Print From

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2010082063

Project Title: Mulqueeney Ranch Wind Repowering Project - Conditional Use Permit appl. PLN2019-00226

Lead Agency: Alameda County Planning Department

Contact Name: Andrew Young

Email: andrew.young@acgov.org Phone Number: 510-670-5400

Project Location: Tracy/Mountain House area - Unincorporated Alameda County (*City*) Alameda (*County*)

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The proposed project - Conditional Use Permit PLN2019-00226 - would entail the replacement of approximately 518 previously existing old generation wind turbines installed in the 1980s, removed in 2016, with up to 36 new wind turbines, on a site of approximately 4,600 acres and 29 parcels. The site is located in the southeastern quadrant of the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area, north and south of Patterson Pass Road between 1 and 2 miles north of Tesla Road, and approximately one mile south of Interstate 580.

The project would have a generating capacity of up to 80 MW, using turbines rated between 2.2 and 4.2 MW per turbine. The project is a conditionally permitted use in the A (Agriculture) zone district, and allowed by the East County Area Plan, a part of the Alameda County General Plan. The Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) has been pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162, as a project “tiered" under the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area Repowering Program EIR (PEIR), which the County certified in November 2014. The project would contribute to meeting state Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS), greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction, and carbon neutrality goals.

Identify the project’s significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Aesthetic resources could be adversely effected by public scenic views of construction debris or post-construction storage of surplus parts and materials. Mitigation to screen and maintain construction and storage sites would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Air quality standards could potential be exceeded due to construction-period emissions. Mitigation of best management practices and vehicle management would reduce project-level impacts to a level of less than significant; cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Biological resources could be adversely affected by avian mortality, bat mortality, effects on wildlife movement, and other potential impacts on special-status species and their habitats. Mitigation would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Cumulative avian and bat mortality impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Cultural resources could be adversely affected by grading and construction activities that could disturb unknown archaeological resources and human remains. Mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Other impacts could result related to geotechnical and soil considerations, mineral resources, and paleontological resources, on conflicts with GHG policies, due to hazards and handling of hazardous materials, on water runoff and water quality, on transportation safety and emergency vehicle access, and on risk of wildfire. All of these impacts, with the exception of effects on cumulative air quality conditions and avian and bat mortality, can be avoided or reduced to a level that is less than significant with the adoption of identified mitigation measures.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

The following list is from the Notice of Preparation:
1. Avian impacts
a. Considerations regarding recent studies, including golden eagles and other species
b. Consideration of recently available fatality estimates
c. Considerations of turbine size and turbine blade risk or swept area
d. Considerations of micro-siting and detailed consequences of grading
e. Consideration of candidate species and changes in status
f. Mitigation measures
2. Bat impacts
a. Consideration of ongoing research on fatality monitoring
b. Consideration of ongoing research on adaptive management and mitigation strategies
3. Cumulative impacts
a. Considerations regarding recently available information on avian and bat impacts
b. Considerations regarding the total buildout and maximum capacity of the APWRA

Comments on the NOP did raise most of the above issues, including impacts on golden eagles, bats, cumulative impacts, incorporating recently available fatality estimates and use surveys, monitoring studies, consideration of key focal raptor species, other candidate species. and other matters.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE BAY DELTA REGION
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE