City's zoning ordinance, either because they are below the minimum lot size or have inadequate street frontage.

Discussion

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a size, scale or nature to physically divide a community. The PSS plan does propose a “road diet” on the wider central stretch of Highland Avenue from Park Way to Vista Avenue. If anything, this project would reduce the physical separation between sides of the street by making it easier for pedestrians to cross.

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?*

The PSS plan does not conflict with any federal, state, county or special district plans, and is consistent with the Piedmont General Plan, Climate Action Plan and other applicable plans, policies, and regulations.

c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

This does not apply, as no portion of Piedmont is covered by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XI. Mineral Resources

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Piedmont’s principal mineral resources are volcanic rocks. Basalt, andesite, and rhyolite deposits were mined during the East Bay’s early development and used for building roads, curbs, and foundation stones. A number of quarries operated in Piedmont in the early 1900s, including stone quarries on the present sites of Davies Tennis Stadium and Dracena Park and a rock quarry where the Corporation Yard and Coaches Field are located. A large sandstone aggregate quarry once existed just north of the City limits on Pleasant Valley Road; the lake behind the Rockridge Shopping Center is a remnant. Piedmont’s quarries closed as the land around them became urbanized. The dust, noise, vibration, water pollution, and scarring of the natural topography made continued operation infeasible. Given the city’s small size and built-up, residential character, quarrying is not expected to resume in the future.

Piedmont has no known oil, gas, or geothermal resources that might be extracted in the coming years. The State Mining and Geology Board has identified no regionally significant aggregate or other mineral resources in the city.

Discussion

- 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?
- 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?

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature to result in the loss of availability of a:

- a) Known mineral resource; or
- b) Locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XII. Noise

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Result in the 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) If 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—expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

As an almost entirely residential city with no freeways, railroads, airports, or rapid transit systems, Piedmont is relatively quiet. Its principal noise sources are traffic, construction, domestic sources (leaf blowers, car alarms, air conditioners, barking dogs, etc.), sirens, and passing aircraft. The ambient noise level at any given location depends on a number of factors, including topography, proximity to major arterial or collector streets, and distance from Interstate 580. Ambient noise in the

western half of the city tends to be somewhat higher than the eastern half, given the higher population density; proximity to the freeway; presence of schools, businesses, and other non-residential uses; and less extensive tree cover.

Residences facing major streets such as Grand Avenue and Moraga Avenue experience higher noise levels than residences elsewhere in Piedmont. Steeper streets such as Oakland Avenue may experience higher noise levels than other streets with comparable traffic volumes due to the acceleration required for vehicles to climb the hill. Noise levels diminish fairly dramatically away from major streets. This is due both to the normal reduction in noise level with distance from the source, and the absorption of noise by the first row of homes adjacent to these streets.

Locations more than 500 feet away from Piedmont's major arterials generally have very low noise levels. The relatively hilly terrain and wooded character of the city provides natural noise shielding for these areas. Canyon and ravine settings such as Dracena Park may provide even further reductions.

Given the quiet character of the city, domestic noise sources are a greater concern in Piedmont than they might be in other cities. Noise from sporting events at local parks and school playgrounds, leaf blowers and gardening equipment, private parties, and construction is a concern in some neighborhoods. Noise from air conditioning units, pool and spa filter systems, exhaust systems, air compressors, wireless equipment cabinets, pumps, and other mechanical equipment may also be an issue. These noise sources are regulated by the Piedmont Municipal Code and by the Building Code. Noise studies may be required when potential new sources of noise are introduced.

As part of the 2009 General Plan Update, a noise contour diagram was created for Piedmont indicating the ambient noise levels at different locations in the city. Because the city does not have major stationary sources of noise, noise contour lines follow the highest-volume traffic arteries in narrow bands. Contours in the range of 65 dBA L_{dn} run along Grand, Moraga, and Highland Avenues and along Park Boulevard. Contours in the range in of 60 dBA L_{dn} run along Oakland and Linda Avenues. An area with ambient noise levels in the vicinity of 60 dBA exists around the Piedmont Civic Center, including the Recreation Center and Swim Club. Noise levels in the vicinity of 50 dBA generally extend a half block off the major arterials and around major public gathering places such as Witter Field and Piedmont High School. Ambient noise levels in most of the city are below 50 dBA L_{dn} .

The 2009 General Plan includes a set of noise compatibility standards which indicate the maximum acceptable noise levels on residential development sites. Areas where the ambient noise levels are greater than 70 dB are considered "normally unacceptable" for residential use. Areas where the ambient noise levels are 60-70 dB are considered "conditionally acceptable." Measures to mitigate and reduce noise levels (i.e., insulation, landscaping, locating outdoor living space to the rear) are usually required.

Discussion

- 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?*
- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*
- c) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*
- d) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components—such as new residential development, for example—that would permanently increase noise levels. The PSS plan does propose physical improvements that would generate temporary increases in noise and vibration during their construction. These would be minor and similar in nature to frequent roadway projects in the city and would be regulated as usual through the Municipal Code. For these reasons, it is not expected that the PSS plan would:

- a) Expose people to noise levels that exceed the standards established in the General Plan or Municipal Code;
- b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; or
- c) and d) Result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.

- 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?
- 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?

The above do not apply, as:

- e) No portion of Piedmont is within an airport land use plan area and there are no airports within two miles of the City; and
- f) There are no private airstrips within or near Piedmont.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

The 2020 Census reported that Piedmont’s population is approximately 11,135. The City contains about 3,838 households and has an average household size of about 2.91. The City’s population has remained stable since 1960. Changes in the last 50 years have been primarily due to fluctuations in household size rather than new development. Approximately 98 percent of the dwelling units in Piedmont are single-family detached homes. Piedmont homes tend to be larger than homes in nearby communities, and both rents and home prices in Piedmont are substantially higher than the regional averages. Piedmont has had the highest percentage of owner-occupied housing in Alameda County for many years. Some 90% of the City’s dwelling units are occupied by owners, with most of the remainder occupied by renters (1-2% of the units are vacant).

Piedmont has the highest median age (47.4) of any city in Alameda County. About one in seven Piedmonters is over 65, compared one in ten for the county as a whole. Piedmont has become slightly more diverse in the last two decades, although the changes have been less dramatic than elsewhere in the East Bay. The City is approximately 74.49 percent White, 17.85 percent Asian, 1.37 percent Black, 6.03 percent Multi-racial, and “Other.” Approximately 1.5 percent of the City’s residents speak English “not well” or “not at all.”

Discussion

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature to:

- Induce substantial population growth in Piedmont; or
- b) and c) Displace existing housing or people.

However, improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities with added traffic safety would attract young adults and families with children to move into Piedmont, and provide a safer environment for older pedestrians and cyclists.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIV. Public Services

	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of these public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Fire protection

The Piedmont Fire Station is located within City Hall at 120 Vista Avenue. The Piedmont Fire Department staffs 3 pieces of equipment at all times. One type 1 Fire Engine, one type 2 Fire Truck and one type 2 Rescue Ambulance. In addition to these units the Fire Department maintains an extended fleet of vehicles which include a Chiefs command vehicle, a reserve type 1 Fire Engine, a reserve type 1 Rescue Ambulance, a type 6 (wild land) Fire Engine, and a utility pickup truck. The Fire Department currently staffs seven-line fire fighters per day aboard one engine, one truck and an ambulance. The full-time professional staff of 23 includes a chief, three captains, three lieutenants, three engineers, thirteen firefighters and paramedics. The Fire Department shares the 911 emergency calling and dispatching system with the Piedmont Police Department. The Fire Department’s Dispatch and business offices are linked to the Oakland Police and Fire Department’s 800 MHz Computer

Aided Dispatch system. In the event of an emergency or disaster, back-up is provided through mutual aid agreements with surrounding communities. These agreements are reciprocal, meaning that Piedmont firefighters may be called on to respond to emergencies in Oakland and nearby cities.

