Notice of Intent
to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the
Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

Notice is hereby given that the City of Piedmont has completed a Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the proposed Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

The PBMP is the City’s first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation. Its broad goals are to increase the amount of walking and bicycling in Piedmont and to improve walking and biking safety throughout the city. The PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements to achieve those goals. The improvements consist of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices. The draft PBMP document is available at [http://www.ci.piedmont.ca.us/publicworks/docs/planning/bike-ped/2014-08-08-draft_pbmp.pdf](http://www.ci.piedmont.ca.us/publicworks/docs/planning/bike-ped/2014-08-08-draft_pbmp.pdf).

The Initial Study prepared by the City’s consultant under the direction of 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 at the front desk of Piedmont City Hall (120 Vista Avenue, in Piedmont). Comments on the document may be submitted in writing or verbally. Written comments will be accepted until 5:00 pm, Thursday, October 9, 2014, and should be emailed or sent to:

Kate Black, City Planner  
Piedmont City Hall  
120 Vista Avenue  
Piedmont, CA 94611  
kblack@ci.piedmont.ca.us

Verbal comments may be made at the October 13, 2014 public hearing of the Piedmont Planning Commission. The hearing will begin at 5:00 pm and will be held in the Piedmont City Hall Council Chambers at 120 Vista Avenue.

The Piedmont City Council is scheduled to consider the Negative Declaration at its regularly scheduled meeting on November 3, 2014. The meeting will begin at 7:30 pm and will be held in the Piedmont City Hall Council Chambers, at 120 Vista Avenue. 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.
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Introduction

This document presents the Initial Study checklist and Negative Declaration for the Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). The PBMP is the City’s first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation. Its broad goals are to increase the amount of walking and bicycling in Piedmont and to improve walking and biking safety throughout the city. The PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements to achieve those goals. The improvements consist of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices.

A comprehensive, long-range planning effort such as the PBMP is considered a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For this reason, an evaluation of potential environmental impacts stemming from the PBMP is required by state law. The City of Piedmont is the CEQA lead agency for the project. The City, with consultant help, 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.
Declaration

Project Name
Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master 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 the City of Piedmont’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). The PBMP is the City’s first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation. Its broad goals are to increase the amount of walking and bicycling in Piedmont and to improve walking and biking safety throughout the city. The PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements to achieve those goals. The improvements consist of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices.

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.

Date
September 12, 2014

Kate Black, City Planner
City of Piedmont
Background

1. Project name
   Piedmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

2. Lead agency name and address
   City of Piedmont
   Department of Public Works
   120 Vista Avenue
   Piedmont, CA 94611

3. Project sponsor's name and address
   Same as lead agency

4. Contact person and phone number
   Kate Black, City Planner
   Department of Public Works
   120 Vista Avenue
   Piedmont, CA 94611
   kblack@ci.piedmont.ca.us
   (510) 420-3063

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.

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 City of Piedmont’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). The PBMP is the City’s first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation. Its broad goals are to increase the amount of walking and bicycling in Piedmont and to improve walking and biking safety throughout the city. The PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements to achieve those goals. The improvements consist of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices. A more detailed project description follow this section.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting
   Piedmont is situated in the heart of the San Francisco Bay Area, in northern Alameda County. 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 City of Piedmont’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP). The PBMP is the City’s first citywide planning effort devoted exclusively to non-motorized transportation. Its broad goals are to increase the amount of walking and bicycling in Piedmont and to improve walking and biking safety throughout the city. The PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements to achieve those goals. The improvements consist of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices.

Piedmont is located in northern Alameda County, approximately 2 miles northeast of Downtown Oakland and 10 miles east of San Francisco. The City is encircled by Oakland on all sides. Piedmont includes 1.7 square miles of land. Its topography consists of gently rising terrain with steeper hills, ridges, and canyons in the eastern half of the City. Elevation ranges from 40 feet to 704 feet. Piedmont is the second smallest of Alameda County’s 14 cities. In 2008, the city had a population of approximately 11,000.

