Sand Hill Wind Repowering Project
Implementation Checklist

The proposed Sand Hill Wind Repowering Project (Project) has been determined to be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the *Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area Repowering Final Program Environmental Impact Report* (PEIR), State Clearinghouse #2010082063. The PEIR was certified by the East County Board of Zoning Adjustments on November 12, 2014.

In accordance with the purpose of the PEIR, the Project has been evaluated as a subsequent project through an environmental checklist which validates its consistency with the PEIR, and with program Alternative 2 (buildout of 450 MW of wind energy production), which the PEIR evaluated. The summary analysis in the checklist is intended to inform public agency decision makers and the public of the Project's conformity with the analysis in the PEIR and to identify the specific impacts and mitigation measures relevant specifically to the Project. The relationship of the checklist to the PEIR is consistent with the intent of a Program EIR as provided by the CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(d), which provides for use of an Initial Study to determine that the current Project would have no new or different environmental effects that were not disclosed in the PEIR or that require a new environmental impact report (EIR). The environmental checklist that follows represents an Initial Study for the purpose of Section 15063, including its provision for use with a previously prepared EIR (Section 15063(b)(1)(B)). Moreover, any public notice required by County ordinance will state, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(e), that the activities associated with the Project are within the scope of the PEIR and that the PEIR adequately described and assessed these activities.

The checklist will provide the basis for making findings to approve the Project pursuant to Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Also consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, a Project-specific Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is required for the proposed Project as a condition of approval of the requested conditional use permit to construct and operate the repowered wind energy facility.

The checklist provides a list of all identified impacts as presented and numbered in the PEIR, except that the suffixes used to distinguish alternatives and individual projects in that document have been removed. Relevant mitigation measures are indicated with checkboxes, followed by a discussion supporting the conclusion.

The checklist is intended to be considered in concert with the PEIR. Full setting and analytical information can be found in the PEIR, which is available on the County's website:

http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/landuseprojects/apwraprog.htm

Additional information and analysis supporting the determinations summarized in this checklist are provided in the *Sand Hill Wind Repowering Project Environmental Analysis* (Environmental Analysis) (Alameda County Community Development Agency 2018).

Impact	Discussion in Text		APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the Project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?		Summary of Documentation
	Existing Conditions	Impacts					No	Yes	
Aesthetics									
Impact AES-1: Temporary visual impacts caused by construction activities (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-3–4 3.1-8–10	3.1-12–13	Would construction or heavy equipment be visible from residences or recreation areas and trails?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure AES-1: Limit construction to daylight hours** ☒ Do not allow construction between sunset and sunrise or on weekends ☒ Do not use high-wattage lighting sources	☒	☐	A map indicating locations of viewpoints relative to the proposed Project is provided in Figure 3.1-1 within the Environmental Analysis. Photo simulations of the turbine locations where construction activities would occur is presented in Figures 3.1-2 through 3.1-9 within the Environmental Analysis. The visibility of proposed wind turbine construction areas from these viewpoints, as demonstrated in the simulations, suggest that construction activities and heavy equipment may be visible from County-designated scenic routes Altamont Pass Road, Mountain House Road, and Grant Line Road, as well as the California Aqueduct Bikeway. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-1 would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.
Impact AES-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6–7 3.1-8–10	3.1-15–16	Would new turbines be placed in areas where no turbines currently exist? (See Policies 105 and 106 for list of sensitive ridgelines, pg 3.1-6)	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ☒ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings. (complete text in Environmental Analysis.) **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways** ☒ Clean all derelict equipment, debris, and litter ☒ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ☒ Maintain site through the life of Project operations **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ☒ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ☒ Screen sites from view	☒	☐	The majority of the Project area was previously developed with wind energy facilities, as shown in Figure 3.1-1 within the Environmental Analysis. Although substantially larger, the new turbines would not be out of character with the existing conditions in and near the Project area, which now includes numerous large-scale wind turbines, to the west of the Project area. However, some Project turbines would be placed on ridges where no turbines existed when the Notice of Preparation for the PEIR was circulated in 2010. While site development review is not required for most of the proposed turbines, it is expected that a focused site review to implement Mitigation Measure AES-2a for those turbines placed on ridges where no turbines existed in 2010 would reduce impacts on scenic vistas to less than significant levels, together with implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-2b and AES-2c, which would be applicable to all turbine sites.
Impact AES-3: Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6 3.1-8–10	3.1-19–20	Would turbines be located along a state- or county-designated scenic highway? (See Attachment B for list)	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ☒ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings or where turbines were not in place at the time the Notice of Preparation was circulated (2010). **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways** ☒ Clean all derelict equipment, debris, and litter	☒	☐	As shown on Figure 3.1-1 within the Environmental Analysis, the new turbines would be located adjacent to county-designated scenic routes Altamont Pass Road, I-580, Mountain House Road, and Grant Line Road. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-2b and AES-2c, the impacts of the Project are within the scope of the impacts described in the PEIR and this impact would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure AES-2a is required for some turbines as described above, because the repowering Project would entail turbines on some ridgelines along Mountain House Road that were not developed with turbines at the time the PEIR Notice of

						☒ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ☒ Maintain site in such a manner through the life of Project operations **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ☒ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ☒ Screen sites from view			Preparation was released in 2010. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-2a would reduce this impact to less than significant.
Impact AES-4: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6 3.1-8–10	3.1-23–24	Would new turbines be placed in areas where no turbines currently exist?	☒	☐	**See Impact AES-2.**	☒	☐	In general, replacing many small turbines with far fewer large turbines would not degrade, and may improve, the visual character or quality of the Project area. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-2b and AES-2c, this impact would be less than significant.
Impact AES-5: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6 3.1-10–11	3.1-27–28	Would turbine be located in a setback area? Are there residents nearby - i.e., within 500 meters [1,640 feet] in a generally east or west direction to account for all seasons? Could blades cause shadow flicker that would disturb sensitive viewers, especially residents?	☐ ☐ ☐	☒ ☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure AES-5: Analyze shadow flicker distance and mitigate effects or incorporate changes into Project design to address shadow flicker** ☒ During Project design, the Project applicant will prepare a graphic model and study to evaluate shadow flicker impacts on nearby residences. (see mitigation measure for details on thresholds) ☒ If it is determined that existing setback requirements as established by the County are not sufficient to prevent shadow flicker impacts on residences, Alameda County will require an increase in the required setback distances to ensure that residences are not affected. ☒ If any residence is nonetheless affected implement measures to minimize impact, such as relocating the turbine; providing opaque window coverings, window awnings, landscape buffers, or a combination of these features to reduce flicker to acceptable limits; or shutting down the turbine during the period shadow flicker would occur. ☒ Relocate turbine if property owner is not amenable to other mitigation measures (window coverings, etc.)	☒	☐	As described in the PEIR, the new, larger turbines would require FAA lighting. The PEIR further states that because lighting for repowered turbines would be similar to lighting of previously existing turbines in the program area, the lighting of the new turbines would not create a new source of substantial or significantly adverse light in the program area that would affect daytime or nighttime views. Accordingly, no mitigation measures are identified to reduce or minimize the impact. The County has since noted that unlike the non-repowered, first- and second-generation turbines that were under 200 feet in total turbine height, the new turbines (up to 500 feet in total turbine height) are required by FAA to have individual lighting, which is notably different from the lighting used on previously existing smaller turbines. However, as discussed in Section 1.3.5 of the Environmental Analysis, this visual lighting effect does not constitute a change in the project or its circumstances; it is instead a change in information that could have been known when the PEIR was certified, and therefore does not require mitigation or other additional CEQA review. Because the existing turbines would be replaced with far fewer of the larger, more efficient turbines, the daytime source of glare is expected to be reduced. Further, the color of towers and rotors on the new turbines would be neutral and non-reflective (e.g., dull white or light gray), minimizing glare. Sand Hill will retain a qualified engineer to conduct a shadow flicker analysis. If receptors are exposed to shadow flicker beyond the thresholds specified in the PEIR, Sand Hill will implement the provisions of Mitigation Measure AES-5. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact AES-6: Consistency with state and local policies (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-3–7	3.1-30	Would the Project comply with measures set forth to protect visual resources along scenic roadways and open space areas identified for protection (Alameda County 1966) and comply with measures set forth in the ECAP to protect visual resources such as sensitive viewsheds, streets and highways, scenic highways, and areas	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ☒ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways**	☒	☐	Information is included in the Environmental Analysis depicting the location of residences as well as the proposed turbine locations. Photo simulations are presented in the Environmental Analysis in Figures 3.1-2-3.1-9. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-2a, AES-2b, AES-2c, and AES-5, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

			affected by windfarms (Alameda County 2000)?			☒ Clean all derelict equipment , debris, and litter ☒ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ☒ Maintain site in such a manner through the life of Project operations **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ☒ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ☒ Screen sites from view **Mitigation Measure AES-5: Analyze shadow flicker distance and mitigate effects or incorporate changes into Project design to address shadow flicker** ☒ During Project design, the Project applicant will prepare a graphic model and study to evaluate shadow flicker impacts on nearby residences. (see mitigation measure for details on thresholds) ☒ If it is determined that existing setback requirements as established by the County are not sufficient to prevent shadow flicker impacts on residences, Alameda County will require an increase in the required setback distances to ensure that residences are not affected. ☒ If any residence is nonetheless affected implement measures to minimize impact, such as relocating the turbine; providing opaque window coverings, window awnings, landscape buffers, or a combination of these features to reduce flicker to acceptable limits; or shutting down the turbine during the period shadow flicker would occur ☒ Relocate turbine if property owner is not amenable to other mitigation measures (window coverings, etc.)			
Agricultural Resources									
Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use (less than significant with mitigation)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-7–8	Would Project components be built on Prime Farmland?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure AG-1: Avoid conversion of Prime Farmland** ☐ Do not place wind turbines or other related facilities/infrastructure in locations that would result in the permanent conversion of land that is Prime Farmland or Farmland of State Importance	☒	☐	*See Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR for the location of prime farmland in the program area.* As shown in Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR, there is one small area of Prime Farmland in the far northeastern corner of the APWRA program area. However, the Sand Hill Project area consists entirely of land designated as grazing land. No Prime Farmland is within the Project area boundary. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract (no impact)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-9	Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☒	☐	**Note:** Wind turbines are a conditionally permitted use in the agricultural zone applied to the program area and are a compatible use, allowed under the Williamson Act contracts for grazing land covering the program area. Therefore, repowering Projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	The Project area is within the program area considered in the PEIR. As indicated in the PEIR (Figure 3.2-2), all but two of the Project parcels (APNs 99B-7050-4-1 and 99B-7350-2-1) are subject to Williamson Act contracts. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract. As described in the PEIR, windfarm uses are conditionally permitted in Alameda County's "A" (Agriculture) zone district, which encompasses the entire program area, and in areas designated under the ECAP as Large Parcel Agriculture (LPA), which applies to almost all of the program area. Wind turbines are a compatible use, allowed under the Williamson Act contracts covering grazing land within the program area, and the replacement of wind turbines on land currently under Williamson Act contract would not remove the land from Williamson Act contract status. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.

Impact AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (no impact)	3.2-3 3.2-6	3.2-10	Would Project features be built in forest or timber land?	☒	☐	**Note:** There is no forest land in the program area. Therefore, repowering Projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	There is no forest land within either the program area or the Project area. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact AG-4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (no impact)	Same as previous	Same as previous	Same as previous	☒	☐	**Note:** There is no forest land in the program area. Therefore, repowering Projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	There is no forest land within either the program area or the Project area. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact AG-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (less than significant with mitigation)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-11	Would Project features be built on Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or forest land?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure AG-1: Avoid conversion of Prime Farmland** ☐ Do not place wind turbines or other related facilities/infrastructure in locations that would result in the permanent conversion of land that is Prime Farmland or Farmland of State Importance	☒	☐	*See Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR for the location of Prime Farmland in the program area.* The Sand Hill Project area consists entirely of land designated as grazing land. As shown in Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR, no Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance is within the Project area boundary. There is no forest land within either the program area or the Project area. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Air Quality									
Impact AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (less than significant)	3.3-1–7	3.3-19	Would the Project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☒	☐	Repowering Projects and other related activities that would not result in substantial increase in employment would fall within the impact assessed in the PEIR under Impact AQ-1.	☒	☐	Appendix A in the Environmental Analysis provides an Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the proposed Project. Because the Project would entail the same activities considered in the PEIR, there would be no conflict with applicable air quality plans. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation (significant and unavoidable)	3.3-1–7	3.3-21	Would Project construction create air quality conditions that violate air quality standards? Would Project operation create air quality conditions that violate air quality standards? Would the Project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☐ ☒ ☐	☒ ☐ ☒	**Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures** ☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing measures based on BAAQMD's Additional Construction Mitigation Measures** ☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP	☒	☐	Appendix A to the Environmental Analysis provides an Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the proposed Project Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a and AQ-2b would not reduce total construction-related NO_x emissions of projects such as those assessed in the PEIR to a less-than-significant level. This impact would be significant and unavoidable, and was recognized as such in the PEIR. The findings to approve the Project will be required to indicate the unavoidable adverse impact of construction-related emissions.
Impact AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)(significant and unavoidable for construction and less than significant for operation)	3.3-1–7	3.3-37	Would the Project create new permanent stationary sources of criteria pollutants or increase criteria pollutant emissions from any existing stationary sources? Would the Project result in an increase in ROG, NOX, PM10, or PM2.5? Would the Project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☒ ☐ ☒	☐ ☒ ☐	**Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures** ☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing measures based on BAAQMD's Additional Construction Mitigation Measures** ☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP	☒	☐	Appendix A to the Environmental Analysis provides an Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the proposed Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a and AQ-2b would not reduce total construction-related NO_x emissions of projects such as those assessed in the PEIR to a less-than-significant level. This impact would be significant and unavoidable, and as above, will have to be acknowledged in the required findings.
Impact AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant	3.3-14	3.3-40	Would the Project be located near sensitive receptors?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures**	☐	☐	Appendix A to the Environmental Analysis provides an Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the proposed Project

concentrations (less than significant with mitigation)						☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing measures based on BAAQMD's Additional Construction Mitigation Measures** ☒ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP			The closest sensitive receptors to the Project are a number of single-family residences along Altamont Pass Road, West Grant Line Road, Mountain House Road, Midway Road, and Kelso Road. The PEIR applied mitigation to ensure that construction related air pollutant emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutants. Additionally, most residences are 0.5 mile or more from construction activities. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation, as concluded in the PEIR.
Impact AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people(less than significant)	3.3-14	3.3-41	Would the Project include activities not covered in the PEIR? Would the Project cause objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people?	☒ ☒	☐ ☐		☒	☐	Appendix A to the Environmental Analysis provides an Air Quality Technical Memorandum for the proposed Project. The PEIR concluded that neither construction nor operation of the repowering projects would result in significant odor impacts. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Biological Resources									
Impact BIO-1: Potential for ground-disturbing activities to result in adverse effects on special-status plants or habitat occupied by special-status plants (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–6 3.4-22–25	3.4-60	Would Project construction affect special-status plants or habitat occupied by special-status plants?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Conduct surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status plant species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status plant species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices shown in MM BIO-1b and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Avoid and minimize impacts on special-status plant species by establishing activity exclusion zones** ☒ Establish activity exclusion zones around special-status plant species if construction will occur within 250 feet of the occupied habitat ☒ If exclusion zone is to be smaller, consult with qualified biologist and obtain concurrence from CDFW. **Note:** All impacts on large-flowered fiddleneck, diamond-petaled California poppy, and caper-fruited tropidocarpum must be avoided, impacts on other special-status plant species will be avoided to the extent feasible, and any impacts related to avoidance being infeasible will be addressed through compensatory mitigation.	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. In summary, special-status plants have been documented in the study area. PEIR mitigation measures BIO-1a through BIO-1e ensure less than significant effects through identification, avoidance, and where avoidance is infeasible, compensatory mitigation for special-status plant species.
						Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: Compensate for impacts on special-status plant species ☒ Where avoidance of impacts on a special-status plant species is infeasible, compensate for through the acquisition, protection, and subsequent management in perpetuity of other existing occurrences at a 2:1 ratio (occurrences impacted: occurrences preserved). ☒ Provide detailed information to the County and CDFW on the location of the preserved occurrences, quality of the preserved habitat, feasibility of protecting and managing the areas in-perpetuity, responsibility parties, and other pertinent information. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring			*See above.*

Impact BIO-2: Adverse effects on special-status plants and natural communities resulting from the introduction and spread of invasive plant species (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-3–4 3.4-8–21	3.4-65	Would construction vehicles have the potential to introduce invasive plant species into the Project area?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare a Grassland Restoration Plan in coordination with CDFW ☒ Receive CDFW approval of Grassland Restoration Plan **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP ☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board **Note:** Erosion control reduces impacts related to invasive plants through erosion of soils in which they grow.	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Project would involve the use of construction vehicles that could introduce invasive plant species. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact BIO-3: Potential mortality of or loss of habitat for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-28–29	3.4-67	Would the Project occur in or near vernal pool habitat or drainages? Would the Project involve road construction or widening? Would the Project alter the hydrology or sedimentation? Would herbicides be used during operation or maintenance near or upstream of suitable habitat for curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle? Would the Project involve road or firebreak maintenance?	☐ ☐ ☒ ☒ ☐	☒ ☒ ☐ ☐ ☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Project, like other Projects analyzed in the PEIR, could have direct and indirect impacts on habitat for special-status invertebrates. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
						Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Implement measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle ☒ Implement avoidance and minimization measures. ☒ Where impacts cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the PEIR). ☒ If an incidental take permit is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the permit in consultation with USFWS.			
Impact BIO-4: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle(less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-25–28	3.4-71	Would the Project cause the removal of elderberry shrubs during construction or operation? Would the Project cause the trimming of elderberry shrubs during construction or operation? Would the Project cause disturbance of elderberry roots within the shrub dripline?	☒ ☒ ☒	☐ ☐ ☐	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☐ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☐ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. No elderberry shrubs were identified in the Project area. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

			Would the Project cause changes in topography or compaction of soil from construction in the vicinity of elderberry shrubs?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☐ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction **Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ☐ Avoid removal of elderberry shrubs. ☐ Protect elderberry shrubs/clusters within 100 feet of the construction area. (A qualified biologist will mark the elderberry shrubs and clusters and orange construction barrier fencing will be placed at the edge of the buffer areas.) ☐ Receive approval from USFWS for buffer areas. No construction activities will be permitted within the buffer zone. ☐ Post signs every 50 feet (15.2 meters) along the perimeter of the buffer area fencing... ☐ Inspect buffer area fences around elderberry shrubs weekly by a qualified biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities and monthly after ground-disturbing activities until Project construction is complete or until the fences are removed ☐ Submit biological inspection reports to USFWS. **Mitigation Measure BIO-4b: Compensate for direct and indirect effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ☐ If elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided and protected as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4a, the Project proponent will obtain an incidental take permit from USFWS. ☐ **If elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided and protected as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4a, the Project proponent will compensate for the loss of any elderberry shrubs.**			
Impact BIO-5: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for California tiger salamander, western spadefoot, California red-legged frog, and foothill yellow-legged frog (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-8–22 3.4-29–32	3.4-76	Would the Project include any of the following activities? • Excavation, grading, or stockpiling of soil • Removal or disturbance of upland habitat • Installation of power collection and communication systems • Turbine construction • Road infrastructure construction/maintenance and upgrades • Meteorological tower installation and removal	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. No suitable habitat for foothill yellow-legged frog is present in Project area; however, suitable habitat for CTS, CRLF, and spadefoot is present. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
			• Temporary staging area set-up • Reclamation • Operation and maintenance • Travel on maintenance roads			**Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** ☒ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents ☒ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS (California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander) and from CDFW (California tiger salamander only) before construction begins.			

						☒ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable Project permits (e.g., ESA or CESA incidental take authorization). ☒ Comply with the State of California State Water Resources Control Board NPDES construction general requirements for stormwater. **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** ☒ If impacts on aquatic and upland habitat for special-status amphibians cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the PEIR). ☒ If take authorization is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the authorization in consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW. **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance.			
Impact BIO-6: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for western pond turtle (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-32–33	3.4-82	Would the Project involve construction activities in or near ponds, reservoirs, drainages, or surrounding riparian and grassland areas? Would the Project involve road construction or widening activities?	☐ ☐	☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction. **Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct preconstruction surveys for western pond turtle and monitor construction activities if turtles are observed** ☒ Conduct surveys for western pond turtle one week before and within 24 hours of beginning work in suitable aquatic habitat. ☒ Have a biological monitor present during construction activities in the aquatic habitat where the turtle was observed.	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Biological Resources Evaluation (*Appendix B*) found that suitable habitat for western pond turtle is present in the Project area, and direct effects could result from Project activities. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
						☒ Have a qualified biologist remove and relocate turtle to appropriate aquatic habitat outside and away from the construction area (relocation of western pond turtle requires a letter from CDFW authorizing this activity).			
Impact BIO-7: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for Blainville's horned lizard, Alameda whipsnake, and San Joaquin coachwhip (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-32–34	3.4-85	Would the Project involve construction activities in grassland, chaparral, oak woodland, or scrub? Would the Project involve road and firebreak maintenance activities in grassland, chaparral, oak woodland, or scrub?	☐ ☐	☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction	☐	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Biological Resources Evaluation (*Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis*) found that Alameda whipsnake has low likelihood to occur in the Project area because of the lack of suitable habitat; however, the other two species are likely to occur. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

						Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles ☒ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents ☐ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (Alameda whipsnake) before construction begins. ☐ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable Project permits (i.e., ESA incidental take permit).			
						Mitigation Measure BIO-7b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status reptiles ☒ If impacts on habitat for special-status reptiles cannot be avoided or minimized, compensatory mitigation will be undertaken in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the EIR). ☐ If incidental take permits are required for Alameda whipsnake, compensatory mitigation will be undertaken in accordance with the terms of permits in consultation with USFWS and CDFW.			
Impact BIO-8: Potential construction-related disturbance or mortality of special-status and non–special-status migratory birds (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-34–42	3.4-89	Would construction occur during nesting season (generally February 1–August 31)?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance **Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non–special-status nesting birds** ☒ Implement best management practices, including: ☒ Preconstruction bird surveys ☒ Coordination with USFW on golden eagles ☒ Coordination with CDFW and USFWS on active nests **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** ☒ Implement best management practices, including: ☒ Preconstruction burrowing owl surveys ☒ Coordination with CDFW on active burrowing owl nests ☒ Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl buffer ☒ Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl exclusion plan	☒	☐	The Biological Resources Evaluation (*Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis*) concluded that suitable nesting habitat for tree-nesting raptors (e.g., eagles, Swainson's hawks, white-tailed kites) is not present in the Project area; however, nesting habitat for other species (e.g., ground-nesting birds) is present. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impact BIO-9: Permanent and temporary loss of occupied habitat for western burrowing owl and foraging habitat for tricolored blackbird and other special-status and non–special-status birds (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-34–42	3.4-94	Would the Project result in the temporary or permanent loss of grassland?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** ☒ If impacts on aquatic and upland habitat for special-status amphibians cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the EIR). ☒ If take authorization is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the authorization in consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW. **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Project area provides suitable burrowing owl habitat as does most of the program area. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
						Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Compensate for the permanent loss of occupied habitat for western burrowing owl ☒ If construction activities would result in the removal of occupied burrowing owl habitat, permanently protect mitigation land through a conservation easement or implement alternative mitigation ☒ Consult with CDFW, as described in its Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (California Department of Fish and Game 2012:11–13), to develop the compensation plan ☒ Submit compensation plan for County review and approval			
Impact BIO-10: Potential injury or mortality of and loss of habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-45–46	3.4-96	Would the Project result in temporary or permanent impacts on grassland? Would the Project use vehicles that could hit San Joaquin kit fox or American badger? Would the Project have exposed pipes, large excavated holes, or trenches that could entrap San Joaquin kit foxes or American badgers? Would the Project have operation or maintenance activities, such as road and firebreak maintenance?	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	☒ ☒ ☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ☒ Implement BMPs, including: ☒ Preconstruction San Joaquin kit fox and American badger surveys ☒ Conducting preconstruction surveys no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of ground disturbance, or any activity likely to affect San Joaquin kit fox ☒ Submission of results of the preconstruction survey including the locations of any potential or known San Joaquin kit fox dens to USFWS ☒ If implementation of some of these BMPs requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (San Joaquin kit fox) before construction begins.	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Biological Resources Evaluation (*Appendix B*) found limited likelihood of kit foxes using the Project area, but they could pass through it between areas of more suitable habitat. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

						Mitigation Measure BIO-10b: Compensate for loss of suitable habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger ☒ If permanent impacts on habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C in EIR). ☒ If incidental take permits are required for San Joaquin kit fox, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of permits in consultation with USFWS and CDFW.			
Impact BIO-11: Avian mortality resulting from interaction with wind energy facilities (significant and unavoidable)	3.4-1–8 3.4-46–49	3.4-102	Would the Project include turbines or powerlines?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-11a: Prepare a Project-specific avian protection plan** ☒ Prepare a Project-specific avian protection plan (APP) ☒ Submit a draft Project-specific APP to the County for review by the TAC **Mitigation Measure BIO-11b: Site turbines to minimize potential mortality of birds** ☒ Conduct a siting process ☒ Prepare a siting analysis to select turbine locations to minimize potential impacts on bird and bat species ☒ Use model to identify dangerous locations for birds and bats based on site-specific risk factors ☒ Include siting analysis and model results for each turbine in Project-specific APP **Mitigation Measure BIO-11c: Use turbine designs that reduce avian impacts** Implement the following design-related measures: ☒ Select designs that have been shown or that are suspected to reduce avian fatalities, based on the height, color, configuration, or other features of the turbines ☒ Limit or eliminate perching opportunities ☒ Limit or eliminate nesting or roosting opportunities ☒ Install lighting on the fewest number of turbines allowed by FAA regulations, and all pilot warning lights will fire synchronously. Use only red or dual red-and-white strobe, strobe-like, or flashing lights and operate at the minimum allowable intensity, flashing frequency, and quantity allowed by FAA. **Mitigation Measure BIO-11d: Incorporate avian-safe practices into design of turbine-related infrastructure** ☒ Implement avian-safe practices **Mitigation Measure BIO-11e: Retrofit existing infrastructure to minimize risk to raptors** ☒ Retrofit any existing power lines in a specific Project area that are owned by the wind Project operator and are associated with electrocution of an eagle or other raptor, within 30 days, to make them raptor-safe according to Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines.	☒	☐	See Chapter 3, Section 3.4, of the Environmental Analysis for information regarding the Project's anticipated impacts on avian mortality. In summary, the proposed Project will cause avian mortalities and require preparation of a Project-specific avian protection plan and other mitigation measures. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable after application of all mitigation measures, consistent with the determination of the PEIR regarding program activities.
						☒ Retrofit all other existing structures to remain in a Project area during repowering, as feasible, according to specifications of Mitigation Measure BIO-11c prior to repowered turbine operation. **Mitigation Measure BIO-11f: Discourage prey for raptors** Apply the following measures when designing and siting turbine-related infrastructure to minimize opportunities for fossorial mammals to become established ☒ Do not use rodenticide on the Project site to avoid the risk of raptors scavenging the remains of poisoned animals			

						☒ Place boulders (rocks more than 12 inches in diameter) excavated during Project construction in aboveground piles more than 500 meters (1,640 feet) from any turbine ☒ Move existing rock piles created during construction of first- and second-generation turbines at least 500 meters (1,640 feet) from turbines ☒ Place gravel around each tower foundation to discourage small mammals from burrowing near turbines **Mitigation Measure BIO-11g: Implement postconstruction avian fatality monitoring for all repowering Projects** Implement the postconstruction monitoring program, including: ☒ Conducting fatality monitoring for a minimum of 3 years ☒ Forming a technical advisory committee (TAC) ☒ Conducting carcass surveys ☒ Providing for avian use surveys to be conducted within the Project area boundaries for a minimum of 30 minutes duration ☒ Submitting raw data and annual reports to the County **Mitigation Measure BIO-11h: Compensate for the loss of raptors and other avian species, including golden eagles, by contributing to conservation efforts** ☒ Implement the compensation measures, including submitting to the County for approval specific conservation effort to be pursued as part of the avian conservation strategy review process **Mitigation Measure BIO-11i: Implement an avian adaptive management program** ☒ Implement the adaptive management program in MM BIO-11i if fatality monitoring described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11g results in an estimate that exceeds the preconstruction baseline fatality estimates (i.e., estimates at the nonrepowered turbines as described in this PEIR) for any focal species or species group (i.e., individual focal species, all focal species, all raptors, all non-raptors, all birds combined). This includes: ☒ Preparing a Project-specific adaptive management plan within 2 months following the availability of the fatality monitoring results.			
						☒ Implementing the Project-specific adaptive management plans within 2 months of approval by the County			
Impact BIO-12: Potential mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal or disturbance (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-127	Would the Project construction or decommissioning involve any of the following activities? • Increased traffic, noise, lighting, or human access • Removal or disturbance of trees, rock outcrops, debris piles, outbuildings, or other artificial structures • Removal of special-status species' roost structures	☐ ☐ ☒ ☒	☒ ☒ ☐ ☐	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☐ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☐ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction **Mitigation Measure BIO-12a: Conduct bat roost surveys** ☐ Prior to development of any repowering Project, conduct a roost habitat assessment to identify potential colonial roost sites of special-status and common bat species within 750 feet of the construction area ☐ If suitable roost sites are to be removed or otherwise affected by the proposed Project, conduct targeted roost surveys of all identified sites that would be affected (several separate survey visits may be required)	☒	☐	The Biological Resources Evaluation (Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis) did not detect any potential roosting habitat in the Project area. Accordingly, this impact (for the Project) is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

						☐ At the completion of the roost surveys, submit a report documenting areas surveyed, methods, results, and mapping of high-quality habitat or confirmed roost locations			
						Mitigation Measure BIO-12b: Avoid removing or disturbing bat roosts ☐ Do not disturb active bat roosts and provide a minimum buffer of 500 feet where preexisting disturbance is moderate or 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal ☐ Confirm buffer distances and determination of the need for a biological monitor for active maternity roosts or hibernacula in consultation with CDFW. ☐ Wherever feasible, leave structures (natural or artificial) showing evidence of significant bat use within the past year in place as habitat ☐ Consult with CDFW should such a structure need to be removed or disturbed ☐ Provide environmental awareness training to construction personnel, establish buffers, and initiate consultation with CDFW if needed ☐ Shield and angle artificial night lighting within 500 feet of any roost in such that bats may enter and exit the roost without artificial illumination and the roost does not receive artificial exposure to visual predators ☐ Conduct tree and vegetation removal outside the maternity season (April 1–September 15) ☐ If a maternity roost or hibernaculum is present within 500 feet of the construction site where preexisting disturbance is moderate or within 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal, have a qualified biological monitor onsite during groundbreaking activities			
Impact BIO-13: Potential for construction activities to temporarily remove or alter bat foraging habitat (less than significant)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-130	Would Project construction degrade bat foraging habitat by replacing vegetation with nonvegetated land cover types?	☐	☒	**Note**: No mitigation is required for Projects as described in the PEIR because the limited amount of habitat loss would be offset by the increase in foraging habitat brought about by decommissioning.	☒	☐	Construction impacts on bat foraging habitat are identical to those described in the PEIR and are less than significant. No mitigation is required.
Impact BIO-14: Turbine-related fatalities of special-status and other bats (significant and unavoidable – *findings of overriding considerations made with the PEIR*)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-131	Would the Project involve turbines?	☐	☒	**Note:** These mitigation measures will not reduce the impact to a less than significant **Mitigation Measure BIO-14a: Site and select turbines to minimize potential mortality of bats** ☒ Use the best information available to site turbines and to select from turbine models in such a manner as to reduce bat collision risk; measures include siting turbines the greatest distance feasible up to 500 meters (1,640) feet from still or flowing bodies of water, riparian habitat, known roosts, and tree stands (California Bat Working Group 2006:6). ☒ Conduct a bat habitat assessment and roost survey to identify and map habitat of potential significance to bats ☒ Incorporate relevant bat use survey data and bat fatality records published by other Projects in the APWRA into turbine siting decisions ☒ Carry out roost surveys according to the methods described in Mitigation Measure-BIO-12a.	☒	☐	Turbine-related fatalities would be the same as assessed in the PEIR because Project characteristics would be comparable. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.
						Mitigation Measure BIO-14b: Implement postconstruction bat fatality monitoring program for all repowering Projects ☒ Implement a scientifically defensible, postconstruction bat fatality monitoring program ☒ Include on the TAC at least one biologist with significant expertise in bat research and wind energy impacts on bats			

						☒ Conduct bat acoustic surveys concurrently with fatality monitoring in the Project area ☒ Modify the fatality search protocol will be implemented to obtain better information on the number and timing of bat fatalities ☒ Use bat carcasses in detection probability trials to develop bat-specific detection probabilities **Mitigation Measure BIO-14c: Prepare and publish annual monitoring reports on the findings of bat use of the Project area and fatality monitoring results** ☒ Produce annual reports of bat use results and fatality monitoring within 3 months of the end of the last day of fatality monitoring ☒ Report special-status bat species records to CNDDB **Mitigation Measure BIO-14d: Develop and implement a bat adaptive management plan** ☒ In concert with Mitigation Measure BIO-14b, develop adaptive management plans to ensure appropriate, feasible, and current incorporation of emerging information **Mitigation Measure BIO-14e: Compensate for expenses incurred by rehabilitating injured bats** ☒ Assume in full the cost of reasonable, licensed rehabilitation efforts for any injured bats taken to wildlife care facilities from the program area			
Impact BIO-15: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on alkali meadow (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-10–11	3.4-141	Would the Project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in alkali meadow habitat? Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in alkali meadow habitat?	☐ ☐	☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Compensate for the loss of alkali meadow habitat** ☒ If alkali meadow habitat is filled or disturbed, compensate for the loss of this habitat ☒ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ☒ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Biological Resources Evaluation identified alkali meadow habitat in areas that would be crossed by Project roads. This impact is consistent with analysis in the PEIR, and all mitigation measures would apply. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact BIO-16: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on riparian habitat (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-14–15	3.4-142	Would the Project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in riparian habitat? Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in riparian habitat?	☒ ☒	☐ ☐	**Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Compensate for the loss of riparian habitat** ☐ If riparian habitat is filled or removed as part of a Project, compensate for the loss of riparian habitat ☐ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ☐ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan	☐	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. The Biological Resources Evaluation did not identify riparian habitat in the Project area; accordingly, this impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact BIO-17: Potential for ground-disturbing activities to result in direct adverse effects on common habitats (less than significant)	3.4-8–21	3.4-143	Would the Project cause ground disturbance in common habitats? Would the Project include the following measures, which are part of the Project, as described in Chapter 2, *Program Description*, of the EIR? ☒ develop a reclamation plan in coordination with the County, USFWS, and CDFW ☒ ensure the reclamation plan is completed and approved by the County 6 months in advance of Project decommissioning	☐ ☐	☒ ☒	**Note**: No mitigation is required for Projects as described in the PEIR because all lands disturbed by infrastructure installation or removal would be returned to pre-Project conditions per the County required reclamation plan. If the Project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. Project conditions would include restoration of disturbed lands and grassland restoration. The PEIR conclusion applies: the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact BIO-18: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on wetlands (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-15–17	3.4-145	Would the Project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in wetlands?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Compensate for the loss of wetlands** ☒ If wetlands are filled or disturbed as part of a Project, compensate for the loss of this habitat functions	☒	☐	Appendix B to the Environmental Analysis provides a biological resources study for the proposed Project. As disclosed in the PEIR, the Project would involve road

			Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in wetlands?	☐	☒	☒ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ☒ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan			infrastructure upgrades in wetlands; the PEIR conclusion and mitigation measures would apply.
Impact BIO-19: Potential impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites (significant and unavoidable - *findings of overriding considerations made with the PEIR*)	3.4-1–8 3.4-25–49	3.4-146	Would the Project involve construction activities or fencing of work areas?	☐	☒	**Note:** These mitigation measures will not reduce the impact to less than significant **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☒ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ☒ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all Project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction	☒	☐	As disclosed in the PEIR, Project construction would create temporary obstacles to wildlife movement. Turbine operation would result in mortality of birds and bats moving through the area. The impact for the Project, as the PEIR concluded, would be significant and unavoidable. All mitigation measures would apply, with the exception of those pertaining to bat roosting habitat and habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle, neither of which are present in the Project area.
						Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle ☐ Avoid removal of elderberry shrubs. ☐ Protect elderberry shrubs/clusters within 100 feet of the construction area. (A qualified biologist will mark the elderberry shrubs and clusters and orange construction barrier fencing will be placed at the edge of the buffer areas.) ☐ Receive approval from USFWS for buffer areas. No construction activities will be permitted within the buffer zone. ☐ Post signs every 50 feet (15.2 meters) along the perimeter of the buffer area fencing... ☐ Inspect buffer area fences around elderberry shrubs weekly by a qualified biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities and monthly after ground-disturbing activities until Project construction is complete or until the fences are removed ☐ Submit biological inspection reports to USFWS. **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** ☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents ☒ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS (California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander) and from CDFW (California tiger salamander only) before construction begins. ☒ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable Project permits (e.g., ESA or CESA incidental take authorization). ☒ Comply with the State of California State Water Resources Control Board NPDES construction general requirements for stormwater. **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☒ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance **Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles**			

						☒ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual Project design and construction documents ☒ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (Alameda whipsnake) before construction begins. ☒ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable Project permits (i.e., ESA incidental take permit).			
						Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non–special-status nesting birds ☒ Implement best management practices, including: ☒ Preconstruction bird surveys ☒ Coordination with USFW on golden eagles ☒ Coordination with CDFW and USFWS on active nests **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** ☒ Implement best management practices, including: ☒ Preconstruction burrowing owl surveys ☒ Coordination with CDFW on active burrowing owl nests ☒ Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl buffer ☒ Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl exclusion plan **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ☒ Implement BMPs, including: ☒ Preconstruction San Joaquin kit fox and American badger surveys ☒ Conducting preconstruction surveys no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of ground disturbance, or any activity likely to affect San Joaquin kit fox ☒ Submission of results of the preconstruction survey including the locations of any potential or known San Joaquin kit fox dens to USFWS ☒ If implementation of some of these BMPs requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (San Joaquin kit fox) before construction begins. **Mitigation Measure BIO-11b: Site turbines to minimize potential mortality of birds** ☒ Conduct a siting process ☒ Prepare a siting analysis to select turbine locations to minimize potential impacts on bird and bat species ☒ Use model to identify dangerous locations for birds and bats based on site-specific risk factors ☒ Include siting analysis and model results for each turbine in Project-specific APP			
						Mitigation Measure BIO-11c: Use turbine designs that reduce avian impacts Implement the following design-related measures: ☒ Select designs that have been shown or that are suspected to reduce avian fatalities, based on the height, color, configuration, or other features of the turbines ☒ Limit or eliminate perching opportunities ☒ Limit or eliminate nesting or roosting opportunities			

						☒ Install lighting on the fewest number of turbines allowed by FAA regulations, and all pilot warning lights will fire synchronously. Use only red or dual red-and-white strobe, strobe-like, or flashing lights and operate at the minimum allowable intensity, flashing frequency, and quantity allowed by FAA **Mitigation Measure BIO-11d: Incorporate avian-safe practices into design of turbine-related infrastructure** ☒ Implement avian-safe practices **Mitigation Measure BIO-11e: Retrofit existing infrastructure to minimize risk to raptors** ☒ Retrofit any existing power lines in a specific Project area that are owned by the wind Project operator and are associated with electrocution of an eagle or other raptor, within 30 days, to make them raptor-safe according to Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines. ☒ Retrofit all other existing structures to remain in a Project area during repowering, as feasible, according to specifications of Mitigation Measure BIO-11c prior to repowered turbine operation. **Mitigation Measure BIO-11i: Implement an avian adaptive management program** ☒ Implement the adaptive management program if fatality monitoring described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11g results in an estimate that exceeds the preconstruction baseline fatality estimates (i.e., estimates at the nonrepowered turbines as described in this PEIR) for any focal species or species group (i.e., individual focal species, all focal species, all raptors, all non-raptors, all birds combined). This includes: ☒ Preparing a Project-specific adaptive management plan within 2 months following the availability of the fatality monitoring results ☒ Implementing the Project-specific adaptive management plans within 2 months of approval by the County **Mitigation Measure BIO-12a: Conduct bat roost surveys** ☒ Prior to development of any repowering Project, conduct a roost habitat assessment to identify potential colonial roost sites of special-status and common bat species within 750 feet of the construction area ☒ If suitable roost sites are to be removed or otherwise affected by the proposed Project, conduct targeted roost surveys of all identified sites that would be affected (several separate survey visits may be required) ☒ At the completion of the roost surveys, submit a report documenting areas surveyed, methods, results, and mapping of high-quality habitat or confirmed roost locations			
						Mitigation Measure BIO-12b: Avoid removing or disturbing bat roosts ☐ Do not disturb active bat roosts and provide a minimum buffer of 500 feet where preexisting disturbance is moderate or 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal ☐ Confirm buffer distances and determination of the need for a biological monitor for active maternity roosts or hibernacula in consultation with CDFW. ☐ Wherever feasible, leave structures (natural or artificial) showing evidence of significant bat use within the past year in place as habitat ☐ Consult with CDFW should such a structure need to be removed or disturbed ☐ Provide environmental awareness training to construction personnel, establish buffers, and initiate consultation with CDFW if needed			

						☐ Shield and angle artificial night lighting within 500 feet of any roost in such that bats may enter and exit the roost without artificial illumination and the roost does not receive artificial exposure to visual predators ☐ Conduct tree and vegetation removal outside the maternity season (April 1–September 15) ☐ If a maternity roost or hibernaculum is present within 500 feet of the construction site where preexisting disturbance is moderate or within 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal, have a qualified biological monitor onsite during groundbreaking activities **Mitigation Measure BIO-14a: Site and select turbines to minimize potential mortality of bats** ☒ Use the best information available to site turbines and to select from turbine models in such a manner as to reduce bat collision risk; measures include siting turbines the greatest distance feasible up to 500 meters (1,640) feet from still or flowing bodies of water, riparian habitat, known roosts, and tree stands (California Bat Working Group 2006:6). ☒ Conduct a bat habitat assessment and roost survey to identify and map habitat of potential significance to bats ☒ Incorporate relevant bat use survey data and bat fatality records published by other Projects in the APWRA into turbine siting decisions ☒ Carry out roost surveys according to the methods described in Mitigation Measure-BIO-12a. **Mitigation Measure BIO-14d: Develop and implement a bat adaptive management plan** ☒ In concert with Mitigation Measure BIO-14b, develop adaptive management plans to ensure appropriate, feasible, and current incorporation of emerging information			
Impact BIO-20: Conflict with local plans or policies (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-6–8	3.4-153	Would Project construction or operation cause the loss of special-status species or their habitat, loss of alkali meadow, loss of riparian habitat, or loss of existing wetlands?	☐	☒	**Note:** The mitigation measures below are not repeated here because they are addressed above **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Conduct surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status species** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Avoid and minimize impacts on special-status plant species by establishing activity exclusion zones** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: Compensate for impacts on special-status plant species** **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Implement measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle** **Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle** **Mitigation Measure BIO-4b: Compensate for direct and indirect effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle** **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands**	☒	☐	Because the characteristics of the Project and the Project area are consistent with those contemplated in the PEIR (with the exception of the absence of riparian habitat), the conclusion would be the same, and the same mitigation measures would apply. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

						Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles **Mitigation Measure BIO-7b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status reptiles** **Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non-special-status nesting birds** **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** **Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Compensate for the permanent loss of foraging habitat for western burrowing owl** **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** **Mitigation Measure BIO-10b: Compensate for loss of suitable habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** **Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Compensate for the loss of alkali meadow habitat** **Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Compensate for the loss of riparian habitat** **Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Compensate for the loss of wetlands**			
Impact BIO-21: Conflict with provisions of an adopted HCP/NCCP or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan (no impact)	NA	3.4-158	Would the Project include activities that are not within the scope of the Project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the program area. If the proposed Project does not fall within the scope of activities described in the PEIR but the Project would not conflict with the EACCS, there would be no impact.	☒	☐	There are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the Project area. The conclusion of the PEIR would apply. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Cultural									
Impact CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (no impact)	3.5-1 to 3.5-6	3.5-6 to 3.5-20	Are any historic architectural resources located in the Project area?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure CUL-1a: Avoid historic resources** ☒ Where feasible, avoid historic resources in design and layout of a proposed Project in the program area **Mitigation Measure CUL-1b: Appropriate recordation of historic resources** ☒ If Mitigation Measure CUL-1a is determined to be infeasible, record the significantly affected historic resource following the guidelines of NPS, HABS, or HAER and provide the documentation to NPS, the SHPO, and local repositories as determined by Alameda County	☒	☐	Three historic resources identified within the Project area (P-01-010613, Grant Line Road; P-01-010947, and P-01-011395 both historic transmission lines) were not formally evaluated for eligibility in the NRHP/CRHR. However, Grant Line Road is an actively in-use roadway and the transmission lines consist of actively in-use overhead power lines; none of which would be affected by Project activities. Similarly, while a segment of the California Aqueduct intersects with the APE, Project-related activities are not anticipated to disturb these resources. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource (less than significant with mitigation)	3.5-1 to 3.5-6	3.5-6 to 3.5-20	Would the Project involve ground-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: Conduct a preconstruction cultural field survey and cultural resources inventory and evaluation** ☒ Conduct an archaeological field survey of the program area and include the documentation and result of these efforts, the evaluation of any cultural resources identified during the survey, and cultural resources monitoring **Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Develop a treatment plan for any identified significant cultural resources** ☒ If any significant resources are identified through the preconstruction survey, develop and implement a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery **Mitigation Measure CUL-2c: Conduct worker awareness training for archaeological resources prior to construction**	☒	☐	Appendix C to the Environmental Analysis provides a cultural resources study for the proposed Project. Cultural resources investigations conducted for the proposed Project (ICF 2018) included historic research, records search, and a pedestrian survey. Previously documented cultural resources in the Project area were identified during the pedestrian survey conducted for the Project. None of these resources would be affected by Project activities. No previously undocumented archaeological resources were identified. Accordingly, it is anticipated that the potential for encountering previously undocumented archaeological resources during Project implementation is low.

				☐	☒	☒ Prior to the initiation of any site preparation and/or the start of construction, ensure that all construction workers receive training overseen by a qualified professional archaeologist who is experienced in teaching nonspecialists, to ensure that forepersons and field supervisors can recognize archaeological resources **Mitigation Measure CUL-2d: Stop work if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities** ☒ In the construction specifications, include a stop-work order if prehistoric or historic-era cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities ☒ If such resources are encountered, immediately halt all activity within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. ☒ If the find is determined to be potentially significant, develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery	☒	☐	In the event archaeological resources are inadvertently uncovered during Project construction, Mitigation Measures CUL-2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d would be implemented. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (less than significant with mitigation)	3.5-1 to 3.5-6	3.5-6 to 3.5-20	Would the Project involve ground-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Stop work if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities** ☒ In the construction specifications, include a stop-work order if human remains are discovered ☒ Do not excavate or disturb the site within a 100-foot radius of the location of such discovery, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains ☒ Notify the Alameda County Coroner	☒	☐	No human remains are known to exist within the Project site. In the unanticipated event that human remains are encountered during Project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would be implemented. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources									
Impact GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of rupture of a known earthquake fault (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ☒ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ☒ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ☒ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into Project design	☒	☐	As described in the PEIR, the program area is known for the frequent occurrence of earthquakes and potential ground shaking; the Project area contains two active faults. The program area is also known to be susceptible to earthquake-induced landsliding. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact GEO-2: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of strong seismic ground shaking (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ☒ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ☒ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ☒ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into Project design	☒	☐	See discussion of Impact GEO-1.
Impact GEO-3: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of seismic-related ground failure, including landsliding and liquefaction (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ☒ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ☒ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ☒ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into Project design	☒	☐	Although the potential for liquefaction is likely low because of the depth to groundwater, the risk of lateral spread and differential settlement is not known. The potential risk would be consistent with that throughout the program area. The impact would less than significant with mitigation.
Impact GEO-4: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report**	☒	☐	See discussion of Impact GEO-3.

landsliding (less than significant with mitigation)				☐		☒ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ☒ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ☒ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into Project design			
Impact GEO-5: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (less than significant)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project include the following measures, which are part of the Project, as described in Chapter 2, *Program Description*, of the EIR? ☒ prepare a SWPPP ☒ develop a reclamation plan in coordination with the County, USFWS, and CDFW ☒ ensure the reclamation plan is completed and approved by the County 6 months in advance of Project decommissioning	☐	☒	**Note:** If the Project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The PEIR concluded that compliance with the federal and local erosion-related regulations (i.e., the SWPPP developed for each Project and the requirements of the county's Stormwater Quality Management Plan) would ensure that ground-disturbing activities do not result in significant erosion. The PEIR also requires a reclamation plan with specific measures taken to ensure sites will be regraded and seeded to pre-Project conditions. Accordingly, this impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact GEO-6: Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ☒ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ☒ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ☒ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into Project design	☒	☐	The PEIR disclosed that expansive soils occur in much of the program area. Compliance with state and local building codes requiring soil sampling and treatment procedures and implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.
Impact GEO-7: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1 to 3.6-17	3.6-17 to 3.6-35	Would the Project involve ground-disturbing earthwork associated with construction?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GEO-7a: Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to monitor significant ground-disturbing activities** ☒ Retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined by the SVP's Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (2010) to monitor activities with the potential to disturb sensitive paleontological resources ☒ Monitor ground-disturbing activities as determined by the professional paleontologist (in general, these activities include any ground-disturbing activities involving excavation deeper than 3 feet in areas with high potential to contain sensitive paleontological resources) ☒ Prepare recovered fossils so that they can be properly documented and ensure they are curated at an appropriate facility **Mitigation Measure GEO-7b: Educate construction personnel in recognizing fossil material** ☒ Ensure that all construction personnel receive training provided by a qualified professional paleontologist experienced in teaching non-specialists to ensure that they can recognize fossil materials in the event any are discovered during construction. **Mitigation Measure GEO-7c: Stop work if substantial fossil remains are encountered during construction** ☒ If substantial fossil remains (particularly vertebrate remains) are discovered during earth disturbing activities, stop activities within 100 feet of the find immediately until a state-registered professional geologist or qualified professional paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find and a qualified professional paleontologist can recommend appropriate treatment.	☒	☐	Appendix C to the Environmental Analysis provides a cultural resources study for the proposed Project The PEIR concluded that most units in the program area are sensitive for paleontological resources. Although the Project area is not in areas underlain by the most sensitive units, substantial damage to or destruction of significant paleontological resources would be a significant impact. As the PEIR concluded, this impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

						☒ Ensure that recommendations regarding treatment and reporting are implemented			
Greenhouse Gas Emissions									
Impact GHG-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (less than significant)	3.7-1–7 3.7-7–11	3.7-16	Would the Project include activities that are not within the scope of the Project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project would include activities unrelated to wind power generation, the GHG impacts generated by the Project would not be offset by the wind power generation related reduction in GHGs described in Impact GHG-1. However, if the Project itself would result in a net reduction of CO_{2e} per year, the impact is less than significant.	☒	☐	As described in the PEIR, while construction-related activities and the potential leakage of SF_6 could result in GHG emissions, repowering would result in a substantial net reduction of GHG emissions. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (less than significant with mitigation)	3.7-1–7 3.7-7–11	3.7-24	Would the Project use vehicles that emit greenhouse gases?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure GHG-2a: Implement best available control technology for heavy-duty vehicles** ☒ Document that the vehicles used for Project construction meet the specified requirements **Mitigation** Measure GHG-2b: Install low SF6 leak rate circuit breakers and monitoring ☒ Ensure that any new circuit breaker installed at a substation has a guaranteed SF6 leak rate of 0.5% by volume or less ☒ Provide Alameda County with documentation of compliance, such as specification sheets, prior to installation of the circuit breaker ☒ Monitor the SF6-containing circuit breakers at the substation consistent with Scoping Plan Measure H-6 for the detection and repair of leaks **Mitigation Measure GHG-2c: Require new construction to use building materials containing recycled content** ☒ In the construction of all new substation and other permanent buildings, incorporate materials for which the sum of post-consumer recycled content plus one-half of the post-industrial content constitutes at least 10% of the total value of the materials in the Project **Mitigation Measure GHG-2d: Comply with construction and demolition debris management ordinance** ☒ Comply with the County's revised Green Building Ordinance regarding construction and demolition debris as follows: (1) 100% of inert waste and 50% wood/vegetative/scrap metal not including Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) and unsalvageable material will be put to other beneficial uses at landfills, and (2) 100% of inert materials (concrete and asphalt) will be recycled or put to beneficial reuse.	☒	☐	As documented in the PEIR, the Project could conflict with several measures in ARB's *Climate Change Scoping Plan* and the County's *Climate Action Plan*. However, these conflicts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-2a through GHG-2d.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials									
Impact HAZ-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (less than significant)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project NOT implement the following BMPs and procedures? • Standard construction BMPs to reduce pollutant emissions during construction • BMPs to reduce the potential for or exposure to accidental spills involving the use of hazardous materials • Procedures to carefully disassemble and remove wind turbines in a manner consistent with recycling and/or reselling the units	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	Project construction would involve small quantities of commonly used materials, such as fuels and oils, to operate construction equipment. The Project would implement standard construction BMPs, as required by the SWPPP, to reduce pollutant emissions during construction. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Impact HAZ-1: 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 (less than significant)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project includes activities not covered in the PEIR the impact could be significant and will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR. Further, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This impact would be less than significant.
Impact HAZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school (no impact)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Is a public or private K–12 school located within 0.25 mile of the Project area?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no public or private K–12 schools within 0.25 mile of the program area. The nearest school is approximately 0.48 mile east of proposed wind facilities and it is unlikely that hazardous materials would be emitted or released within 0.25 mile of any schools. Also, implementation of the SWPPP by contractors would reduce the potential of a hazardous spill incident. Should the Project be located within 0.25 mile of a public or private K–12 school, it would not fall within the impacts assessed in the PEIR and the impact will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	The Project area is not within 0.25 mile of any public or private K-12 school. The nearest school is Mountain House Elementary, approximately 0.54 mile east of Project facilities. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact HAZ-4: Location on a hazardous materials site, creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project involve soil disturbance?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prior to construction activities and remediate if necessary** ☒ Conduct a Phase I environmental site assessment prior to construction and in conformance with the American Society for Testing and Materials Standard Practice E1527-05 ☒ Conduct all environmental investigation, sampling, and remediation activities associated with properties in the Project area under a work plan approved by the regulatory oversight agency ☒ Include results of any investigation and/or remediation activities conducted in the Project area in the Project-level EIR	☒	☐	Project construction would involve soil disturbance; however, a Phase I ESA would be performed prior to construction. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact HAZ-5: Location within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project be located in the Byron Airport influence area?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure HAZ-5: Coordinate with the Contra Costa ALUC prior to final design** ☐ If wind turbines are proposed to be constructed within the Byron Airport influence area zones, coordinate and consult with the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Commission and request review and obtain approval of the final design and placement of wind turbines ☐ Incorporate any ALUC recommendations in to the final design	☒	☐	The nearest public airport, Byron Airport, is located almost 2.7 miles north of the Project area. Livermore Municipal Airport is approximately 11.4 miles southwest of the Project area, and Tracy Municipal Airport is approximately 8 miles southeast of the Project area. Because the Project area is not within 2 miles of a public airport, implementation of the Project would not normally result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. No mitigation is required.
Impact HAZ-6: Location within the vicinity of a private airstrip, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area (less than significant)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip?	☒	☐	**Note:** Should the Project be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip, it would not fall within the impacts assessed in the PEIR and the impact will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	As described in the PEIR, the nearest private airstrip is Meadowlark Airfield, 6.25 miles southwest of the Project area. Therefore, the Project would not be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact HAZ-7: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project increase vehicular traffic?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (*see Traffic*)**	☒	☐	The Project would increase vehicular traffic during construction only; minimal vehicular traffic would be associated with operation and maintenance. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact HAZ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Would the Project alter the Altamont Pass Wind Farms Fire Requirements as described in Exhibit C of the 2005 CUPs?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not alter the Altamont Pass Wind Farms Fire Requirements as described in Exhibit C of the 2005 CUPs. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

residences are intermixed with wildlands (less than significant)									
Impact HAZ-9: During normal operation, the effects of bending and stress on rotor blades over time could lead to blade failure and become a potential blade throw hazard (less than significant)	3.8-1 to 3.8-9	3.8-9 to 3.8-30	Is there potential for blade throw to occur outside windfarm boundaries? Would overall site access be limited to persons approved for entry by the windfarm operators or landowners?	☒ ☐	☐ ☒	**Note:** If the Project does not include such restriction, a standard County requirement, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	All proposed turbines would either meet general or alternative minimum setbacks in accordance with Updated Alameda County Turbine Setback Requirements. Prior to final Project design, the County would ensure that all setbacks requirements are met. Site access would be limited to persons approved for entry. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Hydrology and Water Quality									
Impact WQ-1a-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-7	Would the Project involve earth-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP ☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board	☒	☐	The Project, like the activities considered in the PEIR, would involve earth-disturbing activities, requiring compliance with NPDES requirements, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact WQ-2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted) (less than significant)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-10	Would the Project involve very large areas of disturbance or involve a substantial use of water beyond that described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project has a larger footprint, or a larger water use than that described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project's net footprint would be small, would not involve large areas of ground disturbance to a degree that could adversely affect groundwater recharge. Water usage would be minimal, even during peak construction, when it would be used primarily for dust control BMPs. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact WQ-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-11	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP ☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board	☒	☐	The Project would involve construction activities, including grading; such activities would require a grading permit from the County. These activities are not expected to substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation either within or beyond the Project area. Further, erosion control BMPs would be implemented through the Project SWPPP. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact WQ-4: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-12	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP ☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board	☒	☐	The Project would involve limited improvements and construction that might alter the Project area's existing drainage pattern. Any increase in surface water runoff resulting from permanent Project features would be minor and would not influence surface runoff patterns in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact WQ-5: Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-14	Would the Project be constructed in an area with stormwater drainage facilities?	☒	☐	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP	☒	☐	The Project would not substantially increase the amount of stormwater runoff. Further, the Project area does not rely on constructed stormwater drainage systems. Although the pattern and concentration of runoff could be altered by Project activities such as grading of access

sources of polluted runoff (less than significant with mitigation)			Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board **Note:** The program area does not currently have existing or planned stormwater drainage facilities, but the Project does involve construction activities.			roads, the amount of runoff would not be substantially altered. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact WQ-6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-15	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ☒ File NOI with the State Water Board ☒ Prepare SWPPP ☒ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board	☒	☐	The Project would be consistent with federal, state, and local policies and would not degrade water quality beyond levels described in the PEIR. Compliance with the NPDES permit would ensure that no substantial amount of polluted runoff would be generated during construction. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact WQ-7: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the Project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not include the construction of housing. The Project area is not within a 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact.
Impact WQ-8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the Project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve construction of housing. The Project area is not within the 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact.
Impact WQ-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the Project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve construction of housing. The Project area is not within the 100-year floodplain. There would be no impact.
Impact WQ-10: Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-18	Would the Project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)**	☒	☐	Because the Project area is in rolling hills and far from the ocean or other water bodies, the possibility of a seiche or tsunami is unlikely. A mudflow is also highly unlikely, but possible in rolling hills without implementation of proper BMPs during the construction process. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Land Use and Planning									
Impact LU-1: Physically divide an established community (no impact)	3.10-1–2 3.10-3	3.10-4	Would the Project divide an established community?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no established communities in the program area that could be divided by any development associated with a wind Project. If the Project involves locations or activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project area is within the boundaries of the PEIR program area. Because the program area contains no established communities that could be divided by wind Project development, there would be no impact.
Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose	3.10-1–2 3.10-3		Would the Project involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves locations beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project area is within the boundaries of the PEIR program area and would not involve activities, locations, or materials beyond those described in the PEIR. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.

of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (no impact)									
Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (no impact)	3.10-1–2 3.10-3	3.10-6	Would the Project include activities that are not within the scope of the Project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the program area. If the proposed Project does not fall within the scope of activities described in the PEIR but the Project would not conflict with the EACCS, there would be no impact.	☒	☐	As indicated, there are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the program area, within which the Project area lies. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Noise									
Impact NOI-1: Exposure of residences to noise from new wind turbines (less than significant with mitigation)	3.11-5–8 3.11-8–9	3.11-11	Would the Project be located with approximately 2,000 feet of residences?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Perform Project-specific noise studies and implement measures to comply with County noise standards** ☒ Retain a qualified acoustic consultant to prepare a report that evaluates noise impacts associated with operation of the proposed wind turbines ☒ Include a noise monitoring survey to quantify existing noise conditions at noise sensitive receptors located within 2,000 feet of any proposed turbine location ☒ Include measurement of the daily A-weighted L_{dn} values over a 1-week period and concurrent logging of wind speeds at the nearest meteorological station ☒ Include a site-specific evaluation of predicted operational noise levels at nearby noise sensitive uses. ☒ Modify Project if operation of the Project is predicted to result in noise in excess of 55 dBA (L_{dn}) where noise is currently less than 55 dBA (L_{dn}) or result in a 5 dB increase where noise is currently greater than 55 dBA(L_{dn}) ☒ Submit a report to the County demonstrating how the Project will comply with these performance standards ☒ After review and approval of the report by County staff, incorporate measures as necessary into the Project to ensure compliance with these performance standards	☒	☐	Appendix D to the Environmental Analysis provides a Sound Technical Report for the proposed Project. Based on the noise study prepared by the applicant, two residences are within 1,000 feet of the nearest turbine and would be exposed to noise levels in exceedance of the 55 dBA threshold. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact NOI-2: Exposure of residences to noise during decommissioning and new turbine construction (less than significant with mitigation)	3.11-5–8 3.11-8–9	3.11-15	Would construction equipment be used within 800 feet of residences?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ noise-reducing practices during decommissioning and new turbine construction** ☒ Employ noise-reducing construction practices , which may include: ☒ Prohibit noise-generating activities before 7 a.m. and after 7 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, and before 8 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday ☒ Locate equipment as far as practical from noise sensitive uses ☒ Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound-control devices ☒ Use noise-reducing enclosures around noise-generating equipment where practicable ☒ Do not use gasoline or diesel engines without muffled exhausts	☒	☐	Appendix D to the Environmental Analysis provides a Sound Technical Report for the proposed Project. Based on proposed design, construction equipment would operate within 550 feet of the nearest residence. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Population and Housing									
Impact POP-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure) (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-5	Would the Project create any housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project includes housing, the impact of the Project would not be covered by the PEIR.	☒	☐	The Project would not create any housing or result in any indirect impacts on population beyond those described in the PEIR. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.

Impact POP-2: Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-9	Would the Project result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project results in the demolition or displacement of housing, the impacts of the Project would fall outside of those identified in the PEIR, and additional impacts could occur.	☒	☐	The Project would not result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing units. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact POP-3: Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-9	Would the Project result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project results in the demolition or displacement of housing, the impacts of the Project would fall outside of those identified in the PEIR, and additional impacts could occur.	☒	☐	The Project would not result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing or the displacement of people. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Public Services									
Impact PS-1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; other public facilities (no impact)	3.13-1 3.13-1–2	3.13-3	Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR. Police protection and fire facilities and infrastructure required to protect the program area are already in place to protect the existing wind energy facilities. No residences would be constructed, and because the PEIR concluded that repowering the APWRA would not induce growth, there would be no increased demand on schools or recreational facilities. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Recreation									
Impact REC-1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated (no impact)	3.14-1–2	3.14-3	Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR. There would be no impact.
Impact REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment (no impact)	3.14-1–2	3.14-4	Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR. There would be no impact.
Transportation/Traffic									
Impact TRA-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-10	Would the Project construction or operation increase traffic? Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan** ☒ Prepare and implement a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) that adheres to Alameda County and Caltrans requirements ☒ Submit the TCP for review and approval of the County Public Works Department prior to implementation ☒ Include any additional elements required by the County or Caltrans during their review and approval of the TCP **Note:**	☒	☐	Temporary and short-term increases in local traffic would occur during construction, but the activities and associated traffic would not be beyond the scope of those described in the PEIR. Project operation and maintenance activities would involve 10–20 hours of scheduled maintenance of each wind turbine per year; these activities would not increase traffic beyond that described in the PEIR. A Traffic Control Plan would be implemented as required by Mitigation Measure TRA-1. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

and bicycle paths, and mass transit or conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (less than significant with mitigation)						If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.			
Impact TRA-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (less than significant)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-16	Would the Project maintenance needs be substantially greater than currently required? Would post-construction traffic generated by the maintenance activities exceed the capacity of the CMP roadway system and differ materially from the current maintenance traffic level? Would the increase in construction traffic be substantial? Would the increase in construction traffic degrade the traffic operation of the CMP roadway segments that already exceed the LOS standard E or cause a CMP roadway segment to exceed the LOS standard?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR and would not involve maintenance activities substantially greater than currently required. Construction traffic accessing the Project area would use I-580. Construction traffic is not expected to result in a substantial increase in congestion that would affect existing LOS on state highways. Further, long-term exceedance of LOS standards is not expected to occur and the Project is therefore expected to be in compliance with the established Alameda County General Plan LOS Standards. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact TRA-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks (less than significant)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-17	Would the Project affect air traffic patterns of the public or private airports in the vicinity of the program area? Would the Project result in substantial safety risks associated with airport operations?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR. The nearest turbine is about 2.7 miles south of Byron Airport, the nearest airport. The Project is therefore not expected to change air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the Project will comply with FAA lighting requirements. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact TRA-4: Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-18	Would the Project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	Project construction would involve the use of large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on nearby roadways. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require development and implementation of a construction traffic control plan. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact TRA-5: Result in inadequate emergency access due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-20	Would the Project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways? Would the Project involve lane/road closures occurring during delivery of oversized loads?	☐ ☐	☒ ☒	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	As described for all repowering activities in the PEIR, Project construction would involve the use of large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways, as well temporary road and lane closures. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Impact TRA-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-21	Would the Project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways?	☐	☒	**Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	As described for all repowering activities in the PEIR, Project construction would involve the use of large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways, as well

facilities (less than significant with mitigation)			Would the Project involve lane/road closures occurring during delivery of oversized loads?	☐	☒				temporary road and lane closures. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.
Utilities and Service Systems									
Impact UT-1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-3	Would the Project generate a significant amount of wastewater?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project would not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR, nor would it generate wastewater that would be treated by public wastewater treatment facilities. The Project would be served during construction by several portable toilets and during operation by a septic system associated with the planned O&M building. The Project would not generate a significant amount of wastewater. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-4	Would the Project generate a significant amount of wastewater? Would new water or wastewater treatment facilities be required?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR. Because the Project would not generate a significant amount of wastewater and would use an onsite septic system, it would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-3: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-5	Would the Project substantially modify the existing stormwater drainage patterns? Would the Project increase impermeable surfaces onsite beyond the tower foundations? Would the Project disturb less than 1 acre and therefore NOT be required to have coverage under the state's Construction General Permit?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR. The Project would involve limited improvements and construction that might alter the Project area's existing internal drainage pattern, including the new O&M building, turbine foundations, and upgrades to existing culverts for existing roads and new culverts for new roads. No additional impervious surfaces are proposed. Because the Project would disturb more than 1 acre, it would be required to have coverage under the state's Construction General Permit. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-4: Require new or expanded entitlements to water resources (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-6	Would the Project require more than minimal water use? Would the Project require new or expanded entitlements to supply the program during construction or operation?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR. The Project would not require more than minimal water use, nor would it require new or expanded entitlements to water resources. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the program's Projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-7	Would the Project involve the construction or expansion of wastewater systems? Would the Project require an offsite wastewater treatment provider?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR. The Project would not involve the construction or expansion of wastewater systems, nor would it require an offsite wastewater treatment provider. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-6: Generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of landfills to accommodate	3.16-1–3	3.16-8	Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR, nor would it generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted

the program's solid waste disposal needs—(less than significant)									capacity of landfills. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
Impact UT-7: Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-9	Would the Project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the Project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The Project does not involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR. The Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.

References Cited

Alameda County Community Development Agency. 2018. Sand Hill Repowering Project Environmental Analysis. September. Hayward, CA. With technical assistance from ICF, Sacramento, CA.

Aesthetics

Alameda County. 1966. *Scenic Route Element of the General Plan*. May. Reprinted June 1974, Amended May 5, 1994.

———. 2000. *East County Area Plan*. Adopted May 1994. Modified by passage of Measure D, effective December 22, 2000. Oakland, CA.

Biological Resources

California Bat Working Group. 2006. *Guidelines for Assessing and Minimizing Impacts to Bats at Wind Energy Development Sites in California*. September.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2012. *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*. State of California Natural Resources Agency. March 7.