The Piedmont Fire Department responds to approximately 1,100 service calls each year. Average response time is two minutes for EMS calls. In a given year, approximately 70 percent of the calls to the Piedmont Fire Department are medically related, and 30 percent are fire or utility related. In addition to providing fire fighting and emergency medical response, the Fire Department provides a number of community services for Piedmont residents. It offers guidance on the proper installation and operation of smoke detectors and home fire extinguishers. It operates a battery recycling program in conjunction with Alameda County, a bicycle licensing program, a rapid entry lock-box program which enables firefighters and paramedics to access homes in the event of an emergency, a Safely Surrendered Baby Program for unwanted newborns, and a Vial-of-Life program for residents with emergency medical needs. CPR and first aid programs are also offered by request to all Piedmont residents age 12 or older. The Department also sponsors special events such as Fire Prevention Week and operates public school programs for Piedmont youth. The Department also conducts scenario-based disaster response drills and is trained as first responders in hazardous materials incidents. The Department also answers fire prevention inquiries, interprets fire codes, and assists the Building Department with fire-related inquiries. Piedmont Fire's ambulance is also the longest continually operating Fire Department ambulance in California.

Police protection

The Piedmont Police Department is located in the Veterans Memorial Building at the corner of Vista and Highland Avenues. The Department employs 20 sworn personnel (the police chief, a police captain, four sergeants, twelve patrol officers, two detectives, and a juvenile officer) and ten professional personnel (a support services commander, five dispatchers, a records specialist, two animal control officers and one administrative assistant). The force is supplemented by part-time employees (three community service officers, reserve police officers, per diem dispatcher) and one volunteer. The Department is organized in three divisions: Administration (which includes the Chief of Police), Operations, and Support Services. Over the last five years the Piedmont Police Department received and managed an average of 12,500 calls annually. The geographic area of Piedmont is divided into two patrol areas known as beats. The dividing line for the beats is Highland Avenue, with streets above (east of) Highland Avenue being in Beat 1 and streets below (west of) Highland Avenue being in Beat 2. Patrol Officers work 12-hour shifts on one of four patrol teams (two night teams and two day teams). The City also contracts with a private vendor for school crossing guard services at several intersections.

The services which the Piedmont Police Department provides goes beyond responding to criminal incidents, and includes an array of proactive services that keep Piedmont safe. The Department provides specialized services, including response to home security alarm calls, home checks for residents who are on vacation, fingerprinting, and daily phone calls or visits to check in on single seniors and disabled residents. It also issues solicitor permits, operates a "police explorer" program for teens and young adults interested in law enforcement, and manages crime-scene evidence and found property. Police operations are supplemented by Traffic Enforcement, Neighborhood Watch programs and Police Reserves programs. Ongoing training and education are an essential part of the Department's mission and is required of all personnel. A "Safe Bike Program" is designed to record information about bicycles and offers a platform to encourage reporting stolen bike for registered residents. The Police Department is space-constrained in its current quarters, which were not initially designed as administrative space for law enforcement. Space needs have increased due to the addition of personnel, new technology and communication equipment, but the floor area available has remained the same. The police department has initiated efforts to relocate the dispatch center to the existing EOC/Conference room located near the lobby. The City of Piedmont will also initiate a master plan process soon for a new police department.

Schools

Piedmont is served by the Piedmont Unified School District (PUSD). The District's boundaries are coterminous with the city, but PUSD is a separate taxing entity with a separate governing body (the Board of Education). The Board is responsible for developing educational policy and reviewing and approving the school budget. It also approves additions and alterations to existing buildings, determines what new buildings are built, and manages construction financing. Schools in the PUSD are among the highest ranking in the state. Over 95 percent of its graduates pursue a college education. The District manages a high school, a middle school, and three elementary schools. In addition, an alternative high school for students with special needs and an adult education school both operate on the high school campus. The District also operates a maintenance yard near the middle school campus.

A \$56 million bond measure (Measure E) was approved by Piedmont voters in March 2006 to finance the repair, strengthening, and renovation of specific facilities on all five PUSD campuses. Subsequent evaluations were performed to prioritize improvements and develop a master implementation schedule. Measure E included a series of general obligation bond issues, beginning in 2006. Bonds are being sold as needed to fund the projects. Current projects include the reconstruction of Havens Elementary School. Other types of capital improvements to Piedmont's schools are made on an ongoing basis. These include changes to comply with the federal Americans With Disabilities Act and upgrades to technology and telecommunication systems. In most cases, the changes are designed to enhance the quality of existing facilities, rather than to provide additional classroom space to meet increasing enrollment. Shifts in enrollment in Piedmont are principally due to demographic changes rather than residential development. The number of students in any given year depends on birth rates, trends in the general population, and who is moving in and out of the city. Enrollment is expected to be fairly constant in the coming years, as household size in Piedmont is projected to be relatively stable. Three schools from the PUSD are enrolled in the Safe Route to School (SR2S) Program. Piedmont Middle school has participated in the International Walk and Roll to School Day. The city is actively working with Alameda county to encourage more schools to enroll in the SR2S program to conduct street infrastructure assessments around schools. These assessments are minor in nature, mostly visual.

Parks

Piedmont has 59 acres of parkland. This acreage includes 44 acres of City-owned and operated parks. In addition, Davies Tennis Stadium (owned by the City of Oakland) and a portion of the Oakland Rose Garden, together occupying about six acres, are located in Piedmont. School recreational facilities, including playgrounds at Havens, Wildwood, and Beach, and Witter Field (Piedmont High School) occupy another 8.5 acres, and provide an important community asset. Although there are no regional parks in Piedmont, the City is located within the East Bay Regional Park District. Residents have access to facilities in the Oakland Hills, along the shoreline, and elsewhere in the East Bay, providing a broader range of recreational experiences than can be offered in the city of Piedmont.

In addition, all schools have children's play structures, handball courts, and basketball goals. Havens and Beach Schools have paved areas suitable for youth softball. Wildwood School has a natural lawn area and softball diamond. Witter Field at Piedmont High School has a regulation football field which is suitable for soccer. It also has a running track and a baseball field. Piedmont's parks and landscaped areas are maintained by the Public Works Department. The City has a seven-member Park Commission that advises the City Council on the maintenance and improvement of city parks (and on planting, removal, and maintenance of street trees). The Piedmont Beautification Foundation and Piedmont Garden Club also contribute to park maintenance and conduct regular fund-raisers for park and landscape beautification.

Other public facilities

The City of Piedmont owns and operates several municipal buildings. These include City Hall (120 Vista Avenue), the Veterans' Memorial Building at the corner of Highland and Vista Avenues, and the Recreation Building (358 Hillside Avenue). The City also owns facilities at 801 Magnolia and is considering possible options for its reuse or replacement. The City also owns and operates a Corporation Yard on Moraga Avenue. It houses a variety of public works functions, including equipment storage and vehicle maintenance. The City of Piedmont does not have its own public library. Piedmont contracts with the City of Oakland to provide library services through the Main Library in Downtown Oakland and various Oakland branch libraries. The branches closest to Piedmont are on 41st Street (the Piedmont Avenue branch) and on Mountain Boulevard (the Montclair branch).

Discussion

a-e) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for any of these public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and other public facilities?

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components—such as new residential development, for example—that would create the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and other public facilities. The PSS plan does recommend installing additional bike-parking racks at key destinations. These improvements are sufficiently minor and/or would be regulated through the Municipal Code or design review process so that they would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XV. Recreation

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

The City contains a total of 59 acres of parkland, 44 acres of which are owned and operated by the City. There are nine City-owned facilities. Two other facilities, Davies Tennis Stadium and Oakland Rose Garden are owned and operated by the City of Oakland, but are located or partially located within Piedmont. The City also contains school recreation facilities adjacent to the schools, which can provide additional recreational opportunities for City residents.

Although Piedmont has approximately 5.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, the 2009 General Plan update indicated that demand for certain types of facilities currently exceeds supply. This is particularly true of athletic fields. At times, Piedmont teams and sports programs must rely on facilities in Oakland, Alameda, and elsewhere in the East Bay. The City is currently exploring ways to increase the programming ability of Coaches Field.

Discussion

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?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature—such as new residential development, for example—to substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities. Improvements proposed in the PSS plan might encourage some people to visit parks and other recreational facilities by making it easier to walk or bike to them. The Plan recommends a bikeway through an existing park (Linda Park). However, any such increase in visitors would be expected to be minor enough so as not to result in substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. If anything, the PSS plan would have a beneficial effect on facilities by reducing the need for car parking.

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?*

The PSS plan recommends a number of facilities to increase walking or biking, including for recreational purposes. These facilities include enhanced street crossings and designated bikeways. These facilities are sufficiently minor or would be regulated through the Municipal Code or design review process so that they would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVI. Transportation / Traffic

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

As a “landlocked” city, Piedmont’s road network and circulation system is integrally related to Oakland’s. Primary access to the city is via Grand Avenue, Oakland Avenue, Moraga Avenue, and Park Boulevard. Each of these roads has a freeway interchange—the former two on I-580 and the latter two on State Highway 13. All of these interchanges are located in Oakland and are approximately ½ mile from the Piedmont city limits. These four streets (plus a short segment of Highland between Moraga and Oakland Avenues) form the backbone of Piedmont’s circulation system. Much of the traffic on Moraga Avenue and Park Boulevard in particular is traffic passing through Piedmont, with origins and destinations in other cities.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission classifies Park Boulevard, Grand Avenue, and the portion of Oakland Avenue below Grand Avenue as “Major Arterials.” It classifies Oakland Avenue from Grand to Highland Avenues, Moraga Avenue, Linda Avenue, the Highland/ Sheridan/ Wildwood/ Crocker Avenues through-route and the Hampton Road/St. James Drive through-route as “Collectors.” These streets are included in the Agency’s traffic forecasting program. However, none of Piedmont’s roads are included in the County Congestion Management Program, which includes 134 miles of freeway, 73 miles of state highway, and 27 miles of arterials across Alameda County.

Street network

The City of Piedmont contains 141 streets with a combined length of about 38.75 miles. The General Plan classifies these streets based on their function and character and the volume of traffic each street carries. Streets are classified as arterials (8,000+ vehicles per day), major collectors, minor collectors, and local. Design standards have been adopted for each roadway type. However, many of the streets in Piedmont were constructed 80 to 100 years ago and do not meet these standards. Several are considered to have “marginally adequate” or “inadequate” rights of way. Parking restrictions and other measures are used to ensure access by residents and emergency vehicles.

The road network reflects the city’s historical development patterns and topography. Most of “lower” Piedmont was developed on a modified grid, creating a system of rectangular blocks and enabling traffic to choose alternate routes when traveling through the city. Because the grid is irregular, with gently curving streets and blocks of varying lengths, through-traffic tends to remain on the arterials and collectors. In the upper part of the city, the street network is more disconnected, with streets following topographic contours. Many of the roads are curvilinear or looping, and it is difficult to bypass the main collectors. The streets also tend to be narrower, creating parking problems, accident hazards, and fire safety issues in some cases.

A citywide traffic analysis was conducted in 2007 as part of the General Plan Update. Traffic counts indicated that daily volumes had increased on the Highland/ Sheridan/Crocker Avenues collector route, and on Hampton Road and La Salle Avenue. The General Plan traffic analysis also looked at 2007 volumes for the AM and PM peak hours. Relative to typical urban areas, volumes are low and are indicative of a high level of service. The signalized intersections at Highland/Moraga Avenues, Grand/Rose Avenues and Oakland/ Grand Avenues are typically the only locations in town where commute-related congestion is encountered. Congestion also occurs around the Civic Center and schools during pick-up and drop-off hours. The evening peak tends to be higher than the morning peak on Grand Avenue, but the two are about equal on Oakland and Moraga Avenues. Additional information on the traffic counts may be found in the General Plan.

Regional forecasts and Congestion Management Program

According to regional forecasts prepared by the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), based on studies completed in 2018, average daily traffic volumes on the Grand Avenue corridor through Piedmont are projected to increase almost 22 percent between 2020 and 2040. Volumes on Oakland Avenue and Moraga Avenue are projected to increase about 20 percent. Virtually all of this increase is associated with “pass through” traffic, as the model assumes minimal development within Piedmont (consistent with the General Plan and the lack of vacant or redevelopable land in the city). The ACTC model projects even steeper increases in traffic on the Grand Avenue corridor during the AM and PM peak hours.

