DUMBARTON TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT SPECIFIC PLAN

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(State Clearinghouse No. 2010042012)

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

July 2011

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This statement of findings addresses the potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan located in Alameda County, California and are made pursuant to Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which provide that:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines further stipulates that:

(b) A public agency shall not decide to approve or carry out a project for which an EIR was prepared unless either:

(1) The project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or

(2) The agency has:

(A) Eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible as shown in findings under Section 15091, and

(B) Determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Section 15093.

According to Section 15093 if the CEQA Guidelines:

a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in

the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

As required by CEQA, the City of Newark (City), in adopting these findings, must also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. The MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

Whenever these findings specifically refer to and adopt a mitigation measure that will avoid or mitigate a potentially significant impact, that specific mitigation measure is hereby made a Condition of Approval of the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan project.

1.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan provides a comprehensive policy and regulatory framework to guide future development and redevelopment within the approximately 205-acre Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan establishes the allowable land uses, development regulations, design guidelines, necessary infrastructure improvements, and an implementation plan to direct future development and redevelopment of the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area. Implementation of the Specific Plan will result in a mix of residential, office, retail, parks and recreational open space uses. The following table provides a summary of the land use distribution within the Specific Plan area.

Land Use/Zoning Designation	**Total**
Maximum Residential Units	2,500 units
Low Density Residential (LDR)	16.8 acres
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	67.9 acres
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	59.3 acres
High Density Residential (HDR)	5.0 acres
Retail (R)	5.0 acres (35,000 square feet)
Commercial (C)	7.2 acres (195,000 square feet)
Transit Station (TS)	6.1 acres (including parking areas)
Parks and Open Space (POS)	16.3 acres (including parkland provided through the City's Parks Ordinance)
Miscellaneous (M)	23.1 acres
TOTAL	**206.7 acres**

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH) Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on March 31, 2011. The NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested parties for a 30-day public review period, which extended from March 31 to April 30, 2011.

A Notice of Completion (NOC) of the Draft EIR was filed with the SCH OPR on May 18, 2011. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period, which ended on July 1, 2011. During this public review period, the City received written comments on the Draft EIR. Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency responsible for the preparation of an EIR evaluate comments on environmental issues received from parties who reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare a written response addressing each of the comments. A Final EIR was prepared for the project, which assembles in one document all of the environmental information and analysis prepared for the project, including comments on the information and analysis contained in the Draft EIR and responses by the City to those comments.

Pursuant to Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following:

(a) The Draft EIR, including all of its appendices.

(b) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.

(c) Copies of all letters received by the City during the Draft EIR public review period and responses to significant environmental points concerning the Draft EIR raised in the review and consultation process.

(d) Revisions to the Draft EIR.

(e) Any other information added by the lead agency.

2.0 CEQA FINDING OF INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT

The City is the lead agency with respect to the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan pursuant to the Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines. As noted above, Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation for the rationale for each finding. The Final EIR for the project identified potentially significant effects that could result from project implementation. However, the City finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less than significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less than significant levels are overridden due to specific project benefits identified in a Statement of Overriding Considerations provided below in Section 7.0.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City adopts these findings as part of its approval of the project. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the City also finds that the Final EIR reflects the City's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

3.0 ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

The record, upon which all findings and determinations related to the approval of the project are based, includes the following:

- The EIR and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the EIR.
- All prior and present information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Commission and City Council relating to the EIR, the approvals, and the project.
- All prior and present information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission and City Council by the project sponsor and consultants.
- All final applications, letters, testimony, exhibits, and presentations presented by the project sponsor and consultants to the City in connection with the project.
- All final information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any City public hearing or City workshop related to the project and the EIR.
- For documentary and information purposes, all City-adopted land use plans and ordinances, including without limitation the general plan, specific plans and ordinances, together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs and other documentation relevant to planned growth in the area.
- The MMRP for the project.
- All other documents composing the record pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).
- The custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the City's decisions are based is Terrence Grindall, Community Development Director, or his designee. Such documents and other materials are located at the Newark Community Development Department, 37101 Newark Boulevard, Newark, CA 94560.

4.0 FINDINGS OF FACT

The following sections make detailed findings with respect to the potential effects of the project and refer, where appropriate, to the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the MMRP to avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant adverse impacts of the project. The EIR and the administrative record concerning the project provide additional facts in support of the findings herein. The Final EIR is hereby incorporated into these findings in its entirety. Furthermore, the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the MMRP are incorporated by reference in these findings. The MMRP was developed in compliance with Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines and is provided under separate cover.

4.1 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGABLE IMPACTS

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091(a)(1) and 15092(b), and to the extent reflected in the EIR and the MMRP, the City finds that changes or alterations have been required to, or incorporated into, the components of the project to mitigate or avoid potentially significant effects on the environment. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts have been determined to fall within the category of impacts that can be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures set forth below.

- Air Quality (potential impacts resulting from air pollutant emissions during short-term construction activities and long-term project operations)
- Biological Resources (potential impacts to salt marsh harvest mouse, nesting raptors, western burrowing owl, tricolored blackbird, salt marsh common yellowthroat and other nesting passerine birds, special-status plant species, wetlands and waters of the U.S./State, and protected trees)
- Cultural Resources (potential impacts to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains)

- Geology and Soils (potential impacts resulting from seismic risk, soil erosion, unstable soil and expansive soil)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (potential impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (potential impacts associated with accidental release or exposure to hazardous materials)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (potential impacts associated with erosion and/or siltation, on or offsite flooding, exceedance of storm drainage system capacity and additional sources of polluted runoff)
- Noise (potential impacts resulting from short-term increases in noise and ground-borne vibration during construction, exposure of future residential uses to noise from future commuter train service, and long-term increases in traffic noise)
- Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems (potential impacts to existing wastewater conveyance facilities)
- Traffic (potential impacts resulting from the deterioration of the level of service at several intersections)

4.1.1 Air Quality

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts from air pollutant emissions during construction activities and long-term project operations is found in Section 4.2 (Air Quality) of the Draft EIR.

Construction activities during development allowed by the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan would result in fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) emissions, exhaust from the operation of vehicles and equipment on the project site, and additional dust from grading and hauling activities associated with site preparation. It is possible that asbestos-containing materials exist in buildings that may be modified or demolished and naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) has been identified within the project area.

The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan includes space for a future multi-modal transit station that would include commuter train service. Based on the land use plan, residential uses have the potential to be located in proximity to the transit station. Diesel trains are a common source of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions and require adequate buffers and/or other mitigation.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which would mitigate or avoid potential impacts from air pollutant emissions during construction activities and long-term project operations as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Short-term air quality impacts during construction will be less than significant with implementation Mitigation Measures 4.2-1a and 4.2-1b, which require implementation of Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) "basic" and "additional" measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction. Long-term impacts associated with the proximity of the future transit station to residential uses will be mitigated to

less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-2, which requires a minimum of 1,000 feet between the future transit station and residential uses or filtered air supply systems.

4.1.2 Biological Resources

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts to special-status species, nesting birds and raptors, wetlands and waters of the U.S./State, and protected trees is found in Section 4.3 (Biological Resources) of the Draft EIR.

The salt marsh harvest mouse is a federal and state listed endangered species. It is found in salt marsh habitats that are dominated by pickleweed. Parcels within the project area that will be developed contain pickleweed that could support the salt marsh harvest mouse. Suitable nesting habitat for white-tailed kite, red-tailed hawk, northern harrier and western burrowing owl occurs within the project area. Common passerine birds and other birds with special-status, such as the tricolored blackbird and salt marsh common yellowthroat, could be impacted by future development activities within the project area, including loss of nesting habitat, disturbance to nesting birds and death of adults and/or young. The project area provides suitable habitat for special-status plants, which could be impacted by the project. Future development within the project area will result in the fill of wetlands and waters of the U.S./State, and the removal of trees protected by the City's Municipal Code. Project-related impacts would be cumulatively considerable when combined with other projects in the region.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts to special-status species, nesting birds and raptors, wetlands and waters of the U.S./State, and protected trees as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Potential impacts to the salt marsh harvest mouse will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-1, which requires preparation of a Habitat Assessment to determine presence of suitable habitat and pre-construction measures. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-2 through 4.3-4 requiring pre-construction nesting surveys, appropriate non-disturbance buffers and a Mitigation Plan (for the western burrowing owl), if nests are identified, will reduce impacts to nesting raptors, the western burrowing owl and nesting passerine birds to less than significant. Potential impacts to special-status plant species will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-5, which requires pre-construction plant surveys and implementation of specific measures, if special-status plants are found. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-6, requiring a wetland delineation, if not already completed, verification of the delineation by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), authorization of any fill of wetlands and/or waters of the U.S./State, and mitigation compensation, will reduce impacts to wetlands and/or waters of the U.S./State to less than significant. Potential impacts to protected trees will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-8, which requires a tree permit, tree replacement at a 1:1 ratio and a Tree Management Plan. Implementation of mitigation for project-related impacts would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant.

4.1.3 Cultural Resources

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts on historical, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains is found in Section 4.4 (Cultural Resources) of the Draft EIR.

There are no recorded archaeological resources, including prehistoric sites and no recorded, reported or known Native American sites located in, adjacent or near the project area. In addition, no historic resources have been formally recorded or reported. Nevertheless, given the location of the project area adjacent to historic salt marshlands at the edge of San Francisco Bay, the area is considered to be moderately sensitive for archaeological resources, including historic resources and human remains. Thus, ground disturbing activities have the potential to damage or destroy unknown cultural resources. Although no paleontological resources are known to exist in the project area and it has a low sensitivity for such resources, the presence of unknown paleontological resources cannot be ruled out. Ground disturbing activities have the potential to damage or destroy unknown paleontological resources. Project-related impacts would be cumulatively considerable when combined with other projects in the region.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid the potential impacts on historical, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Potential impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains will be less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1a, which requires training of construct crews on the mechanisms used to identify cultural resources and to caution them on the implications of knowingly destroying cultural resources or removing artifacts or human remains from the project area. This mitigation measure also includes specific steps to take should subsurface deposits believed to be cultural and human in origin are discovered. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b, requiring the evaluation of existing buildings or structures or the Union Pacific Railroad corridor that will be affected by the project for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, will reduce impacts to historical resources to less than significant. Implementation of mitigation for project-related impacts would reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant.

4.1.4 Geology and Soils

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts associated with seismic risk, soil erosion, unstable soil and expansive soil is found in Section 4.5 (Geology and Soils) of the Draft EIR.

Future development within the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area will involve construction of structures in a seismically active region. Consequently, the project area will likely experience moderate ground shaking during earthquakes occurring on offsite faults and secondary events such as liquefaction or landslides that

could expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death. Vegetation removal and grading associated with future development within the project area will expose soil and increase the potential for soil erosion from wind or stormwater runoff. Soil conditions within the project area have the potential for differential settlement that could damage structures. In addition, the project area is underlain by clayey, expansive soil that has a high shrink/swell potential that could damage structures.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts associated with seismic risk, soil erosion, unstable soil and expansive soil as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Potential impacts associated with ground shaking, seismic-related liquefaction and landslides, soil erosion, unstable soil and expansive soil will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1, which requires preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation for individual properties within the project area prior to their development and implementation of recommended construction measures identified in the investigation. In addition, Mitigation Measures 4.5-2 and 4.5-3 require coordination with the Alameda County Water District (ACWD) to ensure compliance with ACWD Ordinance No. 2010-01

4.1.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is found in Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the Draft EIR.

The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan is part of a regional effort to reduce vehicle trips and GHG emissions, support transit and enhance the quality of life in the region. It is a Priority Development Area as a part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy development. Although the project will generate GHG emissions, sustainable practices will be incorporated into the project design, including water, energy, solid waste, and transportation efficiency measures to reduce project GHG emissions to 27.92 percent below the business as usual scenario.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts related to GHG emissions as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-1, which will ensure that proposed project design features are incorporated in future development plans, will reduce impacts to less than significant.

4.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts associated with hazardous materials sites and accidental release of hazardous materials is found in Section 4.7 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of the Draft EIR.

Eight properties within the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area are known to have contaminated groundwater and soils. For all eight properties, soil and water sampling have been performed through contaminant testing and disclosure documentation. Mitigations associated with remediation of properties have been identified and appropriate pollutant thresholds that need to be achieved prior to development have been established. In addition, use of hazardous materials in the project area after construction may create a hazard if accidentally released into the environment.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts associated with hazardous materials sites and accidental release of hazardous materials as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Potential impacts associated with development on sites with known contaminated groundwater and soil and accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment will be reduced to less than significant with adherence to federal, state and local standards and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-1a through 4.7-1e. Mitigation Measure 4.7-1a requires the property owner to: 1) summarize available information regarding soil and groundwater contamination; 2) perform a data gap analysis; 3) determine whether any additional investigation is needed; 4) provide either a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) or Feasibility Study (FS); 5) based on the HRA or as set forth in the FS, develop remedial options to address the identified risks; and 6) submit a report to the Oversight Agency. Remedial action plans, risk management plans and health and safety plans will be required as determined by the Oversight Agency for a given property, if not already completed, to prevent an unacceptable risk to human health, including workers during and after construction.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-1b requires areas that will be graded to be cleared of debris, significant vegetation, pre-existing abandoned utilities, buried structures and asphalt concrete and Mitigation Measure 4.7-1c requires testing of import soil needed for future development for toxic substances. Mitigation Measure 4.7-1d requires areas within the project area with NOA to be confirmed, any necessary permits obtained from the BAAQMD, and implementation of dust control measures and an NOA air monitoring program. Mitigation Measure 4.7-1e provides guidance for development of properties where NOA is known to occur.

