SECTION 1
Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

On November 20, 2018, the City of Fremont approved the Islander Redevelopment Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) (PLN2018-0019). The IS/MND analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the implementation of a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the project site from Medium Density Residential (14.6 to 29.9 units per net acre) to Urban Residential (30 to 70 units per net acre), and rezone the site from to R-3-18 and R-3-27 Multifamily Residential to R-3-70 Multifamily Residential to allow the development of 128 below market rate apartment units. The proposed project would include two phases of construction. Both phases would construct affordable housing for a low-income population of which 25% of the units are reserved for tenants with special needs. The Notice of Determination was filed with the Alameda County Clerk on December 7, 2018, after the second reading of ordinance by the City Council on December 4, 2018.

Subsequent to the adoption of the IS/MND, the *Islander Motel and Vacant Parcels Removal Action Workplan* (RAW) was prepared to address the impacts of metals in soils and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to soil gas at the Project Site. (See Section 2 for detailed RAW Project remedy) Therefore, this Addendum is necessary to address the potential environmental effects of the remedial action as it relates to the residential development in the approved IS/MND.

1.2 BASIS FOR DECISION TO PREPARE ADDENDUM

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an addendum to a previously certified EIR or adopted negative declaration shall be prepared by a lead or responsible agency if changes or additions to the document are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration are applicable. An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration. The decision-making body considers the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project, as modified.

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that, for a project covered by a certified EIR or adopted negative declaration, preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is required if one or more of the following conditions occur:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was

certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This Addendum concluded that some changes or additions to the IS/MND are necessary but none of the conditions requiring the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration are applicable.

1.3 SCOPE AND CONTENT OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). This Addendum considers each of the environmental impacts that were analyzed in the Finial IS/MND and focuses on determining whether the modified project would result in an increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND or would result in any new impacts not previously considered in the Final IS/MND. The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this addendum analysis are the same as those contained within the Final IS/MND. The topic areas considered in the Final IS/MND were as follows:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazardous and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation

• Transportation/Traffic
• Tribal Cultural Resources
• Utilities and Service Systems
• Mandatory Findings of Significance

To comply with the current CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum provides analysis for the two additional environmental topic areas not included in the Final IS/MND, which include Energy Resources and Wildfires.

SECTION 2
Project Background and Proposed Modification

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The project evaluated in the Islander Redevelopment Project Final Initial IS/MND encompassed a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of the project site from Medium Density Residential (14.6 to 29.9 units per net acre) to Urban Residential (30 to 70 units per net acre), and rezone the site from to R-3-18 and R-3-27 Multifamily Residential to R-3-70 Multifamily Residential to allow the development of 128 below market rate apartment units. The proposed project would include two phases.

Phase I would redevelop the existing 70 room Islander Motel by constructing an additional third story to the building and converting motel rooms into 79 below market rate apartment units.

Phase I – Islander Motel Revitalization

Phase I would redevelop the existing 70 room Islander Motel by constructing an additional third story to the building and converting motel rooms into 79 below market rate apartment units. The building would contain 54 studio units, 12 one-bedroom units and 13 two-bedroom units. An elevator will be added to improve accessibility throughout the existing building, and a bridge will be added to connect the two wings of the building at the second and third levels.

Phase I would provide 49 reserved parking spaces for residents and guest parking would be provided on Bell Street. In addition to vehicular parking, a minimum of 42 secured (long-term) bicycle parking spaces and 12 bicycle rack (short-term) spaces would be provided on-site. Other proposed features include a ground-floor leasing office and lobby, community activity room, laundry room, and an enclosed common outdoor courtyard located at the corner of Mowry Avenue and Bell Street. The building would have a maximum height of 28 feet, and lot coverage of 43 percent. The proposed density of Phase I is 71 units per acre.