California law requires each CMA in the state to prepare a Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years outlining strategies to reduce congestion. The City of Piedmont participates in this process, as do the other cities in Alameda County, as well as MTC, BART, AC Transit, the Air Quality District, and Caltrans. Highway projects must be included in the CMA in order to receive funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

The CMP also includes a Land Use Analysis program that requires cities to analyze the impacts of their decisions on the regional transportation network. One of the program’s missions is to recognize the link between land use decisions and transportation impacts. Traffic modeling (and CMA review) is typically required for projects that generate at least 100 PM peak hour trips. Adoption of the Piedmont Housing Element would not generate 100 PM peak hour trips, as the PSS Plan proposes no changes in land use or development intensity.

Parking

The major parking problem areas in Piedmont are the Civic Center area, the Grand Avenue commercial area, the narrower streets in the hill areas, and the area near the casual carpool pick-up spot on Oakland Avenue. Localized parking issues also exist around the City’s parks (particularly Hampton Field) and schools during special events.

Other transportation modes

Transit service to Piedmont is provided by the Alameda Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit). Residents in “lower” Piedmont can use Lines 11 or 12 to reach the 19th Street or MacArthur BART Stations. Line 41 is a “collector” route, transporting passengers from Upper Piedmont to the Civic Center. Riders must then transfer to Line 11 to reach Downtown Oakland and connect to BART. A number of routes also serve trans-bay traffic.

About 13 percent of Piedmont’s employed residents carpool to work, according to the 2019 5-year American Community Survey (ACS). Much of the activity consists of “casual” carpooling on Oakland Avenue. Drivers can pick up riders who queue at a designated “pick-up” point at Hillside Avenue and Oakland Avenue and proceed to the carpool lanes on the Bay Bridge. Other casual parking pick-up spots exist along Park Boulevard (near Trestle Glen) and at Monte Vista and Oakland Avenue, just across the city limit line in Oakland.

Currently, there are 2.8 miles of bike network in Piedmont and the PSS plan adds 9.2 miles to the existing bike network bringing the total to 12 miles. With the annual pavement restoration projects, the City reviews Complete Streets checklists for all streets in the project. If bicycle facilities are shown in the adopted Master Plan, facilities are included with the applicable annual street restoration project. Due to inadequate street width, safety and engineering concerns, and on-street parking, adding designated bike lanes on the majority of streets within the City is not feasible. Hence, the Plan primarily recommends bike routes accommodated within the existing street infrastructure along with signage. There continues to remain a high level of interest in official bike route designations among Piedmonters.

Walking is also a fundamental mode of transportation and is part of the daily routine of many Piedmonters. Most pedestrian travel in the city occurs on sidewalks and crosswalks. The City also has a system of pedestrian footpaths and stairways that run between blocks, particularly in steep areas where the paths serve as “short cuts.” The PSS plan recommends and prioritizes locations for intersection improvement across the City.

Discussion

- a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

Rather than increase in traffic, the PSS plan is more likely to reduce traffic by encouraging more people to walk or bike rather drive for certain trips. The PSS plan does include a project that would reduce car capacity: a “road diet” on a portion of Highland Avenue. To make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross and to create room for bike lanes, Highland Avenue between Park Way and Magnolia Avenue would be restriped from two lanes in each direction to one car lane and one bike lane in each direction, with a painted center turn lane. The parking lanes would remain as they are. Road diets have several significant benefits: they make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross; create room for bike lanes; and make intersections simpler for drivers to navigate, particularly with regard to left-hand turns.

The road diet would not be expected to cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. A traffic-industry rule-of-thumb rule is that four-lane streets are good candidates for road diets if their average daily traffic count is below 15,000–20,000 cars. Traffic counts on Highland Avenue are significantly below that threshold. (A further consideration is that Highland Avenue is already a two-lane street on either side of the segment in question: north of Park Way and south of Vista Avenue.) Besides, the PSS plan recommends that the road diet be considered as part of a broader and detailed traffic study for a reconfiguration of the Highland Avenue corridor. The corridor study would examine potential impacts of a road diet to traffic operations, particularly the possibility of back-ups at and on Oakland Avenue. If the study finds any possible significant negative traffic impacts, feasible mitigation measures would be identified, including changes to the timing of traffic signals.

- b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

This does not apply, as none of the routes in the Alameda County Congestion Management Program pass through the City of Piedmont.