Land uses in Piedmont are almost entirely residential, along with complementary uses such as parks and schools. The city has a small commercial area near City Hall and a few small businesses along Grand Avenue but most residents rely on adjacent shopping districts in Oakland for basic services. Piedmont is less than one mile from the MacArthur and Warren Freeways, 4 miles from the Bay Bridge, and within 3 miles of four BART stations.

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 applied for a grant from the Alameda County Transportation Commission in the spring of 2013 to prepare a Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) for improving conditions for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the city. Given that much of the walking and biking activity in Piedmont consists of children going to and coming from school, the PBMP also pays special attention to the needs of school children (see the end of this chapter for more information about this component of the planning process).

The PBMP process was meant to provide a comprehensive framework for assessing and responding to the community’s needs related to walking and biking. The main objectives were to (i) determine Piedmonters’ critical needs and concerns and (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.

The PBMP builds on other local planning efforts, particularly the City’s General Plan, American with Disabilities Act Right-of-Way Transition Plan, Climate Action Plan 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.

Summary of project

The PBMP planning process consisted of three initial tasks:

- An inventory of existing conditions, to establish the objective state of walking and biking in Piedmont.
- A needs assessment process, to learn about the concerns and needs of local pedestrians and cyclists, and the obstacles and challenges to walking and biking in Piedmont.
- Formulation of a range of improvement options—or preliminary ideas to improve conditions—for the community to consider and prioritize.
These tasks were followed by development of the “action plan” for the PBMP. The action plan consists of several elements related to implementation and represents the “actionable” parts of the PBMP:

- A list of high-priority projects, which are the most important and promising physical improvements for improving conditions.
- A list of lower-priority projects, which may be implemented if the City obtains additional funding.
- Recommended programs in the areas of safety, education, enforcement and encouragement or promotion.
- Recommended policies, or changes to City practices.
- Other implementation actions, or smaller-scale recommendations to further advance walking and biking in Piedmont.
- Funding and phasing considerations, particularly related to the high-priority projects.

PBMP recommendations

In order to achieve its goals, the PBMP includes a set of recommended improvements consisting of physical projects, programmatic activities and changes to City policies and practices. The improvements are organized as follows in the PBMP:

**High-priority projects**

The PBMP recommends five high-priority projects or types of projects. These are the most important physical improvements—with the most community support and the greatest potential to promote safety and encourage walking and biking in a cost-effective manner—that the City can reasonably expect to afford with outside funds over the next ten years. The recommended high-priority projects, listed in the order in which they appear in the PBMP, are:

- **Enhanced street crossings at key locations.** The most common community need, by far, expressed through the PBMP 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.

- **Road diets on Grand and Highland Avenues.** To make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross and to create room for bike lanes, portions of Grand Avenue and Highland Avenue would be put on “road diets.” Grand Avenue north of the city border to Greenbank Avenue, and 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 turn lane in the middle and, on Highland Avenue, possibly a landscaped median. The parking lanes would remain as they are.

- **Sidewalk railings on the Oakland Avenue bridge.** This project would entail installing historically compatible decorative railings along the sidewalk on both sides of the bridge. The railings would prevent a pedestrian from accidentally falling into the roadway and could also have the effect of slowing traffic down moderately by visually narrowing the width of the roadway.

- **Reconfiguration of the Highland Avenue bend.** Arguably the most confusing stretch of road in Piedmont is Highland Avenue roughly from Vista Avenue to Piedmont Court. At this location, Highland Avenue transitions between two and four lanes, and the area has ten crosswalks and two small traffic islands, as well as the large
island formed by Highland Way. This project would consist of a detailed, area-specific traffic study and subsequent reconfiguration of the street to rationalize pedestrian and car traffic in the area. It is expected that reconfiguration would be accomplished through relatively low-cost measures such as restriping, crosswalk improvements and reshaping of the islands.