4.1.7 Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts associated with erosion and/or siltation, on or offsite flooding, exceedance of storm drainage system capacity and additional sources of polluted runoff is found in Section 4.8 (Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR.

Future development within the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area will involve vegetation removal, grading, and the construction of buildings, roads, sidewalks, driveways and parking lots, which will alter existing drainage patterns and increase the potential for erosion and/or siltation. The project will also result in changes to absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the corresponding rate and amount of surface runoff that could cause flooding on or offsite, exceed the capacity of the existing storm drainage system and provide additional sources of polluted runoff. Portions of the project area that are located north of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) right-of-way will likely require crossings of the Hetch Hetchy Pipeline. Any proposed crossings will need to be verified to ensure that there is sufficient depth to allow the storm drainage lines to pass over the pipeline.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts associated with erosion and/or siltation, on or offsite flooding, exceedance of storm drainage system capacity and additional sources of polluted runoff as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-4a, which requires preparation of detailed site-specific hydrology reports, and compliance with the requirements of the General Permit and other federal, state and local policies and regulations, will reduce impacts associated with on or offsite flooding or increased amounts of polluted runoff to less than significant. New development will need to construct adequately sized storm drainage facilities to convey onsite surface water runoff to existing storm drainage facilities. These facilities will be designed to carry stormwater at buildout of the individual development sites, and will be subject to City and Alameda Flood Control District review to verify that they are designed to accommodate increased flows, which will reduce potential impacts associated with the capacity of the existing storm drainage system to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8-4b, which requires future projects requiring storm drainage lines and water mains that cross the Hetch Hetchy Pipeline to include measures to ensure that there is sufficient room for the storm drainage lines to pass over the pipeline (i.e., placement of additional fill), will reduce impacts to less than significant.

4.1.8 Noise

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the potential impacts resulting from short-term increases in noise and ground-borne vibration during construction, exposure of future residential uses to noise from future commuter train service, and long-term increases in traffic noise is found in Section 4.10 (Noise) of the Draft EIR.

Construction activities during future development allowed by the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will expose surrounding sensitive receptors to noise and ground-borne vibration. The project will provide space for a multi-modal transit station that will include commuter train service. Trains have the potential produce noise levels in excess of the normally acceptable land use compatibility standards for residential uses that will be located adjacent to the transit corridor. During operation, development within the project area will result in additional traffic on adjacent roadways, thereby increasing vehicular noise in the vicinity of the existing and proposed land uses and resulting in offsite noise impacts. When combined with other projects, the increase in traffic noise will be cumulatively considerable.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts resulting from short-term increases in noise and ground-borne vibration during construction, exposure of future residential uses to noise from future commuter train service, and long-term increases in traffic noise as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10-1a and 4.10-1b will reduce construction noise impacts to less than significant, while vibration associated with construction will be reduced to less than significant by Mitigation Measure 4.10-2. Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a requires construction contractors to implement a noise reduction program, including limitations on the hours of construction, noise control techniques for equipment and trucks, use of hydraulically or electronically powered impact tools wherever possible, stationary noise sources located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and the noisiest phases of construction limited to ten days at a time, when feasible. Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b requires submission to the City Building Inspection Division of a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise, ongoing throughout demolition, grading and construction. Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 requires noise control measures if pile driving is necessary for building construction.

Potential noise impacts from commuter trains on future residential uses will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-3, which requires preparation of an Acoustical Assessment to demonstrate that exterior and interior noise levels are consistent with applicable land use compatibility standards. Measures (e.g., attenuation barriers, acoustically rated windows, upgraded insulation, etc.) will be implemented where conditions exceed the normally acceptable noise exposure level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-4, requiring the posted speed limit on Willow Street to be 35 miles per hour, will reduce offsite vehicular noise impacts to less than significant.

4.1.9 Public Services and Utilities

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of potential impacts on existing wastewater conveyance facilities is found in Section 4.12 (Public Services and Utilities) of the Draft EIR.

Existing sewer pipelines that will serve the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan area may not be sized to accommodate project buildout. In addition, dual 33-inch sewage force mains under the project area will likely

require structural upgrades or relocation as a result of future development. A 14-inch gravity sewer line in Enterprise Drive may also require structural upgrades.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential impacts on existing wastewater conveyance facilities as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Impacts to existing wastewater conveyance facilities will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12-2, which requires installation of any necessary improvements, beyond those already included in the Union Sanitary District Master Plan and updated fee program.

4.1.10 Traffic

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the potential traffic impacts is found in Section 4.14 (Traffic) of the Draft EIR.

The addition of project traffic to the existing roadway network will cause operations to degrade from an acceptable level of service (LOS) (i.e., LOS C or better) to unacceptable LOS D, E or F, or it would exacerbate unacceptable operations by increasing the average intersection delay by four or more seconds at the following three intersections:

1. Willow Street/Thornton Avenue
2. Willow Street/Enterprise Drive
3. Cherry Street/Mowry Avenue

In addition, the Willow Street/Enterprise Drive intersection also meets peak-hour signal warrants during the AM and PM peak hours.

The addition of project traffic under future year 2035 (cumulative) conditions will cause intersection LOS to degrade from acceptable to unacceptable or exacerbate operations by increasing the average delay by four or more seconds at the following five intersections:

1. Gateway Boulevard/Thornton Avenue
2. Willow Street/Thornton Avenue
3. Willow Street/Enterprise Drive
4. Cherry Street/Mowry Avenue
5. I-880 NB Ramps/Mowry Avenue

The Willow Street/Enterprise Drive intersection also meets peak-hour signal warrants during the AM and PM peak hours.

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which mitigate or avoid potential traffic impacts as identified in the Final EIR. The City further finds that the change or alteration in the project or the requirement to impose the mitigation as a condition of project approval is within the jurisdiction of the City to require, and that this mitigation is appropriate and feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings

Impacts to the intersections of Willow Street/Thornton Avenue, Willow Street/Enterprise Drive and Cherry Street/Mowry Avenue under existing plus project conditions will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1, which requires construction of specific improvements identified in the Final EIR at each intersection. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.14-6, which requires construction of specific improvements identified in the Final EIR at the intersections of Gateway Boulevard/Thornton Avenue, Willow Street/Thornton Avenue, Willow Street/Enterprise Drive, Cherry Street/Mowry Avenue and I-880 NB Ramps/Mowry Avenue, will reduce impacts at each intersection under future year 2035 conditions to less than significant.

4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT ARE CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

This section identifies the significant and unavoidable impacts that require a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued by the City, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts would be significant and unavoidable:

- Traffic (degrade an acceptable intersection LOS to an unacceptable LOS under existing plus project conditions at one intersection, increase demand on transit service, degrade acceptable LOS at five intersections to unacceptable LOS under future year 2035 conditions, and degrade operations on five roadway segments under future year 2035 conditions.

4.2.1 Traffic

Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

An evaluation of potential traffic impacts is found in Section 4.14 (Traffic) of the Draft EIR.

The addition of project traffic to existing conditions would cause the intersection LOS at Cedar Boulevard/Thornton Ave to degrade from acceptable to unacceptable during the PM peak hour and exacerbate operations by increasing the average delay by four or more seconds during the AM peak hour.
The project's increased demand for transit service may not be met by Dumbarton Rail Corridor (DRC) project, as the future of the DRC project is uncertain and improved bus service to the Specific Plan area cannot be guaranteed, as it is under the jurisdiction of Alameda County (AC) Transit.

The addition of project traffic under future year 2035 conditions will cause intersection LOS to degrade from acceptable to unacceptable or exacerbate operations by increasing the average delay by four or more seconds at the following five intersections:

1. SR-84 Eastbound Ramps/Thornton Avenue

2. Cherry Street/Thornton Avenue
3. Newark Boulevard/Thornton Avenue
4. Cedar Boulevard/Thornton Avenue
5. Cherry Street/Central Avenue

The addition of project traffic under future year 2035 conditions will also degrade operations on the following five roadway segments:

1. I-880, from SR 84 Eastbound to Thornton Avenue
2. I-880, from Mowry Avenue to Stevenson Boulevard
3. Thornton Avenue, from Willow Street to Spruce Street
4. Thorton Avenue, from Spruce Street to Cherry Street
5. Thorton Avenue, from Cedar Boulevard to I-880 Southbound Ramps

Findings

The City finds that, pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Findings

Impacts to the intersection of Cedar Boulevard/Thornton Avenue would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 requiring an additional westbound left turn lane from Thornton Avenue to Cedar Boulevard. While no project traffic is added directly to this movement, the addition of this lane would improve overall intersection operations. However, due to the limited right-of-way available along Thornton Avenue and potential secondary impacts (such as increased pedestrian crossing distances), this is not feasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 requiring the City to coordinate with AC Transit to improve bus service to the Specific Plan area would reduce impacts to less than significant. However, ultimate implementation would be under AC Transit's jurisdiction and cannot be guaranteed. Thus, the impact is significant and unavoidable.

An additional eastbound right turn lane on the SR 84 Eastbound Off-Ramp at the intersection of SR 84 Eastbound Ramps/Thornton Avenue would mitigate the impact at this intersection to less than significant. However, this intersection is outside of the City's jurisdiction. SR 84 is a Caltrans-controlled facility, and implementation of this mitigation measure cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

As identified in Mitigation Measure 4.14-6, the following improvements would mitigate impacts under future year 2035 conditions at the five intersections list above but are infeasible for the reasons stated:

- An additional eastbound right turn lane on Thornton Avenue would mitigate the impact at the intersection of Cherry Street/Thornton Avenue. However, due to the built out nature of the City, limited right-of-way is available at the intersection. The City would need to exercise eminent domain to obtain the right-of-way, resulting in impacts to the land owner on the southwest corner of the intersection. Additionally, potential secondary impacts (such as increased pedestrian crossing distances and impacts to bicyclists in the corridor) would occur with the improvement. Therefore, this improvement is not feasible and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

- An additional northbound left turn lane on Newark Boulevard to accommodate the heavy left turn movement would mitigate the impact at the intersection of Newark Boulevard/Thornton Avenue. While no project traffic is added directly to this movement, the addition of this lane would improve overall intersection operations. However, due to the built out nature of the City, limited right-of-way is available at the intersection. The City would need to exercise eminent domain to obtain the right-of-way, resulting in impacts to the land owners on the southeast and southwest corners of the intersection. Additionally, potential secondary impacts (such as increased pedestrian crossing distances and impacts to bicyclists in the corridor) would occur with the improvement. Therefore, this improvement is not feasible and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

- An additional westbound left turn lane on Thornton Avenue to accommodate the high left turn demand would mitigate the impact at the intersection of Cedar Boulevard/Thornton Avenue. While no project traffic is added directly to this movement, the addition of this lane would improve overall intersection operations. However, due to the built out nature of the City, limited right-of-way is available at the intersection. The City would need to exercise eminent domain to obtain the right-of-way, resulting in impacts to the land owners on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection. Additionally, potential secondary impacts (such as increased pedestrian crossing distances and impacts to bicyclists in the corridor) would occur with the improvement. Therefore, this improvement is not feasible and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

- An additional eastbound right turn lane on Central Avenue would mitigate the impact at the intersection of Cherry Street/Central Avenue. However, due to the built out nature of the City, limited right-of-way is available at the intersection. The City would need to exercise eminent domain to obtain the right-of-way, resulting in impacts to the land owner on the southwest corner of the intersection. Additionally, potential secondary impacts (such as increased pedestrian crossing distances and impacts to bicyclists in the corridor) would occur with the improvement. Therefore, this improvement is not feasible and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation for impacts to the five roadway segment listed above would require adding travel lanes and widening roadways throughout the City. As the City is built out, there is little opportunity to widen roadways within the available right-of-way. Therefore, any widening would require property acquisition. Widening of Thornton Avenue could also result in secondary impacts to bicyclists and pedestrians by creating longer crossing distances and creating a less comfortable environment for walking or bicycling. Additionally, four of the impacted roadway segments (on I-880 and SR 84) are Caltrans facilities, and not within the City's jurisdiction. Funding and construction of any necessary improvements is uncertain. Due to the number of affected properties and financial implications, along with the fact that the project cannot legally be conditioned upon the construction of improvements over land over which neither the applicant or the City has control, mitigation for roadway segment impacts is infeasible. Mitigation Measure 4.14-8 requiring the payment of all applicable transportation-related fees will partially mitigate the impacts of the Specific Plan. However, since the fee programs will not fully fund all the mitigation necessary, the impact to roadway segments is significant and unavoidable.

Overriding Considerations

The environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh and override these potentially significant adverse impacts as more fully described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, set forth in Section 7.0 below.

5.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS THAT MAKE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN EIR INFEASIBLE

Based on the entire record, the City finds that the EIR identified and considered a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project which are capable, to varying degrees, of reducing identified impacts. The EIR evaluated three alternatives in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, including:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Build
- Alternative 2: High Density Residential
- Alternative 3: Medium-High Density Residential

5.1 NO PROJECT/NO BUILD

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative (Alternative 1), the development and redevelopment which would be established by the Specific Plan, namely, a mix of residential, office, retail, public/quasi-public and park and open space uses would not occur. The General Plan would not be amended, the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan would not be adopted, and the site would not be rezoned. The zoning designations for the land comprising the Specific Plan area would remain a combination of High Technology Park District, Limited Industrial District and General Industrial District. Therefore, under Alternative 1, there would be no immediate physical or operational changes within the Specific Plan area and existing conditions would remain unchanged.

5.1.1 Environmental Effects

Implementation of Alternative 1 would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts as well as potentially significant impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soil, GHG emissions, hydrology, drainage and water quality, noise, and public services and utilities. Because the project site would remain largely as vacant, weedy industrial land and fields and would not be replaced by more complimentary land uses which enhance the existing aesthetic values of the area, the aesthetic impacts under Alternative 1 would generally be greater in comparison to the proposed project. In addition, without new residential and commercial uses, land values would not increase to help absorb the cost of remediation and there would not be incentives to facilitate the remediation of Specific Plan area. Thus, Alternative 1 would result in a greater impact from hazards and hazardous materials in comparison to the proposed project. Under Alternative 1, current land use conflicts between the project area and existing residences would remain and result in greater land use impacts than the proposed project

5.1.2 Relation to Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would not meet the primary project objectives of developing a sustainable community that includes a variety of residential, retail, employment generating and recreational opportunities in close proximity to each other; providing a mix of housing opportunities at a range of densities from single-family detached to multi-family housing to meet the varied housing needs of the community; creating compact, connected, safe and walkable neighborhoods with convenient access to a future, planned transit station along the DRC, existing employment centers, including Silicon Valley, parks and open space, and commercial services; and providing a sufficient number of residential units within walking distance of the future planned transit station to generate the ridership necessary to support the station if and when the DRC project is implemented.

5.1.3 Feasibility

Alternative 1 is infeasible because it would not meet the project objectives. This alternative would not provide any of the specific social, economic, and other project benefits outlined above or in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

5.2 HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Under the High Density Residential Alternative (Alternative 2), development would be concentrated around the space provided for the future DRC transit station. The mix of residential, office, retail, public/quasi-public, and park and open space uses would remain the same, along with the maximum of 2,500 residential units. However, housing would consist of high density (60 units/acre) development on approximately 42 acres, rather than a variety of residential housing types on approximately 147.2 acres. The acreage proposed for office, retail and public/quasi-public uses would remain the same with approximately 35,000 square feet of retail use and 195,000 square feet of office use. Under Alternative 2, the amount of park and open space uses would increase from 16.31 acres to 121.5 acres. Thus, substantially less area of the Specific Plan area would be developed with housing; however, the same number of units would be construction.

5.2.1 Environmental Effects

Implementation of Alternative 2 would reduce impacts related to: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hydrology, drainage, and water quality, public services and utilities, population and housing, recreation, and noise because less of the project area would be developed. Similar or greater impacts would result in areas of geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, and traffic under Alternative 2.

5.2.2 Relation to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would satisfy some of the project objectives, including creating compact, connected, safe and walkable neighborhoods with convenient access to a future, planned transit station along the DRC, existing employment centers, including Silicon Valley, parks and open space, and commercial services; and providing a sufficient number of residential units within walking distance of the future planned transit station to generate the ridership necessary to support the station if and when the DRC project. However, this alternative would not meet the project objectives of implementing strategies to ensure success for the Specific Plan area developers, homebuilders, and the City; providing a mix of housing opportunities at a range of densities from single-family detached to multi-family housing to meet the varied housing needs of the community; effectuating the City's General Plan goals, policies and programs that require a mix of housing types at a range of densities and for a range of income levels; and encouraging the development of a predominantly vacant area of land for its highest and best use.

5.2.3 Feasibility

Alternative 2 is infeasible because it would not meet the project objectives. This alternative would not provide the mix of housing opportunities needed to ensure success of Specific Plan developers, homebuilders and the City.

5.3 MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Under the Medium High Density Residential Alternative (Alternative 3), residential development would be concentrated away from sensitive biological resources. The mix of residential, office, retail, public/quasi-

public and park and open space uses would remain the same, along with the maximum of 2,500 residential units. However, housing types would consist of medium high density (30 units/acre) development on approximately 83 acres, rather than a variety of residential types on approximately 147.2 acres. The acreage proposed for office, retail and public/quasi-public uses would remain the same and approximately 35,000 square feet of retail use and 195,000 square feet office use would be developed.

Under Alternative 3, the remainder of the Specific Plan area (not developed for residential, office and retail uses) would be rezoned from the current industrial/R&D/office zoning to park and open space; the amount of park and protected open space uses would, therefore, increase from 16.31 acres to approximately 80.5 acres. Thus, substantially less of the Specific Plan area would be developed with housing.

5.3.1 Environmental Effects

Implementation of Alternative 3 would reduce impacts related to: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hydrology, drainage, and water quality, public services and utilities, population and housing, recreation, and noise because less of the project area would be developed. Similar or greater impacts would result in areas of geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, and traffic under Alternative 3.

5.3.2 Relation to Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would satisfy some of the project objectives, including creating compact, connected, safe and walkable neighborhoods with convenient access to a future, planned transit station along the DRC, existing employment centers, including Silicon Valley, parks and open space, and commercial services; and providing a sufficient number of residential units within walking distance of the future planned transit station to generate the ridership necessary to support the station if and when the DRC project. However, this alternative would not meet the project objectives of implementing strategies to ensure success for the Specific Plan area developers, homebuilders, and the City of Newark; providing a mix of housing opportunities at a range of densities from single-family detached to multi-family housing to meet the varied housing needs of the community; effectuating the City's General Plan goals, policies and programs that require a mix of housing types at a range of densities and for a range of income levels; and encouraging the development of a predominantly vacant area of land for its highest and best use.

5.3.3 Feasibility

Alternative 3 is infeasible because it would not meet the project objectives. This alternative would not provide the mix of housing opportunities needed to ensure success of Specific Plan developers, homebuilders and the City.

6.0 FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Based on the entire record before the City, and having considered the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project, the City hereby determines that all feasible mitigation within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City has been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. The feasible mitigation measures are discussed in Section 4.1 and are set forth in the MMRP.

CEQA provides that each public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects it approves or carries out whenever it is feasible to do so (Public Resources Code 21001.1[b]). In mitigating or avoiding a significant effect of a project on the environment, a public agency may exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law other than under CEQA (Public Resources Code 21004). The City has specific powers to mitigate effects that occur within its jurisdiction, namely within the City.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the City to adopt a monitoring or compliance program regarding the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. The MMRP for the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan is hereby adopted by the City because it fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements, as follows:

- The MMRP is designed to ensure compliance with the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed on the project during project implementation
- Measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through conditions of approval, permit conditions, agreements or other measures.

7.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires decision makers to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of a project against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts, those impacts may be considered "acceptable" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)). When significant impacts are not avoided or lessened, CEQA requires the agency to state, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record *(*CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b)).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant impacts identified in the Final EIR for the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan. However, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. The Final EIR provides detailed information regarding these impacts.

The City finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR within the purview of the City will be implemented with the project, and that the remaining significant and unavoidable impacts are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits based upon the facts set forth above in the Findings of Fact, the Final EIR and the administrative record. Each of the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits (overriding considerations) set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the project benefits outweigh its significant adverse environmental impacts and, alone, is an adequate overriding consideration associated with the project that outweigh the project's significant and unavoidable impacts and are, therefore, considered acceptable, warranting approval of the project.

- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will develop a sustainable community that includes a variety of residential, retail, employment generating, and park and recreational opportunities in close proximity to each other.
- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan is consistent with and effectuates the City of Newark's General Plan and other applicable planning and zoning goals, policies, objectives and requirements.

- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will create compact, connected, safe and walkable neighborhoods with convenient access to a future, planned transit station along the Dumbarton Rail Corridor, existing employment centers, including Silicon Valley, parks and open space, and commercial services.
- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will facilitate development based on the principles of sustainability. It is intended to be a community that meets the needs of people and the environment by providing energy efficient buildings, walkable streets, parks, open space, habitat protection, and a diversity of housing opportunities.
- Mixed-use developments, such as proposed by the Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan, typically generate fewer auto trips per unit of land use than single-use suburban developments, which in turn reduce automobile dependence, gasoline consumption, greenhouse gas emissions and emissions of other pollutants associated with automobile use. Fewer automobile trips associated with mixed-use developments also reduce noise pollution and improve congestion on local roadways.
- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will provide employment and shopping opportunities in a centralized location, surrounded by housing, which provides the benefits of reduced automobile dependence, gasoline consumption, greenhouse gas emissions and emissions of other pollutants associated with automobile use, noise pollution and improved congestion on local roadways.
- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan will provide a maximum of 2,500 residential units, which will help the City meet its regional housing needs allocation.
- The Dumbarton TOD Specific Plan, when compared to the other alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative), provides that best available balance between maximizing the attainment of the project objectives while minimizing significant environmental impacts.

Considering all factors, the City finds that each of the above-referenced overriding considerations constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the project benefits outweigh its significant adverse environmental impacts and, alone, is an adequate overriding consideration associated with the project that outweigh the project's significant and unavoidable impacts and are, therefore, considered acceptable, warranting approval of the project.