- 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?*

The Plan does not involve any elements or components that would result in a change in air-traffic patterns.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The PSS plan includes projects that would cause a number of streets and intersections to be redesigned to varying extents. These projects could include striping intersections, adding controlled lights, sidewalk bulbouts or extensions, road diets on a portion of Highland Avenue, bike lanes and sharrows. These projects are meant to improve safety for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. They are not expected to substantially increase traffic-related hazards, since they are common design measures and techniques that meet industry standards and best practices in pedestrian and bicycle planning. Additionally, the Plan recommends the City to look into quick-build projects and traffic calming measures such as speed humps, speed cushions, raised crosswalks, speed tables and rumble strips. These recommendations are a toolkit for the City to use when an improvement project is considered.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

The PSS plan does not involve any elements or components that would result in inadequate emergency access. The plan does propose enhancements at street crossings such as sidewalk “bulbouts” or extensions that would change the design of certain intersections. However, these enhancements would be designed with input from the Fire and Police Departments so as not to impair emergency responders.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

The PSS plan does not involve any elements or components that would substantially increase the need for parking or reduce its supply. On the other hand, the Plan would free up parking capacity in parking-impacted areas, such as the Civic Center, by encouraging some people to walk or bike instead of drive.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

The PSS plan would not conflict with any such policies, plans or programs. In fact, the Plan is designed to support alternative transportation by making it easier and safer for people to walk or bike (and, by extension, to use transit, since these forms of transportation complement each other). Bike racks installed at the Civic Center, per the PBMP, are currently being used by residents and employees. Additionally, the recommended TDM program in the Plan, if implemented, will encourage carpooling and improve last-mile connections to and from transit stops.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Affected Environment

Wastewater treatment

The City of Piedmont owns and maintains its own sewage collection system. There are 47 miles of collection pipes, ranging in size from six inches to 15 inches in diameter. Sewage is conveyed from the City's system to an East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) interceptor sewer and is transported to a wastewater treatment plant near the foot of the Bay Bridge. The facility serves Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, and other cities in the EBMUD service area. Primary treatment at the EBMUD plant removes floating material, oil and grease, sand and silt, and heavy organic solids using pre-chlorination, screening, grit removal, and primary sedimentation. Secondary treatment then biologically removes most of the suspended and dissolved organic and chemical impurities through processes including oxygen activation, final clarification, sludge digestion, and dewatering. Treated effluent is disinfected, dechlorinated and discharged one mile off the East Bay shore through a deep water outfall into San Francisco Bay. Biosolid residuals (sludge) from the treatment process is reused as a soil amendment and for landfill cover.

Water treatment

Piedmont receives its water from East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). Water is filtered and treated at various facilities in the East Bay Hills before being transported to customers. EBMUD is considered to have very high-quality drinking water, with most of the supply requiring minimal treatment to meet health standards. After treatment, water is conveyed throughout the EBMUD service area. The distribution network includes 4,100 miles of pipe, 140 pumping plants, and 170 storage reservoirs with a capacity of 830 million gallons. EBMUD delivers approximately 220 million gallons per day (MGD) to its customers systemwide. Piedmont comprises just under one percent of the District's customer base.

Stormwater facilities

Piedmont's storm drainage system is owned and maintained by the City. The system was initially designed as a combined storm and sanitary sewer system in the early 20th century. The two systems were separated in the 1940s. Because of Piedmont's hilly terrain, the storm sewer system relies on curbs, gutters, and natural drainage to augment the piped system. Stormwater runoff generally flows toward the city's swales and creeks, ultimately reaching Lake Merritt, the Tidal Channel, the Oakland Estuary, and San Francisco Bay. Piedmont's stormwater inlets and conveyance pipes are regularly maintained and cleaned to avoid street flooding. The City also participates in the County Clean Water Program to mitigate stormwater pollution and meet Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