Phase II– New Housing Development

In Phase II the applicant proposes to construct a new four-story apartment building with 49 below market rate units on two undeveloped parcels totaling 0.86 acres located along Bell Avenue to the west of the Islander Motel. A lot merger would be completed to combine the two existing lots into a single lot. The building would contain 24 one-bedroom units and 25 two-bedroom units. Amenities would include a laundry room, exercise room and a community room (with in-building resident services) that opens toward a shared outdoor patio and landscaped courtyard with a patio and play area. Phase II would share a driveway on Bell Street and a private Emergency Vehicle Access Easement with Phase I.

Phase II would provide 42 reserved parking spaces for residents and guest parking is proposed to be provided on Bell Street. In addition to vehicular parking, 27 secured (long-term) bicycle parking spaces and 9 bicycle rack (short-term) spaces would be provided on-site. The four-story building would have a maximum height of 41 feet and lot coverage of 42 percent. The proposed density of Phase II is 58 units per acre. Public improvements would include the construction of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street trees along Bell Street.

A Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) was prepared for the site (April 2019), which determined that a Removal Action Workplan (RAW) needed to be prepared to address the on-site soils containing elevated concentrations of arsenic, dieldrin, and thallium.

The draft RAW, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc. on March 26, 2021, and entitled *Removal Action Workplan, Proposed Orange Cove Elementary School, NEC South Monson Avenue and East South Avenue, Orange Cove, California,* is incorporated by reference in this Addendum.

2.2 PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE PROJECT

The proposed modification to the project evaluated in this Addendum consists of the remedial activities identified in the Draft *Islander Motel and Vacant Parcels Removal Action Workplan*, prepared by Partner Engineering and Science, dated April 10, 2023, and is incorporated by reference in this Addendum.

The Draft RAW presents and evaluates the site conditions, establishes appropriate remedial action objectives for the protection of human health and the environment, and evaluates alternatives and identifies final recommendations for remedial actions at the subject property which are protective of human health and the environment.

Recommended Remedy

The recommended remedy identified is Alternative 4 – **Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems.** The Containment/Capping-in-Place and the VIMS is fundamentally incorporated into the physical design of the proposed residential development and will be installed as part of the construction process for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The activities that would be conducted to implement the remedial action consist of the following:

Containment/Capping-in-Place

To address the soil impacts, the containment cap would be the building proposed on the Bell Street parcels. The soils containing lead above 80 mg/kg and mercury above 1.0 mg/kg would be contained underneath the proposed building such that the proposed building itself would function as a containment cap to minimize the potential to come into contact with the contaminated soil.

To achieve the Removal Action Objectives (RAOs,) it has been determined that approximately 33,600 square feet of lead- and mercury impacted soil would require containment capping. A land use restriction will be executed between DTSC and the property owner and recorded to ensure that the containment cap is operated and maintained and that future uses of the property are consistent with the operation and maintenance of the containment cap. An operation and maintenance plan will be submitted and approved by DTSC. An operation and maintenance agreement specifying the operation and maintenance requirements and providing financial assurance for future operation and maintenance of the containment cap will be prepared and recorded.

Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems

A VIMS will be incorporated into the building designs to address the impacted soil gas and will be designed as passive sub-slab venting systems which can become active if needed. The VIMS would include vent piping, sheet and spray applied vapor barrier materials, inspections during the installation of the vapor barrier including inspections of smoke testing, and the sealing of utility perforations.

An operation and maintenance agreement specifying the operation and maintenance requirements and providing financial assurance for future operation and maintenance of the VIMS will be prepared and recorded.

SECTION 3
Environmental Review

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides analysis that supports the conclusion that the modified project to implement the RAW does not meet the criteria requiring preparation of a subsequent IS/MND as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15164.

This section includes a summary of each of the environmental impact topics evaluated in the Final IS/MND, and a determination as to whether the modified project would result in an increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND, or any new impacts not previously considered in the Final IS/MND.

The Final IS/MND was approved on November 20, 2018. The Final IS/MND link https://www.fremont.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/10348/637910688064570000 and all Project documents are posted on the City of Fremont's website.

No substantial changes in circumstances or no new information of substantial importance have occurred since the Final IS/MND was prepared.

3.2 AESTHETICS

Final IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character. The Final IS/MND concluded the site does not have any visually distinctive characteristics as the Phase I site is developed with a motel and the Phase II site is vacant and largely unmaintained. The views of the project site from roadways and nearby development would change as the Islander Motel building is renovated and the vacant Bell Street parcels are transformed to a developed residential use; however a three and four story multi-family residential project is consistent with the existing visual character of the project area, which is generally two and three-stories.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems will not have the potential to result in any long-term degradation of the site's visual character or quality. In addition, the proposed remediation activities will not have the potential to create any new lighting impacts beyond what was evaluated in the Final IS/MND or exacerbate the conditions that led to the initial determination. Based on the above, the proposed remediation activities will not result in any additional significant adverse aesthetic impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse aesthetic impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.3 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Final IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have no impact on Agriculture and Forest Resources. There are no agricultural uses or forest land on the property. The project site is surrounded by urban development.

Modified Project: The modified project is within the same footprint as the residential development project. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts to agricultural or forestry resources or result in a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.4 AIR QUALITY

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would be Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated for air quality, specifically for D. *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

Project impacts related to increased community risk can occur either by introducing a new sensitive receptor, such as a residential use, in proximity to an existing source of TACs or by introducing a new source of TACs with the potential to adversely affect existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. The project would introduce new sensitive receptors (residences) in the proximity of nearby TAC sources that include local roadways such as Mowry Avenue and Fremont Boulevard, and stationary sources such as gas stations.

Although this issue is not an impact of the project on the environment under CEQA, the effect of existing TAC sources on future project receptors (residences) is analyzed to comply with the Clean Air Plan goal of reducing population TAC exposure and protecting public health in the Bay Area. The BAAQMD recommends using a 1,000- foot screening radius around a project site for purposes of identifying community health risk from siting a new sensitive receptor or a new source of TACs.

The project would not be a substantial source of localized TACs. However, temporary project construction activity would generate dust and equipment exhaust on a temporary basis that could affect nearby sensitive receptors.

Construction activity is anticipated to include demolition, grading and site preparation, building construction, and paving. Both the single- and cumulative-source thresholds for health risks and hazards were evaluated for project site's construction. The *Table "D": Combined Community TAC Levels at Construction* identified the project would have a significant impact because the project construction activities alone would exceed the single-source cancer risk threshold of 10.0 per million for cancer risk. The project would not have a significant impact with respect to hazard or annual PM2.5 concentration impacts or the cumulative impacts.

As such, impacts related air quality would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure Air Quality Air-1:

Mitigation Measure Air Quality Air-1 (Construction Equipment): The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment used on-site would achieve a fleet-wide average 85 percent reduction in PM2.5 emissions. One feasible plan to achieve this reduction would include the following:

a. 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. Note that the construction contractor could use other measures to minimize construction period DPM emission to reduce the predicted cancer risk below the thresholds. The

use of equipment that includes CARB- certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters3 or alternatively-fueled equipment (i.e., non-diesel) would meet this requirement.

b. b. Other measures may be the use of added exhaust devices, or a combination of measures, provided that these measures are approved by the City and demonstrated to reduce community risk impacts to less-than-significant.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The construction equipment and activity to implement the remedy is comparable to those identified and analyzed in the Final IS/MND.

With the implementation of the Mitigation Measures AIR-1, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse air quality impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse air quality impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on biological resources. The property is not located near any streams, creeks, or other bodies of water nor does it contain bodies of water, riparian habitat, wetlands, or other sensitive natural communities identified in any local or regional plans that would be subject to state and/or federal regulations. The project site is not a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Development of the project site would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, as none exist that affect the area. Therefore, there would be no impact to riparian or other sensitive natural habitat resulting from construction of the project.

The proposed project would redevelop a vacant site containing non-native grassland, which currently provides limited potential foraging habitat for resident and migratory birds. Onsite annual grassland habitat is relatively small in size and largely composed of non-native species, generally understood to support a lower diversity of wildlife than native grassland communities.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The remediation activities would not result in any additional significant adverse biological resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse biological resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on Cultural Resources. The Islander Motel was constructed in 1975 and therefore does not meet the minimum age threshold for consideration as a historical resource or historic property under CEQA and Section 106, respectively, and under the City's Historic Resources Ordinance.

The applicant completed a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System on May 29, 2018 (File No. 17-0858). The review included the project site and a 0.5-mile radius. Previous surveys, studies, and site records were accessed. Records were also reviewed in the Historic Property Directory for Alameda County, which contains information on places of recognized historical significance including those evaluated for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Inventory of Historical Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. The purpose of the records search was to: (1) determine whether known cultural resources have been recorded within the project vicinity; (2) assess the likelihood for unrecorded cultural resources to be present based on historical references and the distribution of nearby sites; and (3) develop a context for the identification and preliminary evaluation of cultural resources.

The NAHC also provided a list of Native American tribes that may be eligible to consult with the City for this project, pursuant to the requirements of AB 52; a copy of this list was provided to the City. On May 16th, 2018, these Tribes were notified of the project and given the opportunity to request a consultation. No requests for a consultation were received.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The remediation activities would not result in any additional significant adverse cultural resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse cultural resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.7 ENERGY RESOURCES

The Final IS/MND did not analyze potential impacts related to energy resources. The remediation activities involve the use of energy during the Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems. Given the short-term, temporary nature of this process, the additional energy consumed would be less than significant. The remediation activities, therefore, would not have the potential to result in any significant adverse impacts related to energy.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the remediation activities related to energy resources will be less than significant.*

3.8 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on Geology and Soils. The site is relatively flat and is located in area of the City extensively developed with residential and commercial uses. According to the 2004 California State Geologic and Seismic Hazard Zones maps, the project site is not located in an area susceptible to earthquake-induced liquefaction. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, nor are there known active faults located on the site.

Modified Project: The RAW recommends the implementation of a Soils Management Plan. The soil management plan would be used address the known impacts and/or other unidentified subsurface features that may be encountered during upcoming construction activities on the subject property. Specifically, the soil management plan will include a summary of the site history and potential contaminants of concern and provide guidance for the following: identifying suspected impacted soils, managing and stockpiling graded soils (e.g., dust control and stockpile management), collecting and analyzing samples from stockpiled soil as necessary to establish waste classification, and handling and/or disposing of soil with confirmed impacts.

The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to geology and soils would remain less than significant.*

3.9 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions. GHG emissions associated with development of the proposed project would occur over the short-term from construction activities, consisting primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust and worker and vendor trips. There would also be long-term operational emissions associated with vehicular traffic within the project vicinity, energy and water usage, and solid waste disposal.

GHG emissions associated with construction were computed to be 233 metric tons (MT) of CO2e for the total construction period of Phase I and 66 MT of CO2e for the total construction period of Phase II, for a combined total of 299 MT of CO2e for the total construction period for the whole project. These are the emissions from on-site operation of construction equipment, vendor and hauling truck trips, and worker trips. Neither the City nor BAAQMD have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions, though BAAQMD recommends quantifying emissions and disclosing that GHG emissions would occur during construction. The project would incorporate BAAQMD best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable. Best management practices required to be incorporated into construction of the proposed project as a condition of approval include, but are not limited to: using local building materials of at least 10 percent and recycling or reusing at least 100% of asphalt and concrete and 65% of remaining debris.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The construction activity to implement the remedy is comparable to those identified and analyzed in the Final IS/MND. GHG emissions for the entire construction of the project over the construction period plus the operation of the project were determined to be less than significant in the Final IS/MND.

Therefore, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts related to GHG emissions or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to greenhouse gas emissions would remain less than significant.*

3.10 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would be Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated to hazards and hazardous materials specifically for *a: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and b: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted by Running Moose Environmental Consulting, LLC on September 15, 2017. As part of the Phase 2 Subsurface Investigation, Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. conducted a Shallow Soil Investigation at the subject property to investigate the potential impact of OCPs and/or metals to shallow soil as a consequence of a release or releases from historical on-site agricultural operations and/or historical residential activities. Based on the results of the additional testing completed as part of the Phase 2, there is evidence of OCPs and metal impacts to shallow soil beneath the subject property.

The Phase 2 recommends further investigation to evaluate the extent of lead impacts to soil beneath the subject property and implementation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) during redevelopment of the subject property to address the identified impacts. As such, impacts related to the potential accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 (Soil Remediation Work) and Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan):

> **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 (Soil Remediation Work):** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits for site development, the applicant shall retain a qualified environmental professional to oversee remediation work to remove or otherwise mitigate known contaminants or Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) at the property, as identified in the Phase I/ Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and Shallow Soils Investigation prepared for the project site. The remediation work shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the relevant overseeing agencies (City of Fremont Fire Department, and designated Alameda County or State Department oversight agency, or other appropriate agency having jurisdiction). Completion of the remediation work and procurement of an appropriate closure document or written statement from the relevant overseeing agency(ies) that the remediation work has been satisfactorily completed and without further conditions or obligations shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the City of Fremont Community Development

Department. Compliance with this mitigation may require the applicant or their agent to complete a Preliminary Endangerment Report, Voluntary Cleanup Agreement or other documentation as determined by the appropriate agency, and receive concurrence that the site's RECs have been resolved.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan): Prior to commencement of remedial actions required under Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the applicant, or its contractors, shall prepare and implement a site-specific health and safety plan (HASP) to minimize impacts on public health, worker health, and the environment. The HASP shall be prepared in accordance with State and federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations (29 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1910.120). Copies of the HASP shall be made available to construction workers for review during their orientation and/or regular health and safety meetings. The HASP shall identify chemicals of concern, potential hazards, worker training requirements, personal protective equipment and devices, decontamination procedures, the need for personal or area monitoring, and emergency response procedures. The HASP shall be amended, as necessary, if new information becomes available that could affect implementation of the plan.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The RAW objective is the protection of human health and the environment. Therefore, with implementation of the Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse hazardous materials impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to hazards and hazardous materials would remain less than significant.*

3.11 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact to hydrology and water quality. The proposed development would not violate any water quality standards, deplete groundwater supplies, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern nor substantially degrade water quality. The project would be required to connect to the existing public sanitary sewer and storm drain systems that serve the area and would obtain its water from existing piped public water mains serving the site. The Alameda County Water District has confirmed that it is capable of meeting the project's water demands without significantly impacting its supplies or its distribution system.

Modified Project: The modified project would not result in any changes to the conclusion of the Final IS/MND that potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.12 LAND USE AND PLANNING

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning. The current land use General Plan designation for the site is Medium Density Residential (14.6 to 29.9 units per acre). The project includes redesignating the site to Urban Residential (30 to 70 units per acre) to allow for a residential development that is greater than 29.9 units per acre.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems will not physically divide an established community; Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation; or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to land use and planning would remain less than significant.*

3.13 MINERAL RESOURCES

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a no impact on mineral resources. According to local and state mineral resources maps, there are no known mineral resources of importance to the state or region on the site or within the surrounding area.

Modified Project: The modified project is within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to mineral resources would remain no impact.*

3.14 NOISE

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would be Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated to noise specifically for *a: Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies and d: A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

The impacts related noise impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure Noise-1**,** Mitigation Measure Noise-2, Mitigation Measure Noise-3, Mitigation Measure Noise 4 and Mitigation Measure Noise-5:

Mitigation Measure Noise-1 (Common Area Wall): To meet the City's 60 dBA Ldn threshold at the Phase I outdoor courtyard, the proposed barrier height would need to be six feet along the perimeter of the courtyard. The barrier shall be constructed of a concrete panel or prefabricated sound barrier, which will not warp or have gaps which would allow traffic noise levels to flank through the barrier.

Mitigation Measure Noise-2 (Sound Rated Doors and Windows): High-performance soundrated windows and doors would be required for all units to achieve the 45 dBA Ldn interior noise standard, as well as the instantaneous interior noise level goal of 50 dBA Lmax

in bedrooms and 55 dBA Lmax in other rooms. Typical dual glazed windows are adequate to reduce interior maximum (instantaneous) noise levels to 50 dBA in rooms other than bedrooms. Windows and sliding glass doors on the exterior bedroom facades, parallel and perpendicular to Mowry Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 33. Residential units facing to the west, and opposite Mowry Avenue do not require specific STC ratings for windows and sliding glass doors.

Mitigation Measure Noise-3: (Forced Air Ventilation): Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation for all exterior facing rooms on the project site, so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control noise. Alternatively, where PTAC (wall mounted) air conditioning units are used, they are required to have an STC rating of 33.

Mitigation Measure Noise-4 (Review of Building Permit Plans): During final design, the floor plans and building elevations shall be reviewed by a qualified acoustical specialist prior to issuance of a building permit and a letter shall be submitted to the building inspector along with the plans stipulating that the design incorporates the noise control treatments necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels.

Mitigation Measure Noise-5 (Construction Equipment): The General Plan Update EIR identifies modification, placement, and operation of construction equipment as a means for minimizing the impact on the existing sensitive receptors. Construction equipment should be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as possible. Additionally, construction activities for the proposed project should include the following best management practices (also described in the General Plan Update EIR) to reduce noise from construction activities near sensitive land uses:

a. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and holidays. No construction is permitted on Sundays.

b. Excavating, grading and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and holidays. No construction is permitted on Sundays.

c. Contractors shall equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

d. Contractors shall utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

e. Loading, staging areas, stationary noise-generating equipment, etc. shall be located on larger sites as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.

f. The Contractor shall comply with Air Resource Board idling prohibitions of uneasy idling of internal combustion engines.

g. A temporary noise control blanket barrier could be erected, if necessary, along building facades facing construction sites. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling.

h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.

i. Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction delays and hours a day and evening contract number for the job site, and a contact number for the project sponsor in the event of noise complaints. The applicant shall designate an on-site compliant and enforcement manager to track and respond to noise complaints.

Modified Project: The modified project would involve noise generating activities that would be comparable to project construction activities. Based on the applicability of Mitigation Measures Noise- 4 and Noise- 5, to the remedial activities and the Removal Action Implementation requirements included in the RAW, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse noise impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse noise impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.15 POPULATION AND HOUSING

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact to population and housing. The project proposed a General Plan land use change from Medium Density Residential (14.6 to 29.9 units per acre to Urban Residential (30 to 90 units per acre) to allow for a residential development that is greater than 29.9 units per acre. The proposed change would allow infill residential development to support the regional housing need, however, as an infill site it would not necessitate the extension of infrastructure or public services to undeveloped areas to support new residential development. Thus, the project would not induce substantial growth indirectly as a result of infrastructure extensions.

Modified Project: The proposed remediation activities would not induce substantial population growth in an area or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to population and housing would remain less than significant.*

3.16 PUBLIC SERVICES

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact to public services. The project site is located in a largely built-out residential area of the City where all of the public facilities, utilities and services needed to serve the project are already in place.

Modified Project: The proposed remediation activities would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to public services would remain less than significant.*

3.17 RECREATION

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on recreation. The proposed project would result in an increase in the use of City parks, primarily Central Park. However, the project includes a total of 128 units which would not result in a significant increase in demand on any existing park or other recreational facilities or necessitate the need for new park facilities.

Modified Project: The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to recreation would remain less than significant.*

3.18 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would be Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated to transportation/traffic specifically for *d. substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The project would result in a temporary increase in truck traffic and construction activities that affect rights-of-way. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require a construction management plan and implementation throughout construction to minimize impacts. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan: The project applicant and its construction contractor shall prepare and implement a traffic management plan for construction activities that may affect road rights-of-way during construction, to reduce traffic congestion during construction and facilitate travel of emergency vehicles on affected roadways. The traffic management plan must follow applicable City of Fremont Standards Details (whichever edition is current as of the date of construction). The traffic management plan shall be submitted to the City of Fremont Public Works Department for review and approval before the approval of improvement plans and issuance of building permits where roadway improvements may cause impacts on traffic. The traffic management plan shall be implemented throughout construction. The plan shall include at least the following items and requirements:

- A set of comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, warning signs, cones for drivers, use of flag persons to direct traffic flows when needed, and designated construction access routes;
- Identification of haul routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on motor vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, circulation and safety, and specifically to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible on streets in the project area;

- Notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur;
- Provisions for monitoring surface streets used for haul routes so that any damage and debris attributable to the haul trucks can be identified and corrected by the project applicant; and
- Methods to ensure continued access by emergency vehicles. During project construction, access to the existing surrounding land uses shall be maintained at all times, with detours used, as necessary, during road closures.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The construction equipment and activity to implement the remedy is comparable to those identified and analyzed in the Final IS/MND. The limited number and duration of the truck trips required; the implementation of the remediation would not be considered significant. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse traffic impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse transportation/ traffic impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Prior Initial Study/MND.*

3.19 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact on Tribal Cultural Resources. The Phase 1 report notes that the majority of the subject property was cultivated with orchards from as early as the late 1930s through the early 1970s. The 38853 Bell Street parcel appeared to have been residentially developed as early the late 1930s; fewer orchard trees appeared to have been present on that parcel. Two residences and associated outbuildings were present on the Bell Street parcel through 2007, at which time they were demolished, and the parcels have remained vacant to the present time. Following removal of the orchards on the Mowry Avenue parcel, the existing Islander motel facility was constructed in 1973. The site is surrounded by urban development, including multi-family residential development to the west and south, Mowry Avenue to the east and a commercial center to the north.

The residential development project would implement standard development requirements (Fremont Municipal Code Chapter 18.218), which include the City's notification of Native American tribes that might have knowledge of tribal cultural resources within the project site: Notification, Affiliated California Native American Tribes. In addition, the residential development will comply with PRC Section 21074(a)(1) and Fremont Municipal Code Chapter 18.218.

Modified Project: The remediation activities consisting of Containment/Capping-in-Place and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Systems are within the same footprint/ground disturbing areas that were analyzed in the Final IS/MND. With implementation of the development requirements the modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse tribal cultural resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse tribal cultural resource impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.20 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

IS/MND: The Final IS/MND concluded the project would have a less-than-significant impact utilities and services impacts. Based upon utility and water agency responses to plan review and engineering studies, all utilities necessary to serve the project, including natural gas, electricity, water, and sewer facilities exist in the area and could be connected without significant offsite improvements.

Modified Project: The modified project would not result in any changes to the conclusion of the Final IS/MND that potential impacts related to utilities and services would be less than significant.

Conclusion: *The potential impacts of the modified project related to utilities and services would remain less than significant.*

3.21 WILDFIRE

The Final IS/MND, did not analyze potential impacts to wildfires as a result of implementing the project. The project site is located in an urban environment and would not have the potential to result in any impacts to wildfire. The remediation activities will not result in any additional significant adverse impacts or increase in the severity of impacts to wildfire.

Conclusion: *The remediation activities will not result in any impacts related to wildfires.*

3.22 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Final IS/MND concluded the discussion adequately addressed all potential impacts the proposed project may have on the environment. The initial study found that the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. In addition, with the implementation of the identified mitigation measures listed in Section XX/XIX/Mitigation Measures, combined with the project conditions of approval, would reduce all impacts the project may have to a less-than-significant level.

The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse biological or cultural resource impacts, additional substantial adverse impacts on human beings or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND. Furthermore, the cumulative impacts associated with the project were found to be less than significant in all environmental impact topic areas. Since the foregoing analysis in each of the subject areas in

this Addendum indicates that none of these impacts would be substantially increased due to the modified project, the Modified Project would not result in an appreciable increase in cumulative impacts.

Conclusion: *The modified project would not result in any additional significant adverse impacts specified in the Mandatory Findings of Significance or a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the Final IS/MND.*

3.23 CONCLUSION

Based on the forgoing analysis, DTSC has determined that the potential environmental impacts associated with the remediation activities have been analyzed and addressed in the Final Islander Redevelopment Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and this Addendum and would not result in conditions outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 that would require the preparation of a subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration.