

# Golden Hills North Wind Energy Center Repowering Project: Errata Sheet

Since publication of the *Environmental Checklist* for the Golden Hills North Wind Energy Center Repowering (Golden Hills North) Project on September 16, 2015, Golden Hills North Wind, LLC revised the Project Description to provide additional information on proposed activities within Contra Costa County, including the construction of up to 400 linear feet of new road and grading associated with the improvements to an existing road, located within the boundaries of the existing Vasco Winds Repowering Project. Approval of these activities in Contra Costa County are subject to review and approval of a Grading Permit and Transportation Permit by Contra Costa County.

Although the revised project is not directly within the scope of the original project analysis included in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area Repowering Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), the roadway construction and related grading is deemed a necessary component of the current Golden Hills North Wind Project, and may be considered within the general scope of activities evaluated in the Final EIR certified by Contra Costa County for the Vasco Winds Repowering Project in 2010, and within the general scope of activities evaluated in the Repowering Program EIR certified by Alameda County in 2014. The revised project description would not result in any change in the type of impacts beyond those disclosed in the two documents. No new, discrete significant environmental impacts would result from the project change, beyond those already described in the CEQA Environmental Checklist and Project Description. All mitigation measures identified in the PEIR, and in the Vasco Winds FEIR, would be implemented respectively on lands within the jurisdiction of Alameda and Contra Costa County, unless stated otherwise below in the revisions to the Environmental Checklist.

Provided below is a complete description of the proposed revisions. The original text is copied below, with new text shown with an underline, and deleted text with a strikethrough.

## Environmental Checklist

Impact	Summary of Documentation
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)	<i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.6.2; The Project would involve construction activities, but such activities will require grading permits from the County of Alameda <u>and the County of Contra Costa</u>. Overall, the Project would not create new or substantially more adverse significant impacts to hydrology and water quality in relation to alteration of a stream or river. Suitable erosion control BMPs would be implemented through the Project SWPPP. With implementation of WQ-1 <u>as defined in the PEIR</u> impacts would be less than significant. <u>However, because Alameda County does not have jurisdiction over project activities occurring in Contra Costa County, this mitigation measure is considered infeasible as not legally enforceable for project effects occurring in Contra Costa County. With implementation by Contra Costa County of this mitigation measure or Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a as defined in the Vasco Winds FEIR, impacts in Contra Costa County might be less than significant.</u></i>
Impact WQ-6a-1: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality—program Alternative 1: 417 MW	<i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.6.2; The Project would involve construction activities but it will not substantially degrade water quality over what was disclosed in the APWRA Repowering PEIR <u>or Vasco Winds FEIR</u>. The Project will be consistent with federal, state, and local policies. BMPs of the required NPDES permit will be implemented. With implementation of WQ-1, <u>and Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 as defined in the Vasco Winds FEIR, and issuance of</u></i>

Impact	Summary of Documentation
	<i>a Grading Permit and Transportation Permit by Contra Costa County, impacts would be less than significant.</i>
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 of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (no impact)	<i>The Project would not involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR or Vasco Winds FEIR.</i>
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)	Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.  <i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.1; The Project does have suitable annual grassland [Large-flowered fiddleneck, etc.] and alkali wetland habitat [Brittlescale, etc.] for these species to occur on the property. However, none of these species were found during the fall and spring rare plant surveys conducted in 2014-2015. With implementation of BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, BIO-1e, and BIO-2 from the PEIR and Mitigation Measure 4.4-8 from the Vasco Winds FEIR for activities within Contra Costa County, impacts would be less than significant.</i>
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)	Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.  <i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.1; The Project does have potential for adverse effects on special-status plants and natural communities resulting from the introduction and spread of invasive plant species. With implementation of BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, BIO-1e, and BIO-2 from the PEIR and Mitigation Measure 4.4-8 from the Vasco Winds FEIR for activities within Contra Costa County impacts would be less than significant.</i>
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)	Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.  <i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.2; There are no vernal pools within the portion of the project located on Contra Costa County land. The Project does have potential suitable seasonal wetland and pond habitats for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle in Alameda County. However, these species were not detected during wildlife surveys of the site conducted by CH2M HILL biologists in fall 2014 and winter 2015. With implementation of BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, and BIO-3b, impacts would be less than significant.</i>
Impact BIO-4: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle (less than significant with mitigation)	Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine if mitigation measures are required.  <i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.2; The Project does not have habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle on site (in Alameda County or Contra Costa County) as no presence of this species was found during the fall 2014 and winter 2015 wildlife surveys conducted by CH2M HILL biologists. With implementation of BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, BIO-4a, and BIO-4b, impacts would be less than significant.</i>
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)	Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.  <i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.2; The Project does have suitable seasonal wetlands and ponds for California tiger salamander, western spadefoot, California red-legged frog, and foothill yellow-legged frog on site. In addition, California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog were detected during wildlife surveys conducted by CH2M HILL biologists in fall 2014 and</i>

Impact	Summary of Documentation
	<p>winter 2015. However, potential impacts to these species would be the same as those in the APWRA Repowering PEIR. With implementation of BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, BIO-5a, BIO-5b, and BIO-5c <u>from the PEIR and Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 from the Vasco Winds FEIR for activities within Contra Costa County</u>, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact BIO-12: Potential mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal or disturbance (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.2; <u>There are no bat roosts within the portion of the project in Contra Costa County.</u> The Project could result in mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal or disturbance <u>within Alameda County.</u> With implementation of BIO-1b, BIO-3a, BIO-12a, and BIO-12b impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact BIO-15: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on alkali meadow (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p>Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine if mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.3; <u>The Project's road infrastructure updates within project areas in Alameda County have potential to result in adverse effects on alkali meadow.</u> With implementation of BIO-15 impacts would be less than significant. <u>Alkali meadow habitat is absent from the portion of the project in Contra Costa County.</u></p>
<p>Impact BIO-16: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on riparian habitat (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p>Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.3; <u>The Project's road infrastructure updates within project areas in Alameda County have potential to result in adverse effects on riparian habitat.</u> With implementation of BIO-16 impacts would be less than significant. <u>Riparian habitat is absent from the portion of the project in Contra Costa County.</u></p>
<p>Impact BIO-21: Conflict with provisions of an adopted HCP/NCCP or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan (no impact)</p>	<p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.3.2.7; <u>The Project area does not have adopted HCP/NCCPs and would not conflict with the EACCS. No mitigation is required. The ECCCHCP is the only adopted habitat conservation plan that could be affected in the portion of the GH North Project located in Contra Costa County. As analyzed in the Vasco Winds EIR, road construction and related activities within the Vasco Wind project footprint would be consistent with the ECCCHCP/NCCP and therefore would have no impact related to this issue. No other adopted HCPs/NCCPs are applicable to the GH North Project.</u></p>
<p>Impact CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p>Use cultural resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required. See Attachment 1, Appendix B.</p> <p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.4.2; <u>The Project area does have cultural resources present for portions of the project in Alameda County; no resources are present for portions of the project in Contra Costa County.</u> However, the Project is not expected to result in new significant impacts or substantially more adverse significant impacts to cultural resources related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. This conclusion is based on the results of the pedestrian surveys, record searches of the Project area, and the fact that all resources will be avoided. With implementation of CUL-1a and CUL-1b, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Impact CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p>Use cultural resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required. See Attachment 1, Appendix B.</p> <p>See Attachment 1, Section 3.4.2; <u>The Project area includes four resources (recommended as eligible by the NRHP) located in Alameda County which will be avoided during project implementation. In the event that a resource is unexpectedly encountered, implementation of CUL-1a, CUL-1b, CUL-2a, CUL-2b, CUL-2c, CUL-2d, CUL-2e and CUL-3, as defined in the PEIR, and Mitigation</u></p>

Impact	Summary of Documentation
	<p><u>Measure 4.5-2a as defined in the Vasco Winds FEIR, will reduce impacts to less than significant.</u></p> <p><i>The Project is not expected to result in a substantial adverse change in the significant of an archaeological resource. This conclusion is based on the results of the pedestrian surveys, record searches of the Project area, and the fact that all resources will be avoided.</i></p>
<p>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 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)</p>	<p><i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.8.2; The Project's construction will occur in 2016, and therefore would not overlap with construction activities from the Golden Hills Project in 2015. Temporary and short-term increases in local traffic would occur but construction-related truck trips for the Project would be approximately half of those anticipated for the Golden Hills Project. A Traffic Control Plan will be implemented through TRA-1 and submitted to Alameda County and Contra Costa County for review, and with implementation impacts would be less than significant. Contra Costa County may require gate access improvements, pavement repair, a transportation permit, road closure permit, or impose other conditions consistent with conditions set forth in the Land Use Permit granted for Vasco Winds, i.e. conditions 71 through 76, and Mitigation Measure 4.17-1 defined in the Vasco Winds FEIR.</i></p>
<p>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)</p>	<p><i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.8.2; During construction, the Project would involve the use of large, slow moving construction-related vehicles and equipment. Caltrans District 4, and Alameda County and Contra Costa County permits will be acquired in order to move oversized or overweight materials and comply with limitations on vehicle sizes and weights. In addition, Mitigation Measures 4.17-2a, -2b, and -2c in the Vasco EIR, which call for preparation of temporary traffic control plan, preparation of a plan for mitigating construction-related road damage, and repair of any damaged roads by the Applicant, would be implemented to reduce potential impacts on roads located within Contra Costa County to a less-than-significant level. With implementation of TRA-1, and Mitigation Measure 4.17-1 defined in the Vasco Winds FEIR, impacts would be less than significant.</i></p>
<p>Impact TRA-5: Result in inadequate emergency access due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)</p>	<p><i>See Attachment 1, Section 3.8.2; During construction, the Project would involve the use of large, slow moving construction-related vehicles and equipment in both Alameda and Contra Costa counties. However, the Project will not change any existing emergency access routes, modify existing patterns of emergency access, or require closures of public roads. With implementation of TRA-1 for activities within Alameda County and Mitigation Measure 4.17-1 as defined in the Vasco FEIR for activities within Contra Costa County, impacts would be less than significant.</i></p>

## Attachment 1: Project Description and Affected Environment Analysis

### Section 1.5 Entitlements Required

Table 1-1 identifies the permits, approvals, and agency consultations expected to be required for approval of the proposed project. Because the project entails construction of a new road within Contra Costa County jurisdiction, Contra Costa County is participating as a Responsible Agency.

TABLE 1-1

**Expected Permits, Approvals and Consultations – Supplemental for this Errata**

Agency	Permit/Approval Required
<b>Local</b>	
<u>Contra Costa County, Department of Conservation and Development<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Grading Permit</u>
<u>Contra Costa County, Public Works Department<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Transportation Permit for extra-large loads.</u>

<sup>1</sup>Responsible Agency under CEQA.

**Section 2.3 Project Location and Land Ownership**

The proposed GH North Project site is located in Alameda County and Contra Costa County, California, directly north of I-580.

TABLE 2-1

**Land Parcels Within Project Site – Supplemental for this Errata**

Assessor Parcel Numbers in Contra Costa County
<u>001-021-010</u>
<u>005-190-002</u>
<u>005-070-014</u>
<u>005-190-001</u>

**Section 2.3.1 Land Use and Zoning**

The GH North Project encompasses approximately 4,389 acres of lands zoned (A) Agriculture and designated as Large Parcel Agriculture in Alameda County, which is intended to promote implementation of general plan land use proposals (or designations) for agricultural and other nonurban uses, and lands zoned A-4 (Agricultural Preserve, 20 acre minimum) and designated as Agricultural Lands (AL) in Contra Costa County.

**Section 3 Environmental Analysis**

The GH North Project would incorporate and implement all mitigation measures specified in the APWRA PEIR and certified by the Alameda County East County Board of Zoning Adjustments, and where relevant, mitigation measures specified in the Vasco Winds Repowering Project FEIR and certified by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors. Specific mitigation measures relevant to a particular impact of the GH North Project are cited in the same manner as in the APWRA PEIR and the associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted for the Golden Hills Project in conjunction with APWRA Repowering Program approval.

**Section 3.3 Biological Resources**

This section discusses the effects on biological resources from the proposed GH North Project, Phase 2 of the Golden Hills Project. This analysis relies on and incorporates by reference the project setting and regulatory setting as described in the APWRA Repowering PEIR (Alameda County Community Development Agency, 2014). Potential impacts to biological resources from the GH North Project are discussed relative to conclusions in the APWRA Repowering PEIR for the Golden Hills Project. The APWRA Repowering PEIR conclusion stated that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with regard to adverse impacts to special-status species and cumulative impacts. Consistent with the

APWRA Repowering PEIR and Contra Costa County standards, biological resources for the GH North Project were evaluated with regard to the East County Area Plan (Alameda County, 1994 and 2000); East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (ICF International, 2010); East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan [ECCCHCP/NCCP] (ECCCHC, 2007); coordination with USFWS and CDFW; a query of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) online inventory (CNPS, 2015); and a query of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) (CDFW, 2015) for the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series Byron Hot Springs, Altamont, Clifton Court Forebay, and Midway topographic quadrangles in which the GH North Project property is located, as well as a 10-mile radius around the project boundary.

### **3.3.1 Setting**

The vegetation and wildlife surveys determined that no substantial changes had occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken that would necessitate major revision to the certified PEIR for the approved Golden Hills Project. The existing plant communities, topography, and nature of the biological resources were found to be consistent with previous surveys undertaken for the approved Golden Hills Project in Alameda County, and Vasco Winds Project in Contra Costa County (Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, 2010). Figure 3.3-1 depicts the existing land cover types in the project area including annual grassland, alkali and seasonal wetlands, ponds, drainages, and developed areas. These plant communities and habitat types are the basis of the special-status and sensitive species impact analyses described below, which is consistent with the overall analyses presented in the APWRA Repowering PEIR and Vasco Winds EIR.

### **3.3.2 Impact Analysis**

... Potential impacts to special-status species would be the same as those identified in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR, which are also consistent with the Vasco Winds EIR. To reduce or eliminate impacts to special-status species, the full suite of mitigation measures in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR and applicable measures from the Vasco Winds EIR for portions of the project that occur on Contra Costa County land would be implemented. The implementation of the GH North Project would not result in new or substantially more adverse significant impacts related to special-status species....

#### **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)**

[for all plant species].... However, Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1e and BIO-2 outlined in the APWRA Repowering PEIR for special-status plants on Alameda County land and mitigation measure 4.4-8 from the Vasco Winds EIR for activities on Contra Costa County land would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **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)**

....Potential impacts to these species would be the same as those identified in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR and Vasco Winds EIR (with the exceptions noted above). With the implementation of the mitigation measures noted herein, preconstruction clearance surveys, recovery and relocation, biological monitoring, potential compensatory mitigation, and invasive plant species prevention (Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1e and BIO-2) for activities on Alameda County land and mitigation measure 4.4-8 from the Vasco Winds EIR for activities on Contra Costa County land potential impacts to these species would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

#### **Impact BIO-3: Potential mortality of or loss of habitat for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotes diving beetle (*Hygrotes curvipes*) (less than significant with mitigation)**

As described in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, suitable seasonal wetland and pond habitats for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle occur on the GH North Project property in Alameda County. There are no seasonal wetland and pond habitat for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle within the portion of the project on Contra Costa County. These species were not detected during wildlife surveys of the site conducted by CH2M HILL biologists in fall 2014 and winter 2015. Potential impacts to these species would be the same as those identified in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR. With the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, including preconstruction clearance surveys, biological monitoring, and potential compensatory mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, and BIO-3b), potential impacts to these species would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

**Impact BIO-4: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*) (less than significant with mitigation)**

As described in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, elderberry trees are limited in the Golden Hills Project area within Alameda County; there are no elderberry trees within the portion of the project in Contra Costa County. Elderberry trees suitable for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle were not detected during the rare plant surveys of the GH North Project property (Sycamore Environmental Consultants, 2015) or during the fall 2014 and winter 2015 wildlife surveys conducted by CH2M HILL biologists on the site and the species is not known to be present within the GH North property (CDFW, 2015). Therefore, potential impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle would be the less than what was identified in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR, as no habitat currently exists on site. With the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, including preconstruction clearance surveys and biological monitoring (Mitigation Measures BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, BIO-4a, and BIO-4b), there would be no impact to valley elderberry longhorn beetle.

**Impact BIO-5: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), western spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*), California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), and foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylei*) (less than significant with mitigation)**

As described in the APWRA Repowering PEIR and consistent with the Vasco Winds EIR, suitable seasonal wetlands and ponds for California tiger salamander, western spadefoot, California red-legged frog, and foothill yellow-legged frog are found on the GH North Project property. California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog are known to be present within the GH North property (CDFW, 2015) and both species were detected during wildlife surveys conducted by CH2M HILL biologists in fall 2014 and winter 2015 on the site. In addition, the entire site is within designated critical habitat for California red-legged frog. Potential impacts to these species would be the same as those identified in the certified APWRA Repowering PEIR and Vasco Winds EIR. With the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, including preconstruction clearance surveys, biological monitoring, and potential compensatory mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1b, BIO-1e, BIO-3a, BIO-5a, BIO-5b, and BIO-5c) for project activities in Alameda County and mitigation measure 4.4-5 (from Vasco Winds EIR) for activities in Contra Costa County, potential impacts to these species would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

**Impact BIO-12: Potential mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal or disturbance (less than significant with mitigation)**

As with the approved Golden Hills Project, construction could result in potential mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal within the GH North Project property in Alameda County; there are no bat roosts within the portion of the project in Contra Costa County. Similar to the Golden Hills Project, the hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), and western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis*) have the potential to occur within the GH North

Project area. As described in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal as a result of construction at the GH North Project constitutes a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1b, BIO-3a, BIO-12a, and BIO-12b would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact BIO-15: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on alkali meadow (less than significant with mitigation)**

Road infrastructure upgrades that could affect this habitat would include grading, widening, and re-gravelling of existing roads and construction of new roads to accommodate decommission and repowering activities. Culverts would be upgraded for existing roads, and new culverts would be installed for new roads. Direct effects would consist of fill of alkali meadow at locations where roads crossing the habitat would be widened. Indirect effects could involve altered hydrology or runoff of sediment and other substances during road construction activities. Some effects, such as those due to runoff, would be avoided and minimized through implementation of erosion control BMPs and post-construction reclamation. Installation of new and upgraded culverts would maintain existing hydrology. Alkali meadow habitat is absent from the within the portion of the project in Contra Costa County. However, loss of alkali meadow habitat within the project area in Alameda County as a result of direct fill would be a substantial adverse effect on a sensitive natural community. Because specific designs have not been developed for the GH North Project, it is not possible to quantify this effect for portions of the project in Alameda County. However, if alkali meadow is affected by road infrastructure upgrades, it would be a significant impact. As described in the approved PEIR for the Golden Hills Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-15 would reduce this impact to a level less-than-significant level.

**Impact BIO-16: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on riparian habitat (less than significant with mitigation)**

Road infrastructure upgrades would include grading, widening, and re-gravelling of existing roads and construction of new roads to accommodate decommissioning and repowering activities. Culverts would be upgraded for existing roads, and new culverts would be installed for new roads. Loss of riparian habitat as a result of direct fill would be a substantial adverse effect on a sensitive natural community. Because specific designs have not been developed for the GH North Project, it is not possible to quantify this effect. Alkali meadow habitat is absent from the within the portion of the project in Contra Costa County. However, if riparian habitat within Alameda County is affected by road infrastructure upgrades, it would be a significant impact. As described in the approved PEIR for the Golden Hills Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-16 would reduce this impact to a level less-than-significant level.

**Impact BIO-21: Conflict with provisions of an adopted HCP/NCCP or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan (no impact)**

The ECCCHCP is the only adopted habitat conservation plan that could be affected the portion of the GH North Project located in Contra Costa County. As analyzed in the Vasco Winds EIR, road construction and related activities within the Vasco Wind project footprint would be consistent with the ECCCHCP/NCCP and therefore would have no impact related to this issue. No other adopted HCP/NCCP are applicable to the GH North Project. No other adopted habitat conservation plans (HCPs) or natural community conservation plans (NCCP) are applicable to the approved Golden Hills Project or the GH North Project. The EACCS, while not a formal HCP, provides guidance for the project planning and permitting process to ensure that impacts are offset in a biologically effective manner. As discussed in the APWRA Repowering PEIR, the mitigation measures established in the PEIR are based on measures from the

EACCS, with some modifications and additions. ~~Because there are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the project area and the GH North Project would not conflict with the EACCS, there would be no impact.~~

### **Section 3.4 Cultural Resources**

#### **Impact CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource (less than significant with mitigation)**

..... In addition to the five previously recorded cultural resources which were located during the survey, ten new cultural resources were identified and recorded within portions of the project in Alameda County; no resources were identified and recorded on project lands located in Contra Costa County. ...

#### **Impact CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource (less than significant with mitigation)**

As described above, four resources, P-01-000173, and Temporary Site Nos. S-1, S-2, and S-3 are recommended as eligible for the NRHP. All of these are located on Alameda County lands and will be avoided during project implementation. ....

### **Section 3.6 Hydrology and Water Quality**

#### **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)**

.... Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Project Proponent would be required to submit a grading permit to Alameda County and Contra Costa County for approval. Any alteration of the bed or banks of jurisdictional water features, including through access road improvement and/or construction, would not be permitted to commence prior to development and implementation of a resource agency permits including but not limited to USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. ....

#### **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 (less than significant)**

.... The GH North Project would be constructed in accordance with applicable Alameda County and Contra Costa County requirements. Compliance with existing standards and requirements would ensure an adequate level of protection from flood hazards. ....

### **Section 3.8 Transportation and Traffic**

This section discusses the effects on transportation and traffic from the proposed GH North Project, Phase 2 of the Golden Hills Project under the APWRA Repowering Program. The analysis relies on and incorporates by reference the environmental and regulatory setting as described in the APWRA PEIR (Alameda County Community Development Agency, 2014) and the Vasco FEIR (Contra Costa County, 2010). Potential impacts to transportation and traffic from the GH North Project are discussed relative to conclusions in the APWRA PEIR for the Golden Hills Project.

#### **Section 3.8.2 Impact Analysis**

#### **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)**

....During construction, the proposed GH North Project would require the delivery of heavy construction equipment and large turbine components using local roadways. The use of oversized vehicles during construction can create a hazard to the public by decreasing motorist views on roadways and by the obstruction of roads. This scenario has the potential to create a significant impact. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 and Mitigation Measure 4.17-1 (Vasco EIR) to develop and implement a construction traffic control plan would be implemented consistent with the APWRA PEIR in order to reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. The traffic control plan will be submitted to both Alameda County and Contra Costa County (for the affected roads within Contra Costa County) for review and approval. In addition, Mitigation Measures 4.17-2a, -2b, and -2c in the Vasco EIR, which call for preparation of temporary traffic control plan, preparation of a plan for mitigating construction-related road damage, and repair of any damaged roads by the Applicant, would be implemented to reduce potential impacts on roads located within Contra Costa County to a less-than-significant level.

Consistent with the approved Golden Hills Project, the GH North Project would also obtain special permits from Caltrans District 4, ~~and~~ Alameda County, and Contra Costa County in order to move oversized or overweight materials and comply with limitations on vehicle sizes and weights (Alameda County Community Development Agency, 2014).

...

**Impact TRA-5: Result in inadequate emergency access due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)**

...The GH North Project would not change any existing emergency access routes, modify existing patterns of emergency access, or require closures of public roads. As with the approved Golden Hills Project, construction of the GH North Project would require use of slow-moving trucks carrying overweight or oversized loads in both Alameda and Contra Costa counties. These activities could interfere with the emergency access system and would therefore have a potential significant impact on emergency access. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1 (for activities within Alameda County) and Mitigation Measure 4.17-1 (Vasco EIR, for activities within Contra Costa County), a traffic control plan would be developed and submitted to Alameda and Contra Costa counties for review so project construction and demolition activities would avoid interruptions in any emergency services.