Water supply

The EBMUD service area includes 1.3 million residents in a 331 square mile service area extending from Crockett to San Lorenzo, and from Oakland to Walnut Creek and the San Ramon Valley. About 90 percent of the EBMUD's water originates from melting snowpack in the Sierra Nevada, while the other 10 percent consists of runoff to local reservoirs. The District employs an array of water conservation measures to reduce per capita water consumption. However, increasing population in the EBMUD service area may still trigger future increases in demand. The service area is expected to gain 218,000 residents between 2010 and 2030. While less than one-tenth of one percent of this growth will occur in Piedmont, it still has implications for the city's long-term water supply. As the District contends with increasing demand, it also faces constrained supply due to drought, reduced snowpack, water rights issues, and mandatory releases to sustain fish populations in the Mokelumne River. The Mokelumne River supply is also vulnerable to the effects of earthquakes, levee failures, and fires. EBMUD is exploring additional water sources, including a regional water supply project with the Sacramento County Water Agency and City of Sacramento. The project will have the ability to divert up to 185 million gallons per day (MGD) from the Sacramento River, including 100 MGD for EBMUD customers during drought years. The District is also exploring the use of groundwater basins (aquifers) and injection wells as a means of storing water. It is also collaborating with the San Francisco PUC, the Contra Costa Water District, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District to explore the feasibility of a regional desalination facility, and implementing recycled water projects to reduce the use of high-quality potable water for landscaping and irrigation.

Wastewater capacity

The average annual flow into the EBMUD wastewater treatment plant is about 80 million gallons per day. The plant was designed and constructed for population and employment levels that far exceed today's levels, with a capacity of 168 million gallons per day. EBMUD projects that wastewater flows into its main treatment plant will remain relatively constant over the next two decades. Population gains in the service area will be offset by increased water conservation and efficiency. In fact, the District projects that the volume of effluent discharged to the Bay may actually decrease in the coming decades due to increased use of recycled wastewater.

Landfill capacity

In January 2018, the City of Piedmont signed a new ten-year agreement with Richmond Sanitary Service (aka Republic Services) to provide trash, recycling, and green waste services. Waste collected from Piedmont is hauled to a transfer station in Richmond. Solid waste is taken to the Keller Canyon Landfill in Pittsburg. Recyclable materials are either taken to the West Contra Costa Processing Facility in Richmond, the IRRF Household Hazardous Waste Facility, or the Alameda County Computer Resource Center. Organic materials are taken to the West County Compost Processing Facility in Richmond.

Solid waste regulations

Since the passage of the Integrated Waste Management Act in 1989, Piedmont has enacted a number of waste reduction, recycling, and composting programs. The City achieved its 50 percent diversion target prior to 2000 and is currently recycling at a rate close to the Alameda County goal of 75 percent diversion by 2020. Solid waste collection service in Piedmont is provided by Richmond Sanitary Service, which also offers recycling and green waste services. Solid waste is collected and transported to the Keller Canyon Landfill in Pittsburg. The City achieved a 75% diversion rate in 2020 and plans to increase that rate to 85% by 2030 as part of Piedmont's CAP 2.0 goal. The City has implemented a variety of programs related to recycling, green waste, electronic waste, source reduction, and public education to increase diversion. The City also adopted a construction and demolition debris ordinance that requires projects with a valuation greater than or equal to \$50,000 to divert at least 50% of the debris generated by the project from going to the landfill.

Discussion

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*
- 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?*
- 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?*
- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*
- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*
- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*
- g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a nature—such as new residential development, for example—that would:

- a) Cause wastewater treatment requirements to be exceeded;
- b–c) Require or result in the construction or expansion of drinking water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage facilities;
- d–f) Require new or expanded entitlements of water supplies, commitment of additional wastewater treatment services or additional landfill capacity; or
- g) Bring into question compliance with federal, state or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project...	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion

- 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?*

The PSS plan does not involve elements or components of a size, scale or nature to create the impacts listed above.

- 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)?*

The PSS plan is not expected to result in any cumulatively considerable impacts. In fact, cumulatively, the proposals in the PSS plan would have the effect of decreasing the negative impacts associated with car traffic by encouraging some people to walk and bike, and providing traffic calming measures.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The PSS plan is not expected to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. In fact, the plan is expected to improve quality of life in Piedmont by making it easier for people to walk and bike, and alleviating traffic safety concerns, which would improve levels of physical activity and decrease congestion, noise, emissions of pollutants and other negative impacts associated with car traffic.

Mitigation Measures

None required.