Print Form

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 #: 2023010091

Project Title: SMP 38/SMP 39/SMP 40 Project

Lead Agency: City of Livermore

Contact Name: Ashley Vera, Associate Planner

Email: asvera@livermoreca.gov Phone Number: (925) 960-4479

Project Location: Livermore (*City*) Alameda (*County*)

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

The project site consists of nine parcels identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 904-1-7-21; 904-1-2-12; 904-1-7-32; 904-3-1-4; 904-10-2-2, -3, -5, -7, and -8, totaling approximately 217.04 acres in unincorporated Alameda County. The project site is generally located west of Isabel Avenue/State Route (SR) 84, north of Stanley Boulevard, south of West Jack London Boulevard, and east of El Charro Road. On SMP 38, the proposed project includes an Sphere of Influence (SOI) Amendment. On SMP 39 the proposed project includes development of six industrial buildings consisting of approximately 755,500 sf of new building space, and associated improvements. On SMP 40, the project includes development of two industrial buildings consisting of up to 759,275 sf of new building space and associated improvements. A number of approvals would be required for development of SMP 39 and SMP 40, including a SOI Amendment for SMP 39, General Plan Amendment, Pre-zoning and Annexation, Zoning Map Amendment/Planned Development, Vesting Tentative Subdivision Maps, a Pre-Annexation Agreement, and Development Agreement. A Site Plan Design Review entitlement is required for SMP 39 and SMP 40, which would include a review of the site plan, building, and landscape design; however, the entitlement is only proposed for SMP 40 at this time. A Site Plan Design Review entitlement will be required at a later date for the future development of SMP 39. In addition, the proposed project would include annexation of four additional parcels (APNs 904-10-2-3, -5, -7, and -8) located east of SMP 40. Development of SMP 38 and additional annexation parcels is not proposed.

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

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project identified a number of impacts as less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures, less than significant, or no impact including in the following issue areas: Aesthetics; Geology and Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Land Use and Planning; Mineral Resources; Population and Housing; Public Services; Recreation; and Wildfire. Implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the Initial Study would be sufficient to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The Draft EIR provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project related to Agricultural Resources; Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy; Biological Resources; Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources; Hydrology and Water Quality; Noise; Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems; and Transportation, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce impacts. As described in the Draft EIR, some impacts related to Agricultural Resources have been determined to remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the Draft EIR.

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 areas of known controversy for the proposed project relate to the following:

• The inclusion of solar arrays.
• Compliance with applicable laws governing tribal notifications, including Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18.
• Effects to the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadway network, including Interstate 580 in Livermore and Pleasanton, SR 84 (Isabel Avenue and Vallecitos Road), and East and West Jack London Boulevard, Airway Boulevard, El Charro Road, and Stanley Boulevard.
• Effects to the MTS transit operators (Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART], Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority [LAVTA]).
• Potential increase in roadway maintenance needs.
• Effects of vehicle traffic on cyclist and pedestrian safety.
• Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) mitigation measures.
• Compliance with applicable Caltrans standards and permits.
• Effects on Pleasanton roadways and intersections from project-related traffic.
• Use of site as a quarry.
• Potential allowed land use and zoning for SMP 38 in the future.
• Potential increase in noise levels associated with project operations.

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

Alameda County LAFCo;
Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC);
City of Pleasanton;
Pacific Gas and Electricity (PG&E);
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA);
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA);
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD);
California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB);
San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB);
Zone 7 Water Agency;
Caltrans;
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW); and
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).