- **Designated bikeway network.** While cyclists are allowed on any street in Piedmont, the PBMP recommends a citywide network of designated bikeways providing a higher level of service for cyclists in terms of safety or convenience. The network—approximately 10 miles long—would be a combination of bike lanes and bike routes on narrow streets with no room for bike lanes. Bike routes would come in two varieties: basic and enhanced. Basic bike routes would be marked simply with “Bike route” signs. These would help cyclists find the better routes to their destination while indicating to drivers to especially be on the lookout for cyclists. Enhanced bike routes would have “sharrows” (stencils that encourage drivers and cyclists to share the road) and “Bikes may use full lane” signs. Enhanced bike routes would be appropriate on streets with narrow travel lanes and where the speed differential between cars and cyclists is not significant (for example, on slower-speed streets or on downhills). As appropriate, every segment of the network should be equipped with additional safety features. These include smoother pavement; non-slip surfaces; traffic mirrors; motion-activated flashing signs indicating the presence of a cyclist around a curve; flashing radar speed signs; center lines; and solid white lines demarcating the travel lane from the shoulder or parking lane (by visually narrowing the street, shoulder lines cause drivers to drive somewhat more slowly).

**Lower-priority projects**

In addition to the projects listed above, Piedmonters identified many other important projects during the PBMP needs assessment process. Unfortunately, it is anticipated that over the next ten years, the City will obtain only enough outside funds for the high-priority projects. For this reason, the additional important projects identified by the community are considered lower-priority. These projects or project types, listed in the order in which they appear in the PBMP, are:

- **Additional enhanced street crossings.** During the needs assessment process, individuals in the community identified many additional locations for street-crossing improvements. This project category includes enhanced street crossings at locations beyond those identified as high-priority, particularly if they are near schools and along common school-access routes.

- **Sidewalks and curb ramps.** This includes installing missing sidewalks and curb ramps, and critical sidewalk repairs, particularly in the Civic Center, the Grand Avenue commercial district, along arterials, near schools and along common school-access routes.

- **Footpaths and stairways.** Improvements related to the footpaths and stairways include critical repairs to maintain functionality; lighting to make it easier to see the path of travel while minimizing disturbance to neighbors; hand railings; ramps, where feasible, to provide access to people in wheelchairs and people with strollers; and plaques marking the entrances.

- **Additional traffic calming.** Some of the high-priority projects include or incorporate traffic-calming measures, including sidewalk bulb-outs as part of the high-visibility crosswalks and reduction of travel lanes as part of the road diets. Projects under this category would address the unmet need for additional traffic calming measures along other streets and at other intersections, and also for more-involved measures that serve a particular neighborhood (similar to, for example, the landscaped street triangle at Ronada and Ramona Avenues or the triangle in progress at Linda and Kingston Avenues).
Programs

The PBMP recommends a variety of efforts, grouped under five programs, that address the most common non-physical needs expressed by Piedmonters through the needs assessment process. The programs and activities within each program are listed below in the order in which they appear in the PBMP. The programs would be led primarily by the Public Works Department (especially the spot improvement program) and the Police Department (namely activities related to enforcement, traffic safety and traffic education). Due to their nature, SR2S activities would be led by the PUSD or the Alameda County SR2S program, with support from the City (the City may choose to offer logistical or staff support or limited funding). Similarly, promotional and encouragement activities may be led by outside groups and organizations with support from the City.

- **Safe Routes to School.** Activities under this program would include sponsoring “Walk and Roll to School” days; organizing walking school buses and bike trains (for children to walk or bike to school in a group, escorted by adults); posting online the location and schedule of school crossing guards; analyzing frequently requested locations to determine if they meet State of California criteria for crossing-guard assignments; offering traffic safety education to students; and conducting workshops for parents on SR2S topics, to address objections or concerns.

- **Other safety and education.** Activities would include posting traffic safety and educational messages on the City’s website and other media; creating posters and bumper stickers with Piedmont-specific traffic safety messages for use in City buildings and on City vehicles and making them available to the public for free; deploying speed trailers or signs, as an awareness and educational tool, on streets with a history of speeding complaints; and, as part of neighborhood watch programs, coordinating among residents the use of porch lights in the evening on a street-by-street basis.

- **Enforcement.** Activities would include continuing to maintain on staff at least two full-time traffic-enforcement officers; regularly organizing traffic enforcement campaigns; creating an online form to report chronic traffic problems and to request enforcement action; updating the Engineering and Traffic Speed Zone Survey for the city; and providing a refresher training course for City officers who wish to use the department’s patrol bicycles.

- **Promotion and encouragement.** Activities would include organizing street-closure events in the Civic Center for unprogrammed congregation of residents and recreational activities; adopting official names for the footpaths and stairways and installing plaques or other markers at the entrances; co-sponsoring “energizer stations” on Bike to Work Day to provide free snacks, beverages and small promotional giveaways to cyclists; creating a dedicated section on the City’s website for news, announcements and resources related to walking and biking in Piedmont; and announcing walking and bicycling events and activities on local media and making flyers and brochures available at City Hall.

- **Spot improvements.** Through this program the City would respond to complaint-driven requests for smaller-scale pedestrian and bike improvements, such as installing safety signage and traffic mirrors; restriping crosswalks and bike lanes; and trimming back overgrown vegetation or restricting parking at corners to improve traffic sightlines. The City would also create an online form to report physical hazards and request spot improvements; install accessible pedestrian countdown signals and bike-detection technology at intersections (as traffic signals are upgraded or replaced); continue the City’s current practices on street trees; implement guidelines for the use of less-slippery alternatives to street markings and other street surfaces; adjust the City’s pavement management system to give greater consideration for sealing, resurfacing and repavement project to streets that are designated bikeways; and modify or upgrade storm-drain covers so that so that bike tires can pass safely over the drains, without getting caught.
Policies

As a way of addressing many requests voiced by the public through the needs assessment process, the PBMP recommends that the City develop and adopt two written policies, guiding (i) the installation of crosswalks and stop signs and (ii) the lowering of speed limits. The policy on crosswalks and stop signs would be informed by sound traffic engineering considerations such as traffic speeds and volumes on the streets involved; street grades, widths and other physical characteristics; amount of foot traffic; pedestrian travel paths and crossing patterns; and adequacy of sight lines and stopping sight distances. The policy on speed limits would be informed by the findings of an updated Engineering and Traffic Speed Zone Survey and by other factors and conditions such as accident history, proximity to schools and substandard street width, geometries or sight lines.

Other implementation actions

In addition to the program and policy recommendations listed above, the PBMP recommends a number of smaller-scale actions that the City can take to advance walking and bicycling. These actions are listed below, in the order in which they appear in the PBMP, and are organized under the approximate timeframes recommended for implementation.

- **Near term (Years 2015–2016)**
  - Research the status of footpath and stairway alignments shown on old maps that do not correspond to existing public footpaths and stairways.
  - Request that Bay Area Bike Share install a station in the Grand Avenue commercial district.
  - Install a gate at the bottom of “PE Hill” to allow car access only for service staff with key cards. This action would have to be carried out by the PUSD.

- **Medium term (Years 2017–2019)**
  - Review, conduct minor revisions of, and re-adopt the PBMP in five years (in 2019) to maintain eligibility for Caltrans funding for bike projects.
  - Install additional bike-parking racks at key destinations if needed to meet demand.
  - Pursue public access for passive recreation on the site of the East Bay Municipal Utility District’s reservoir at Blair and Scenic Avenues as part of any redevelopment proposals for the site.
  - If demand justifies it, install bike-parking lockers and showers in the Civic Center for use by City and PUSD staff.

- ** Longer term (Years 2020–2024)**
  - Conduct a comprehensive update of the PBMP within ten years, in 2023–2024.

- **Continuous**
  - Provide annual reports to the Planning Commission acting as the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and to the City Council outlining progress in implementing the PBMP.
  - Continue using the City’s “complete streets” checklist when planning transportation improvements, including the sealing, resurfacing or repavement of streets.
  - Continue using the Piedmont Beautification Foundation as a conduit for private donations for new street triangles, improvements to the city’s footpaths and stairways and other traffic-calming and street-beautification projects.
  - Coordinate with Oakland on the planning, design and funding of inter-city bikeways, particularly on Grand, Moraga and Wildwood Avenues and on Park Boulevard.
## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The 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.

| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agricultural resources | ☐ Air quality |
| ☐ Biological resources | ☐ Cultural resources | ☐ Geology/soils |
| ☐ Hazards and hazardous materials | ☐ Hydrology/water quality | ☐ Land use/planning |
| ☐ Mineral resources | ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/housing |
| ☐ Public services | ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation/traffic |
| ☐ Utilities/service systems | ☐ Greenhouse gases | ☐ 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
September 12, 2014

Kate Black, City Planner
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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 schools, churches, 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 allee of trees along Oakland Avenue, and the city’s churches and schools. Other important landmarks 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 PBMP recommends a number of physical improvements that would have a visual presence. The main ones include sidewalk bulbouts or extensions, new traffic signs, bike lanes and other street markings, and sidewalk railings on the Oakland Avenue bridge, 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?_

The PBMP recommends three types of improvements that could result in new sources of light: (i) at some crosswalks, lighted flashing signs or in-pavement flashing lights; (ii) installation of lights on footpaths and stairways to make it easier to see the path of travel; and (iii) as part of neighborhood watch programs, coordinating among residents the use of porch lights in the evening on a street-by-street basis. All 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 (2004). 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project...</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 of State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Environment

Piedmont is located in the San Francisco Bay Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Direct emissions from motor vehicles are regulated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Although Piedmont does not have major emission sources such as smokestacks or freeways, it is impacted by air pollution from stationary and non-stationary sources throughout the region. Piedmont also contributes to regional air quality problems as residents and employees who drive cars, use gas-powered equipment and electricity, burn wood, barbecue, and perform other routine household activities.

Under federal law, the San Francisco Air Basin is considered a non-attainment area for ozone. 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 Bay Area is considered to be in attainment with the federal standards for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead. Under state law, the Bay Area is considered a non-attainment area for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM_{10}. It 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.

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Board of Directors adopted new CEQA thresholds of significance for air quality impacts. The thresholds are included in the Air District’s updated CEQA Guidelines. The Guidelines address recent changes in air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter (PM) from the State of California and the U.S. EPA. In addition, the new 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 PBMP 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 PBMP does propose two projects that would result in alterations to car traffic: the road diets on portions of Grand Avenue and of Highland Avenue (see page 7 for a description of these projects). As described in more detail in Section XVI, “Transportation / Traffic,” the effects of these projects 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 PBMP are meant to make it easier for people to walk and bike in Piedmont. To the extent that the PBMP encourages some people to walk and bike rather than drive, the plan 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 PBMP 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 (CNDDB), 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 CNDDB.
Additional CNDDB 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 CNDDB 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**

1. 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?

2. 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?

3. 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?

4. 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 PBMP 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:

1. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special-status species;
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community;
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands; or
4. 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.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?

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

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?

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…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 PBMP 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 PBMP does propose the addition of decorative railings along the sidewalk on both sides of the historic Oakland Avenue bridge; however, it is recommended that the railings be historically compatible, and the project would be regulated through the City’s design review process. For these reasons, the PBMP 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…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

**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 geologic 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 Pino (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 2002 Working Group on Earthquake Probabilities, there is a 62 percent chance that the Bay Area will experience an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater between 2003 and 2030. 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.

ABAG’s 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 PBMP 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 PBMP does mention the possibility of rehabilitating Spring Path, between Moraga Avenue and Abbott Way. However, that project would, if anything, be intended to reduce people’s exposure to soil-related hazards by stabilizing the soil in the path alignment. For these reasons, it is not expected that the PBMP 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Environment

The California legislature passed Assembly Bill 32 in 2006, requiring that the state reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. An enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions will be phased in starting in 2012. In addition, Senate Bill 375 seeks to curb GHGs by reducing urban sprawl and vehicle miles traveled. In response to these legislative actions, the City of Piedmont adopted a Climate Action Plan in early 2010 which incorporates strategies to reduce emissions. These strategies include green building, car sharing, transit-oriented development, greater use of renewable energy sources, more efficient water use, energy and water conservation, urban forestry, expanded use of hybrid vehicles, additional recycling and waste diversion programs, and improvements to pedestrian and bicycle networks, among others.

Discussion

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

The PBMP 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 by the PBMP would be expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging some people to walk or bike instead of drive.

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

The PBMP does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation designed to reduce emission of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 PBMP does not involve elements or components of a nature associated with hazardous materials. The PBMP 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 PBMP 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…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐
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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
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 inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow? ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

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 Creek, 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 Clean Water Program. There are no monitoring stations in Piedmont and no specific hot spots have been identified in the city. Regular water quality testing is also done in Lake Merritt. Public Works Department staff completes regular reports to the Alameda County Clean Water Program and also coordinates the ACCWP’s local outreach efforts. These efforts have included a citywide storm drain stenciling campaign to discourage illicit discharges.
Piedmont has adopted a stormwater ordinance to regulate discharges to the storm drainage system and implement pollution control measures (Chapter 31 of the Municipal Code). The ordinance prohibits most 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.

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. The City adopted a flood plain ordinance in 2006, but its intent was to ensure continued eligibility for federal disaster relief funds, rather than to address imminent flood hazards.

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 Dinge 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 Dinge 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.

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 PBMP 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 PBMP 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 vacant PG&E site. 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. An estimated 90 lots—or about two percent of the total—also contain a legal secondary unit. Only 21 lots in the city are developed with multi-family housing. These lots comprise three acres of land and contain 78 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 one residence on one lot and the second lot used as a yard or lawn area. Some of these lots are developable, but most are too small or are impractically configured for development.

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 bath products 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, 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 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 PBMP does not involve elements or components of a size, scale or nature to physically divide a community. The PBMP does propose “road diets” on portions of Grand Avenue and Highland Avenue. Grand Avenue north of the city border to Greenbank Avenue, and 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 turn lane in the middle and, on Highland Avenue, possibly a landscaped median. The parking lanes would remain as they are. If anything, these projects 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 PBMP 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…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 PBMP 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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, 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 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 Ldn run along Grand, Moraga, and Highland Avenues and along Park Boulevard. Contours in the range of 60 dBA LN, 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 Ldn.

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 PBMP does not involve elements or components—such as new residential development, for example—that would permanently increase noise levels. The PBMP 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 PBMP 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Environment

Piedmont’s population is approximately 11,000. The City contains about 3,810 households and has an average household size of about 2.90. The City’s population has remained stable since 1960, when it peaked at 11,117 residents. 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 (43.7) 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 79 percent White, 16 percent Asian, 1 percent Black, 3 percent Multi-racial, and 1 percent “Other.” Approximately 3 percent of the population is of Hispanic origin. 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 PBMP does not involve elements or components of a nature to:

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

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### XIV. Public Services

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affected Environment

**Fire protection**

The Piedmont Fire Station is located within City Hall at 120 Vista Avenue. Fire-fighting equipment includes two engines, one 65’ aerial ladder truck, two ambulances (one front line and one reserve), one utility truck, and one command vehicle. Ambulances are usually replaced at five-year intervals due to the frequency of use. The full-time professional staff of 25 includes a chief, three captains, three lieutenants, three engineers, ten firefighter/paramedics, and five firefighters. 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.

**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, two captains, four sergeants and thirteen patrol officers) and eight non-sworn personnel (five dispatchers, two animal control officers and one administrative assistant). The force is supplemented by Reserve Officers and volunteers. The Department is organized in three divisions: Administration (which includes the Chief of Police), Operations, and Support Services. The Piedmont Police Department handles an average of 27 Calls per day, or a monthly average of about 840 calls. To improve patrol effectiveness, 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 mission of the Piedmont Police Department 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, car seat inspection, 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-site evidence and found property. Police operations are supplemented by Neighborhood Watch programs and Police Reserves programs. Ongoing training and education is an essential part of the Department’s mission and is required of all personnel. 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 and new technology and communication equipment, but the floor area available has remained the same. While there are no plans to relocate, options for reconfiguring the existing space have been explored.

**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.

**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 the former Christian Scientist Church 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 PBMP 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 PBMP
does recommend, if demand justifies it, installing additional bike-parking racks at key destinations and bike-
parking lockers and showers somewhere in the Civic Center for use by City and PUSD staff. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affected Environment

A description of the city’s parks and other recreation facilities is provided in the previous section, “Public Services.” Although Piedmont has 5.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, the General Plan indicates 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 studying options to reduce the deficiency and it regularly undertakes other recreation-related improvements, as the annual budget allows.

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 PBMP 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 PBMP might encourage some people to visit parks and other recreational facilities by making it easier to walk or bike to them. 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 PBMP 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 PBMP 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project...</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 47 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 declined on most of the city’s major streets since 1994, and had only 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, 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), average daily traffic volumes on the Grand Avenue corridor through Piedmont are projected to increase almost 30 percent between 2000 and 2030. Volumes on Oakland Avenue are projected to increase about 10 percent, and volumes on Moraga Avenue are projected to increase 18 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 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 17 percent of Piedmont’s employed residents carpool to work, one of the highest percentages in Alameda County. Much of the activity consists of “casual” carpoolsing 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.

At the present time, there are no officially designated bike routes in the City of Piedmont except for on a short section of Grand Avenue. The City has periodically considered such designations, but liability, safety, and engineering concerns have intervened. There remains a high level of interest in official bike route designations among Piedmont residents.

Walking is also a fundamental mode of transportation and is part of the daily routine of many Piedmont residents. 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.”

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 traffic, the PBMP is more likely to reduce traffic by encouraging some people to walk or bike rather drive for certain trips. The PBMP does include two projects that would reduce car capacity: “road diets” on portions of Grand Avenue and of Highland Avenue. To make it safer and easier for pedestrians to cross and to create room for bike lanes, Grand Avenue north of the city border to Greenbank Avenue, and 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 two-way left-turn lane in the center. The parking lanes would remain as they are.
To evaluate the impact of the proposed road diets on traffic flow, the “level of service” (LOS) was considered under the existing conditions and with the proposed lane reconfiguration at the three signalized intersections that would be affected:

- Grand Avenue and Wildwood Avenue in Oakland
- Grand Avenue and Oakland Avenue
- Highland Avenue and Oakland Avenue

LOS analysis is a means of determining the ability of an intersection to accommodate traffic volumes. The analysis is based on intersection street geometrics, traffic controls and traffic maneuvers. The analysis produces an indication of the level of service at which an intersection is functioning or is expected to function under future conditions. LOS is defined by letters ranging from A to F, with A representing traffic operating conditions with little or no delay for drivers and F characterizing significant delay (see table at right). LOS A–D are usually considered acceptable, while LOS E is considered representative of conditions for which improvements are needed. LOS F conditions are typically unacceptable and indicate that improvements may be needed in the form of traffic control, geometric changes or a combination of both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Avg. delay (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>10–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>20–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>35–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>55–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>More than 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to conduct the LOS analysis, turning movement counts were conducted at the three intersections listed above on Tuesday, August 12, 2014 during the afternoon peak hours of 4-6 pm and on Tuesday, August 19, 2014 during the morning peak hours of 8-10 am. Synchro, a software program that implements the methods of Highway Capacity Manual for signalized and unsignalized intersection, was utilized to analyze and provide the LOS and average delay for each traffic movement, approach and intersection. Only the number of through lanes on Highland and on Grand Avenues were changed for this analysis. Signal timings and all other lane configurations, such as turning lanes on side streets, remain the same in the existing and proposed conditions. Since the counts were conducted before the beginning of the school year, the actual, recorded volumes were increased for the LOS analysis to account for seasonally lower traffic volumes. Volumes were increased by 20% in the AM peak hour (since this period overlaps with school arrival times) and by 5% in the PM peak hour (which occurs after school has been dismissed but while students may be being picked up or dropped off from after-school activities).

The table on the next page shows the existing and proposed LOS for each intersection movement and the associated average delay in seconds. The City of Piedmont does not have formally adopted significance thresholds for CEQA purposes. In the absence of such thresholds, a significant impact for congestion would be if LOS goes from D to E or F or is already at E or F. At the Grand Avenue/Wildwood Avenue intersection in Oakland, the existing overall LOS is B. With the proposed road diet, the overall LOS remains at B during both peak hours. There are increases in delay on all the Grand Avenue approaches, but these tend to be of less than 5 seconds. There is one turning movement where existing LOS is D, off Jean Street in Oakland, but with the road diet the average delay increases by only 1 second during both peak hours. These impacts are considered less than significant.

At the Grand Avenue/Oakland Avenue intersection, the existing overall LOS is at B. With the proposed road diet, the overall LOS remains at B during the morning peak hour, with some minor increases in delay of 5-10 seconds. During the afternoon peak hour, the proposed LOS changes to C, though average delay increases by only 5 seconds. The most noticeable changes occur on the northbound and southbound Grand Avenue approaches, where LOS changes from B to C for all movements, with delays generally of 10-20 seconds. (This condition might be improved with changes to the signal timing, to balance green time during the cycle length.) Again, these impacts are considered less than significant. It is worth noting that delays for several movements at this intersection in the PM peak hour actually decrease.
The existing overall LOS for the Highland Avenue/Oakland Avenue intersection is at level B during both peak hours. With the proposed road diet, the overall LOS remains the same, though delay increases by 1 second in the afternoon peak hours. LOS for the various approaches also remain the same, with delays increasing by 3 seconds or less depending on the approach. Again, these impacts are considered less than significant.

As discussed above and shown in the table, the proposed road diets on portions of Grand and Highland Avenues would increase average delays for some intersection movements and would change overall LOS at one intersection from B to C. However, these delays would not be considered significant. In no case does LOS degrade to D, E or F and in the one case where the existing LOS is D—eastbound Jean Street, at the Grand Avenue/Wildwood Avenue intersection—average delay increases by only 1 second.
Under the proposed road diet, there might be times when the parking lot at the ACE Hardware store is full, that cars move into the bike lane as they wait to enter the parking lot. This would force cyclists to leave the bike lane and momentarily use the general-travel lane. This is a common maneuver for cyclists and would occur only occasionally, so it is not considered a significant impact.

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 PBMP includes projects that would cause a number of streets and intersections to be redesigned to varying extents. These projects include sidewalk bulbouts or extensions, road diets on portions of Grand and Highland Avenues, bike lanes and sharrows (see pages 7–8 for a description of these projects). These projects are meant to improve safety for 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.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The PBMP 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 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.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

The PBMP does not involve any elements or components that would substantially increase the need for parking or reduce its supply. The plan does recommend removing parking spaces at intersections with blind corners or poor or obstructed sightlines in order to enable drivers, pedestrians and cyclists to see each other more easily. This would not be considered a significant impact, as it would be done on a location-specific basis in consultation with residents and would affect very few parking spaces at any one location and, overall, a very small fraction of the city’s parking supply. On the other hand, the PBMP 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 PBMP would not conflict with any such policies, plans or programs. In fact, the PBMP 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).

Mitigation Measures

None required.
XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project…

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

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?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

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?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

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?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  
   - Potentially significant impact: ☐  
   - Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated: ☐  
   - Less than significant impact: ☐  
   - No impact: ☑

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 deepwater 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 December 2007, 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 and is landfilled at the Potrero Hills Landfill near Suisun City (or sorted for recycling and reuse in Richmond). A plan to expand the capacity of the landfill through 2049 has been prepared.

**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 2010. The City’s contract with Republic Services requires the Countywide diversion goals to be met. The City has implemented recycling programs, green waste programs, composting and mulching programs, school and government source reduction programs, special collection events, electronic waste (e-waste) collection programs, and public educational programs to achieve this goal. In 2008, the range of recyclables was expanded to include a variety of plastic products and organic wastes (e.g., food scraps). The City has also adopted a construction and demolition debris ordinance, with mandatory provisions to reduce construction waste.

**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 PBMP 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project...</th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have impacts that are individually limited buy 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The PBMP 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, 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.
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