

SUMMARY

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Guidelines Section 15123, this combined Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) for the Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project (proposed project/proposed action) “Project” contains a brief summary of the proposed Project, the proposed actions, areas of controversy known to the lead agency and issues to be resolved, and a summary of significant impacts and proposed Mitigation Measures or alternatives that would reduce or avoid those effects.

The City of Napa has prepared this combined Draft EIR/EA for Project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CEQA Guidelines, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In order to satisfy both CEQA and NEPA for the proposed Project/proposed action, the City has prepared this environmental document as a joint document, consisting of an EIR under CEQA and an EA under NEPA.

PROJECT LOCATION

The approximately 2.9-acre Site (APNs 038-170-042, -043, and -046) is located at 3700, 3710, and 3720 Valle Verde Drive, just north of the intersection of Firefly Drive and Valle Verde Drive (“Site”). The Site is bordered by a three-story multi-family residential development (Silverado Creek Apartments) to the west, Salvador Creek to the east, a two-story residential condominium development to the south, and a City of Napa-owned property that functions as a stormwater detention area and open space trail to the north.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

A portion of the Site (approximately 1.6 acres) located at 3700 Valle Verde drive, is currently developed with the vacant, approximately 39,771 square foot Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility. The vacant facility is three stories in height and built with 72 units. It has been vacant since 2004.

The remainder of the Site (approximately 1.3 acres) located at 3710 and 3720 Valle Verde Drive is vacant.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Valle Verde and Heritage House Continuum of Housing Project (proposed project/proposed action) “Project” proposes to rehabilitate the vacant Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility with 66 single-room occupancy (SRO) units, including eight American with Disability Act (ADA) accessible one-bedroom units. Of the 66 total units, 33 would be operated as permanent supportive housing with on-site supportive services, and property management (Heritage House). The remaining 33 units would be operated as affordable rental units occupied by income-eligible tenants who do not require supportive services. Heritage House would implement a management plan and have day and night on-site property management. The Project would also include construction of a new three-story multi-family apartment building with 24 affordable units (Valle Verde Apartments), adjacent to the Heritage House. A management plan would also be implemented for the Valle Verde Apartments, including on-site management.

General Plan

The Site is currently designated Multi-Family Residential (MFR-33H) in the City of Napa General Plan (Envision Napa 2020), which is intended to develop or redevelop into a medium to high intensity predominantly attached unit development pattern. Allowable uses include multi-family units, attached single family, SRO facilities, live-work housing, and similar compatible uses such as day care and larger group quarters (e.g., residential facilities and nursing homes).

The Site is also located within the Vintage Planning Area. The MFR-33H designation allows for a density of 18 to 25 dwelling units per acre and 37 to 50 SRO units per acre. On the 1.3-acre Valle Verde Site, between 24 to 33 multifamily units are allowed within this density range. The Project proposes 24 multifamily units on the Valle Verde Site, which is within the permitted density range of the MFR-33H designation. On the 1.6-acre Heritage House Site, the Project proposes 58 SROs and eight one-bedroom units, which is within the permitted density range for SRO projects.

Zoning

The Site is zoned *Multi-Family Residential*. This district provides opportunities for a mix of predominantly attached residential development patterns. Allowable uses include medium and higher density multifamily apartments, single-family attached and detached units, group residential, live-work housing, larger residential care facilities, and similar compatible uses such as day care.

Pursuant to the City's Zoning Ordinance, a factor of two is applied to the permitted General Plan density range for SRO projects. The Heritage House would have a density of 41.3 rooms per acre, which is within the permitted density range of 37 to 50 rooms per acre for SRO projects.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following table summarizes the potentially significant impacts of the Project on the environment and mitigation measures proposed to reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. A significant impact on the environment is a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change to the environment. Potential impacts that are less than significant without mitigation are not described in this summary and can be found in the text of the EIR/EA. A complete description of the Project, its potential impacts, and proposed mitigation measures can be found in the text of this EIR/EA.

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measures
Air Quality	
<p>Impact AIR-3: The Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>MM AIR-3.1: During any construction period ground disturbance, the Applicant shall ensure that the Project contractor implement measures to control dust and exhaust. Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction to a less-than-significant level. The contractor shall implement the following best management practices that are required of all projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). 5. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 6. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 7. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph). 8. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. 9. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 10. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

11. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

MM AIR-3.2: The Project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment used on-site to construct the Project would achieve a fleet-wide average 21 percent reduction in particulate matter exhaust emissions or more. One feasible plan to achieve this reduction would include the following:

- All diesel-powered off-road equipment, larger than 25 horsepower, operating on the site for more than two days continuously shall, at a minimum, meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 2 engines or equivalent. The use of equipment that includes CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters would also meet this requirement. Alternatively, the use of alternatively-fueled equipment (i.e., non-diesel) would meet this requirement.

Biological Resources

Impact BIO-1: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.

MM BIO-1.1: A survey for active bird nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to the start of Project activities (vegetation removal, grading, or other initial ground-disturbing activities) if ground disturbing activities commence during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31). The survey shall be conducted in a sufficient area around the Study Area to identify the location and status of any nests that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by vegetation removal, or grading activities. Based on the results of the pre-construction breeding bird survey, the following measure shall apply.

- If active nests of protected species are found within the Study Area or close enough to the area for construction activity to affect nesting success, a work exclusion zone shall be established around each nest. Established exclusion zones shall remain in place until all young in the nest have fledged or the nest otherwise becomes inactive (e.g. due to predation). Appropriate exclusion zone sizes vary dependent upon bird species, nest location, existing visual buffers, ambient sound levels, and other factors. An exclusion zone radius may be as small as 25 feet (for common, disturbance-adapted species) or as large as 250 feet or more for raptors. Exclusion zone size may also be reduced from established levels if supported with nest monitoring by a qualified biologist indicating that work activities are not significantly impacting the nest.
-

MM BIO-1.2: A pre-construction survey shall be conducted of the existing structures, bridge, and trees within 100 feet of the work areas to determine if any suitable roost habitat is present and the potential for occupancy. Based on the results of the survey, the following measure shall apply.

- If an active maternity roost is located within features scheduled for removal, then consultation with CDFW would be required.
- If any large trees are identified during the preconstruction survey which contain potential roosting features, the tree shall be felled outside of the maternity season (September 1 through April 30) and shall be allowed to lay on the ground for one night to allow any undetected bats to leave the tree before it is processed.
- If no roosts or potential bat roosting substrates are located, then work may proceed without further measure.

MM BIO-1.3: The following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented during bridge removal activities:

- A debris containment device (e.g. net, or tarp) shall be installed prior to work in order to prevent material from entering Salvador Creek.
- Riparian vegetation removed within the Study Area shall be the minimum amount needed for work to occur.
- The extent of disturbance shall be delineated with construction fencing or other high visibility marker to prevent disturbance to areas below top of bank or outside of the construction footprint.

Impact BIO-2: The Project would have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.

MM BIO-2.1: Prior to initiating any Project activities within these areas, the Applicant shall obtain any required permits for impacts to jurisdictional areas. Permanent impacts to all jurisdictional resources would be compensated at 1:1 replacement ratio, or as required by the USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB.

Impact BIO-4.: The Project would 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

MM BIO-4.1: The following measures shall be implemented:

- Hours for initial phases of work shall be limited to 30 minutes after sunrise to 30 minutes before sunset in order to avoid causing disturbance when wildlife are most likely to migrate through surrounding habitats.
- Any lighting used for the Project shall be kept to the minimum necessary to safely operate. Those lights shall also be directed inward toward the Study Area, and not into surrounding habitats.
- All work shall occur only within designated work areas.

impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-2: The Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

MM CUL-2.1: In the event that buried, or previously unrecognized archaeological deposits or materials of any kind are inadvertently exposed during any construction activity, work within 50 ft. of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can assess the find and provide recommendations for further treatment, if warranted. Construction and potential impacts to the area(s) within a radius determined by the archaeologist shall not recommence until the assessment is complete. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

Impact CUL-3: While the Project is not expected to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, the potential exists that unknown resources could be uncovered during subsurface construction activities.

MM CUL-3.1: Human Remains: Native American coordination shall follow the protocols established under Assembly Bill 52, State of California Code, and applicable City of Napa procedures. In addition, the following measures shall be implemented with regard to human remains:

- The treatment of any human remains and associated, or unassociated funerary objects discovered during soil disturbing activities shall comply with applicable state laws. Such treatment would include immediate notification of the Napa County Coroner. In the event of the coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American, the coroner shall notify of the Native American Heritage Commission, which would appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC § 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, the City of Napa, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5[d]). The agreement would take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The PRC allows 48 hours to reach agreement on these matters. If the MLD and the other parties could not agree on the reburial method, the Event Authority shall follow Section 5097.98(b) of the PRC, which states that “the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.”

Geology and Soils

Impact GEO-2:

The Project would result in substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil.

MM GEO-2.1: The Project Civil Engineer shall design and implement a site drainage system to collect surface water and direct towards an established storm drainage system. The Civil Engineer shall also design an erosion control plan prior to Project construction, per the current guidelines of the *California Stormwater Quality Association's Best Management Practice Handbook* (2003).

Impact TCR-1a: The Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

MM TCR-1.1 The Nation shall have the opportunity to provide tribal monitoring and consultation for the Project during the archaeological investigations and ground disturbing activities related to underground utility trenching and the stitch wall required for the Project. The Nation's monitors may work in collaboration with the archaeologists and Project engineers hired/employed by the Applicant. Applicant shall provide written notice to the Nation ten days in advance of any earth-disturbing activities related to utility trenching and stitch wall digging. If the Nation fails to respond or fails to provide monitoring and consultation personnel, on the date(s) of the activities, the Contractor may continue with those activities.

MM TCR-1.2: In the event that Native American human remains are discovered during Project construction activities, and where the Nation has been designated as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), the following provisions shall be implemented:

Impact TCR-1b: The Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

- I. The Nation shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code sections 5097.98 (a) and 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 (e), to: (1) inspect the site of the discovery; and (2) make recommendations as to how the human remains and grave goods shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity.
- II. The Nation shall complete its inspection within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving notification from either the Contractor or the NAHC, as required by California Public Resources Code section 5097.98 (a). The City and the Nation agree to discuss, in good faith, what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes.
- III. Reburial of human remains shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code sections 5097.98 (a) and (b) and 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 (e).
- IV. The City is aware that the Nation may wish to rebury the human remains and associated ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface

disturbances. Should the Nation recommend reburial of the human remains and associated ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near the site of their discovery, the City and Contractor shall make good faith efforts to accommodate the Nation's request.

- V. The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because Yocha Dehe's traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains, and monitors shall make recommendations for removal of cremations. Grave goods are those artifacts associated with any human remains. These items and the soil, in an area encompassing up to two (2) feet in diameter around the burial, and other funerary remnants and their ashes, are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact.

MM TCR-1.3: Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Items (Artifacts). Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Nation. Applicant agrees to cause its contractor to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the Site to the MLD for appropriate treatment, unless Contractor or Applicant is ordered to do otherwise by a court or agency of competent jurisdiction. In addition, the Nation requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations on or adjacent to the Site. Where appropriate (from the perspective of the Nation), and agreed upon in advance by the Nation, certain analyses of certain artifact types will be permitted, which may include, but which may not necessarily be limited to, shell, bone, ceramic, stone and/or other artifacts.

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

With implementation of the foregoing mitigation measures, the Project would not result in any significant impacts.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA requires that an EIR identify alternatives to the project as proposed. The CEQA Guidelines state that an EIR must identify alternatives that would feasibly attain the most basic objectives of the project, but avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.40(e), NEPA requires that an EA discuss appropriate alternatives where the proposal involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources and the

environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives. A summary of Project alternatives follows. A full analysis of Project alternatives is provided in Section 8.0 Alternatives.

Project Objectives

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), the EIR must include a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed Project. The stated objectives of the Project proponent are to:

- Provide needed housing on an infill parcel of approximately 2.9 acres, consistent with the City of Napa's General Plan Housing Element, housing policies, and State law for lower income residents in two modalities: apartments for families; and single room occupancy units for individuals.
- Aid the City of Napa in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) obligation identified by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG/MTC) for affordable housing and confirmed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- Develop a project meeting the City and Napa County's Housing First policy to address the needs of Napa's homeless and vulnerable populations, which includes seniors, those with disabilities, veterans, and at-risk families and individuals.
- Redevelop and retrofit an existing dilapidated structure to accommodate supportive housing and affordable housing.
- Construct an affordable housing apartment complex for lower income families.
- Support the goals of the non-profit Applicants (the Gasser Foundation and Burbank Housing) to provide permanent housing for all Napa residents, which is a fundamental community need and the foundation for a healthy and vibrant community.

Alternatives Considered But Rejected

Location Alternative

Location alternatives were rejected because the number of potentially suitable sites is extremely limited and development of such sites would not substantially reduce the severity of any of the Project's potentially significant impacts. Specifically, development of any potential alternative sites would not reduce the Project potential toxic air contaminant (TAC) and tribal cultural resources impacts because construction would occur on alternative sites in a similar manner to the proposed Site and the surrounding uses in an urban infill setting would likely be similar to that of the proposed Site. Alternative sites that are not located along a creek would avoid potential impacts to riparian habitats and the species they support, however most sites have trees on or near the site that could host nesting activity that would require pre-construction surveys to prevent construction disturbance. Alternative sites could also have the potential for uncovering unknown tribal cultural resources, which would not be determined until the CEQA process was initiated for the site. Further, these sites are not controlled by the Applicant. Since no feasible alternative site was identified that would avoid or lessen the Project's potential impacts, a location alternative was not further analyzed.

No Abandonment of the Valle Verde Drive Right-of-Way Alternative

This alternative was rejected because the Site would not be able to accommodate the Project as there would be insufficient site area available to accommodate the Valle Verde Apartments building and

associated parking. In addition, this alternative would not substantially reduce the severity of any of the Project's potentially significant impacts because construction would occur in the same manner and require the same mitigation measures to reduce potential construction impacts to less than significant levels. Because this alternative would not avoid or lessen the Project impacts, it was not further analyzed.

Project Alternatives

No Project – No Development Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines stipulate that an EIR include a No Project Alternative to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the Project with the impacts of not approving the Project. Under the No Project – No Development Alternative, the existing Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility on the Heritage House Site would remain and the adjacent Valle Verde Site is undeveloped; therefore, this alternative would avoid the mitigated construction TAC impacts, the potential for erosion during construction, potential for bird nesting disturbance, and all other less than significant impacts. The No Project - No Development Alternative would not meet any of the proposed Project objectives to address underserved housing needs in the City of Napa.

No Project – Existing Plans and Policies Alternative

The Guidelines specifically advise that the No Project Alternative is “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project is not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” The Guidelines emphasize that an EIR should take a practical approach, and not “...create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment [Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B)].”

Since the Heritage House Site is currently developed with the vacant Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility, the “No Project – Existing Plans and Policies alternative could include the re-occupancy of the vacant building. The Valle Verde Site (approximately 1.3 acres) is vacant and presumably could be developed with a range of medium and higher density multifamily apartments, single-family attached and detached units, group residential, live-work housing, larger residential care facilities, and similar compatible uses such as day care. Under the MFR-33H General Plan designation, the Valle Verde Site could be developed with a maximum buildout of 32 dwelling units (25 dwelling units per acre).

The No Project – Existing Plans and Policies Alternative would have similar environmental impacts as the proposed Project because any development of the Site would likely result in the same construction TACs and erosion impacts because construction of this alternative would occur in a similar manner to the proposed Project. In addition, any development of the Site involving ground disturbance would have a similar potential for uncovering unknown tribal cultural or archaeological resources.

While the No Project – Existing Plans and Policies alternative would provide some amount of housing on the Valle Verde Site in the form of new construction and some expected re-use of the existing Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility on the Heritage House Site, it would not provide the same housing opportunities for the target resident population as the proposed Project, and therefore would not achieve the stated Project objectives to the same extent as the proposed Project.

Reduced Scale Alternative

Under the Reduced Scale Alternative, the existing vacant Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility on the Heritage House Site would be developed with 66 SRO units (including 8 accessible one-bedroom units), like the Project. Under this alternative, the Valle Verde Site (approximately 1.3 acres) would not be developed. Developing the Site with a smaller project would likely involve a shorter construction timeframe and less grading, which may lessen construction TAC impacts as compared to the Project. A portion of Valle Verde Drive would not be abandoned, and there would not be a need for a lot line adjustment/lot merger. On-street parking would not be displaced. The Reduced Scale Alternative would have reduced erosion and loss of top soil compared to the Project, due the reduced construction disturbance area on the Site. However, the proposed stitch wall would still need to be constructed to minimize bank erosion. In addition, the Reduced Scale Alternative would have the same potential for uncovering unknown tribal cultural resources as the Project, although the Valle Verde Site would remain undisturbed. While this alternative would have reduced environmental impacts, the basic objectives related to the provision of affordable housing for low income families would not be met since the 24 affordable units would not be constructed, although the objectives related to the provision of supportive housing and SRO units would be achieved.

Bridge Removal Alternative

Under this alternative, as a condition of Project approval, the City of Napa would require removal of portions of the Zerba Bridge. Under this alternative, the City would require removal of the bridge decking and tops of piers in order to improve flood conditions, since the bridge acts as an impediment to floodwater flows during large storm events.

As described in *Section 3.10*, under the Bridge Removal Alternative, the base flood elevation (BFE) at the existing Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility and the proposed Valle Verde Apartments would be 38.0 and 39.5 feet, respectively. Similar to the Project, the Valle Verde Apartments could be removed from the special flood hazard area, as its lowest adjacent grade is equal to or greater than the BFE of 39.5 feet. As with the Project, the existing Sunrise Napa Assisted Living Facility lowest adjacent grade on the northeast corner of the building would still be below the 38.0-foot BFE and would need to be elevated at or above the BFE to be removed from the floodplain.

Under the Bridge Removal Alternative, there are slight increases in flood elevations downstream of the Project Site due to the removal of the bridge deck and piers (refer to Figure 3.10-5 and 3.10-6). However, removal of the bridge would improve conditions in the floodplain upstream of the Project resulting from blockage due to the proposed Valle Verde Apartment building. As with the Project, the Bridge Removal Alternative would result in less than one-foot increase in floodplain elevations although the location of the increased elevations would shift from upstream of the bridge to downstream with the bridge removed. In addition, the Bridge Removal Alternative would result in slight decreases in in-channel water surface elevation upstream of the Project whereas there are slight increases at the Project boundary.

Under the Bridge Removal Alternative, impacts to biological resources would be greater than the proposed Project. As described in *Section 3.4*, the Bridge Removal Alternative would result in potential impacts to steelhead within Salvador Creek. Under this alternative, the Applicant would be required to implement avoidance and minimization measures during bridge removal activities to reduce potential impacts to steelhead. Removal of the bridge would temporarily impact

approximately 23 linear feet and 0.01 acre of USACE jurisdictional intermittent stream. The CDFW and RWQCB would also take jurisdiction over the intermittent stream and approximately 0.13 acre of riparian habitat. Under this alternative, the Applicant would be required to obtain any required permits for impacts to jurisdictional areas and compensate any permanent impacts at a 1:1 replacement ratio.

The Bridge Removal Alternative would have similar TAC and erosion impacts because construction of this alternative would occur in a similar manner to the proposed Project, i.e. the incremental effects of bridge removal would add slightly to the construction impacts disclosed in a number of EIR sections, including Air Quality and Noise. In addition, any development of the Site would have a similar potential for uncovering unknown tribal cultural resource.

No Bikeway Improvements Alternative

The Project proposes to build an eight-foot wide bike path adjacent to its parking lot. The path would replace the current Valle Verde Drive connection to nearby trails. Under the No Bikeway Improvements alternative, bikeway improvements would not be implemented, and cyclists would either cycle through the Site drive aisle to connect to nearby trails, or use the existing offsite sidewalk which is narrow. This alternative would have similar environmental impacts as the proposed Project because it would likely result in the same construction TAC and erosion impacts because construction of this alternative would occur in a similar manner to the proposed Project. Under the No Bikeway Alternative, there would be a similar potential for uncovering unknown tribal cultural resource. The No Bikeway Improvements alternative would achieve all of the Project objectives. However, this alternative would not require the removal of seven trees to accommodate construction of the multi-use trail.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The *CEQA Guidelines* state that an EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

Based upon the previous discussion, the environmentally superior alternative would be the No Project – No Development Alternative, which would avoid all Project impacts. This alternative would not meet any Project objectives.

The Reduced Scale Alternative would eliminate the Valle Verde Apartments from the Project, which may lessen the severity of the already less than significant (with mitigation) construction-related TAC impact. This alternative would partially meet the Project objectives, though to a lesser extent since the 24 affordable units would not be constructed. The Reduced Scale Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative to the Project. However, as discussed in each section of the EIR, all Project impacts are capable of being reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of feasible measures and conditions, and there would be no significant and unavoidable impacts from Project implementation.

AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to Section 15123(b)(2) of the state CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. Comments

were received on the Notice of Preparation and are included in Appendix A of this EIR. There are no known areas of substantial controversy; however, issues raised by some of the members of the community include: traffic generation and congestion, water quality, land use incompatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, noise impacts, impacts to Salvador Creek, parking impacts, and safety concerns. These issues noted above are analyzed further in Section 3 of this EIR/EA.

Under CEQA, economic or social effects are not considered significant effects on the environment. Rather, these effects are considered in the context of physical changes resulting from economic or social changes linked to the project. More specifically, Section 15131(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on physical changes.

In the case of the Project, concern has been expressed regarding socioeconomic and demographic changes resulting from the introduction of the future occupants of Heritage House. These topics do not require analysis under CEQA, except to the extent that there is substantial evidence to support a finding that they would result in physical environmental effects.

Under NEPA, Executive Order 12898 requires consideration of how federally assisted projects may have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. The issue of environmental justice is analyzed further in Section 4 of this EIR/EA.