



July 2, 2009

The Honorable Board of Supervisors County Administration Building 1221 Oak Street Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Board Members:

SUBJECT: ADOPT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROJECT FOR

ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS UPON APPROVAL BY CALTRANS AND TO ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CHERRYLAND SIDEWALKS PROJECT PHASE II HAMPTON ROAD IN EDEN TOWNSHIP, ALAMEDA COUNTY,

CALIFORNIA, SPECIFICATION NO. 2063

RECOMMENDATION:

To construct the sidewalk project on Hampton Road between Meekland Avenue and Mission Boulevard, in Eden Township, Alameda County, California, it is recommended that your Board:

- 1. Adopt the resolution approving the Cherryland Sidewalks Project Phase II Hampton Road, in Eden Township, Alameda County (Specification No. 2063);
- 2. Adopt the resolution for a Negative Declaration for this project; and
- 3. Authorize the Clerk of the Board to advertise for bids, upon notification from the Director of Public Works, subject to the issuance of the Authorization to Proceed with Construction (E-76) from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:

This project will provide needed safety and community enhancements along Hampton Road between Mission Boulevard and Meekland Avenue. This is a joint project between the Alameda County Public Works Agency and the County of Alameda Redevelopment Agency, and will construct concrete curb, gutter, sidewalk, pedestrian ramps, driveways, bulbouts, plant street trees, and reconstruct the roadway.

Based on an initial study prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Director of the Community Development Agency has determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, a Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review, and only one comment was received. This comment has been addressed (see attached Caltrans comment). Additionally, the Federal Highway Administration has determined that this project meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The engineer's estimate for this project is \$4,975,000. The advertisement of this project will occur upon Caltrans' issuance of the Authorization to Proceed with Construction.

The engineer's estimate for this project exceeds the current threshold amount of \$100,000 for capital improvement project compliance with the County's Construction and Demolition Debris Management Ordinance. Therefore, the requirement to divert a certain percentage of debris from landfills via reuse and recycling will apply for this project.

FINANCING:

There will be no impact on the General Fund as a result of this action. The engineer's estimate for this project is \$4,975,000, and will be funded by Federal Funds (\$2,999,000) and by the Redevelopment Agency (\$1,976,000). The budget information for this project in the amount of \$4,975,000 is included in Account No. 650011, Fund 27070, Organization 260840.

Yours truly

Daniel Woldesenbet, Ph.D., P.E.

Director of Public Works

Chris Bazar

Yours truly

Director, Community Development Agency

DW/CB/DL/pr

Attachment

c: County Administrator County Counsel

NEGATIVE DECLARATION Alameda County Redevelopment Agency 224 W. Winton Avenue, Rm. 110 Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-6107

ALAMEDA COUNTY NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that Alameda County finds that no significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended will occur for the following proposed project:

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Project's intent is to improve pedestrian safety and implement livability principles instituted by the Board of Supervisors for the Cherryland Sub-Area of the Eden Area Redevelopment Project. This will be accomplished by the construction of major infrastructure improvements along Hampton Road, between Mission Boulevard and Meekland Avenue in unincorporated Hayward, CA.

The Project will include the design and construction of permanent concrete ADA compliant curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Traffic calming measures include enhanced crosswalk improvements with stamped asphalt, intersection modifications on Hampton Road at Mission Boulevard, narrowed roadway, and curb bulb-outs to allow protected street parking, landscaping elements such as tree planters within sidewalks and tree bulb-outs will be included. Storm drain system improvements will be installed on streets that currently are unimproved to prevent water pooling and dangerous walking and driving conditions. Gateway signage and landscaping will be installed at Hampton Road and Mission Boulevard to enhance the entrance to the Cherryland Area and act as a community identifying element. A new fence will be installed adjacent to the Alameda County Flood Control parcel. All proposed work will be within the existing Hampton Road right-of-way.

II. DECLARATION THAT PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT:

The proposed project will have no significant effect on the area's resources, cumulative or otherwise.

II. FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:

- A. In order to facilitate the movement of pedestrians and bicycles along the Hampton corridor, and in conjunction with the policies and regulations regarding development outlined in the Alameda County General Plan, the project as proposed would improve the neighborhood aesthetic, provide a safer roadway for all modes of transportation and enhance circulation.
- B. The proposed project has been reviewed according to the standards and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist has been prepared with a determination that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment.

Alàmeda County Redevelopment Agency Cherryland Sidewalks Project, Phase II Hampton Road Negative Declaration April 16, 2009

- C. By installing new curb, gutter and sidewalk, the project will eliminate approximately 50 non-standard parking spaces currently in the shoulder and pedestrian corridor. As the lost spaces are not included in parking requirements for adjacent properties, their removal would not result in a violation of parking standards for these properties. These parking spaces are currently underutilized, so their removal would have little, if any, affect on overall availability of parking along Hampton Road.
- D. There is no evidence of historical or archaeological resources within the project area. Potential impacts to unknown resources can be adequately mitigated as long as mitigation identified by project specifications is implemented during the construction phase.
- E. Any objectionable noise, odors or release of hazardous materials during construction can be adequately mitigated as the construction plans would include a limitation on the hours of construction, and Best Management Practices would be employed during construction to minimize the potential for releases of hazardous materials.

III. PERSON WHO PREPARED INITIAL STUDY:

Jaimie Benson

Alameda County Redevelopment Agency

Hayward, CA

Dated: April 17, 2009

IV. REVIEW PERIOD:

The public review period established for this Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration is from April 20, 2009 through May 20, 2009. Written comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on May 20, 2009. Any interested party or agent may comment on this Draft Negative Declaration and may send comments to: Alameda County Redevelopment Agency, Attn.: Jaimie Benson, 224 W. Winton Avenue, Rm. 110, Hayward, CA 94544 for review. For further information, contact Jaimie Benson, 510-670-6107.

COPY OF INITIAL STUDY IS ATTACHED

Alameda County Redevelopment Agency Cherryland Sidewalks Project, Phase II Ha Negative Declaration April 16, 2009	ampton Road
Accepted By:	
Described of Communication	
President of Board of Supervis	ors
Date:	

CEQA Initial Study Form

1. Project title:

Cherryland Sidewalks Project Phase II, Hampton Road

2. Lead agency name and address:

Alameda County Redevelopment Agency 224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 110 Hayward, CA 94544

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Jaimie Benson 510-670-6107

4. Project Location:

The street improvement project is located on Hampton Road, between Meekland Avenue and Mission Boulevard, in unincorporated Hayward, CA.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Alameda County Redevelopment Agency 224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 110 Hayward, CA 94544

6. General Plan Designation:

Plan: Eden Area

Subarea: Cherryland - High and Medium Density Residential

7. Zoning:

Residential

8. Description of project:

The Cherryland Sidewalks Project Phase II, Hampton Road involves the full road replacement and narrowing of 4,200 feet of existing two-lane collector road. Additional improvements include new concrete curb, gutter, sidewalks, protected street parking, crosswalks, street trees, tree pruning, and storm drainage facilities.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The surrounding land use is almost exclusively single residential units with some multifamily and park lands. Community features in the project area include the Meek Mansion and Carriage House on Hampton Road (listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Inventory of Historic Resources), and the Meek Estate Park (a California State Point of Historical Interest). Residences in the area include both larger and modest single-family homes, with some older (1920's) bungalows interspersed, and various apartment buildings. Sidewalk conditions within the project area are variable, with some improvements in place, some older sidewalks in need of repair or replacement, and other areas without any sidewalks at all. In those areas without sidewalks, pedestrians use a combination of earthen pathway, road shoulder, driveway and roadway. The purpose of the project is to provide safe walking conditions for school-age children and other pedestrians.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or

participation agreement.)

Public Works, Land Development Public Works, Grading Department Alameda County Fire Department East Bay Municipal Utility District Public Works, Building Inspection

11. Sources consulted in preparing Initial Study.

- 1) Historic Property Survey Report, Peak & Associates, Inc.
- 2) Archeological Survey Report, Peak & Associates, Inc., October 2008
- Focused Survey for Active Nests of Avian Species Hampton Road Improvement Project, Synthesis Environmental Planning, August 2008
- LOS and Queue Analysis of the Project at Hampton Road-Mattox Avenue & Mission Boulevard intersection, Dowling Associates, Inc., July 23, 2008.
- 5) Hampton Road Streetscape Plan Existing Circulation Conditions, Dowling Associates, Inc., November 6, 2007.
- 6) Tree Report Hampton Road Improvements, Hortscience, June 2008.
- 7) Alameda County Important Farmland 2000, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2000.
- Alameda County Airport Land Use Policy Plan and Environmental Impact Report, Alameda County Planning Department, April 1977.
- 9) Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, Official Map, Hayward Quadrangle, July 1, 1974.
- BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, December 1999.
- 11) BASMAA, Flood Control Facility Maintenance Best Management Practices, June 2000.
- 12) California Natural Diversity Database, Rarefind, California Department of Fish and Game, 2008.
- 13) California Scenic Routes A list of the officially designated California scenic highways, California Department of Transportation, website accessed on July 21, 2004.
- 14) Cherryland Area Traffic Assessment, Draft Report, Alameda County Public Works Agency, May 2004.
- 15) East 14th Street/Mission Blvd. Streetscape Master Plan, Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, Alameda County Community Development Agency, July 22, 1999.
- 16) Eden Area General Plan, Alameda County Planning Department, November 3, 1983, Amended June 1, 1995.
- 17) FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, City of Hayward, February 2000.
- 18) Noise Ordinance, Alameda County Ordinance Code, Chapter 6.60.
- 19) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Initial Site Assessment for Willow Avenue Segment, Hayward, CA, Tetra Tech, Inc. May 2004.
- 20) Regulation of Trees in County Right of Way, Chapter 12.11 of Title 12 of the Alameda County General Ordinance Code, 2003.
- 21) Scenic Route Element of the General Plan, Alameda County, May 1966.
- 22) Soil Survey of Alameda County, California, Western Part, USDA, 1981.
- 23) Specific Plan for Areas of Environmental Significance, Alameda County, May 1977.
- 24) USGS 7.5 min Topographic Map: Hayward, Calif. Quadrangle, 1980.
- 25) Williamson Act Map for Alameda County, County Planning Department, 2004.
- 26) Zoning Maps: Meek Estate Orchards, Alameda County Community Development Agency.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise		Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of	Significa	ance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significate environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prep	
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponed NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	because revisions in the
0	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	t on the environment, and
0	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially signal potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environgement of the environgement o	onment, but at least one ent pursuant to applicable neasures based on the ONMENTAL IMPACT
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significent environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) has adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	eve been analyzed pursuant to applicable to that earlier EIR or n measures that are
	J. BENSON	4/17/09
Signa	ature	Date
Signa	ature	Date

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:		•		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCE - Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		3		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\boxtimes
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:		·		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
 e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? 				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				

Hampton Road CEQA Initial Study April 8, 2009

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				. 🔀
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				\boxtimes
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				\boxtimes
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				\boxtimes
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
 a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 				\boxtimes
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	. 🗆			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				\boxtimes
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes
iv) Landslides?				\boxtimes
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				\boxtimes
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				\boxtimes
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				\boxtimes
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		, <u> </u>		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes
h) 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 residences are intermixed with wildlands?	· 🗆			\boxtimes

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\boxtimes
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be 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 which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) 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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) 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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				\boxtimes
g) 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?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
i) 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?	, 🗆			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes
XI, NOISE - Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				\boxtimes
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				\boxtimes
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				\boxtimes

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services:				
Fire protection?				\boxtimes
Police protection?				\boxtimes
Schools?				\boxtimes
Parks?				\boxtimes

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Other public facilities?				\boxtimes
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project 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?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) 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?				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				\boxtimes
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				\boxtimes
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				\boxtimes
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		9		
b) 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?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\boxtimes
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				\boxtimes

EXPLANATION OF RESPONSES

I. AESTHETICS:

- a) The project will have no impact on a scenic vista because there are no scenic vistas identified in the project area.
- b) The project will have no impact on scenic resources because the project area is not located within a scenic highway.
- c) The project will have no impact on the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. The project is designed to improve and upgrade the existing visual character of the project area, through the installation of uniform sidewalks, elimination of off-street parking on property frontages where sidewalks currently do not exist, and installation of street trees. Any fencing removed would be replaced so there would be no visual impact.
- d) The project will not generate a new source of light or glare because there are no new streetlights proposed, and no daytime glare will be generated.

II. AGRICULTURE

a-c) The project is located in a suburban residential neighborhood and would have no impact on agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

- a-c) The proposed project is intended to calm traffic, thus potentially reducing emissions in the area. As a result, the project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan, will not create or contribute to an existing air quality violation, and will not result in a net increase in criteria pollutants.
- d,e) The project is not expected to expose people to objectionable odors or pollutant concentrations, beyond possible nuisance dust exposure during project construction, as the project only involves typical street improvements.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- A completed migratory bird study confirmed that the proposed project will have no impact on birds in the area provided that the project occurs outside of the nesting time window.
- b) The site is located in a currently developed residential neighborhood. A small remnant riparian area is adjacent to the project area along San Lorenzo Creek, but the improvements would not affect that area.
- c) The project will have no impact on a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because the site is located in a strictly residential area.
- d) The project will not interfere substantially with any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species, because the project site is fully developed and is not located near any watercourses or wildlife areas.
- e,f) The project will not conflict with any local policies, ordinances, or conservation plans that protect biological resources. Some tree pruning would take place to remove dead branches from some of the older decadent walnut and chestnut trees, however this would not result in any significant impacts to wildlife or migratory birds.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCE

a-d) Historic and archeological surveys determined that there are no known cultural resources within the project area which will be affected by the Hampton Road improvements. If any archeological or paleontological resources are found during construction, construction activity would stop within 25 feet of the find and an on-call archeologist or paleontologist would be contacted for evaluation and further recommendations.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a) The project lies within the San Francisco Bay area, which at times is exposed to seismic ground shaking and fault rupture. However, if seismic activity occurs, the proposed roadway repairs would not generate a greater risk than already exists.
- b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the proposed project does not involve additional exposure to the soil.
- c-e) The project site is not located on hazardous soil that could be defined as unstable, expansive, or incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a-d) The public will not be exposed to significant hazardous materials as a result of the proposed project because the potential for site contamination is low and hazardous materials are not required for implementation of the roadway improvements.
- e,f) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) The project is not located adjacent to a wildland, thus the risk of exposing people or structures to wildland fires is very low.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a) The project involves the installation of a new storm drain system in compliance with county standards and includes the implementation of a SWPPP during construction; therefore, the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- b) The roadway improvements are not expected to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c) The project site does not 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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site
- d) The project will not significantly increase the amount of impervious surfaces and is therefore not expected to 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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site.
- e) The project is not expected to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- f) The project involves typical street improvements that are not expected to otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- g,h) The roadway improvement project does not lie within a 100-year flood hazard area and does not propose housing.
- The project site has a very low risk of flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- j) The project site has a very low risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow because the project is not located near a volcano, water body, or steep unstable slopes.

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

- a) The project will not physically divide an established community because the project only involves roadway associated improvements.
- b) The project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
- c) The project does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

a,b) Mineral resources are not expected to be present on the project site.

XI. NOISE

- a) During construction, the proposed project may expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Alameda County Noise Ordinance. To prevent this from being a significant impact, construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, and will be temporary in nature.
- b) During construction, the proposed project may expose persons to or generate of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels during pavement removal or conform grinding. To prevent this from being a significant impact, construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, and will be temporary in nature.
- c) The proposed project is not expected to subject persons to substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, as the project is not relocating the roadway or increasing traffic.
- d) The proposed project is not expected to expose persons to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. While temporary noise impacts from construction are expected, these will not be significant due to the fact that construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.
- e-f) The project is not located within the vicinity of an airport.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a-c) The project would not have any effect on growth in population or housing because it only involves improvements to an existing roadway within an already established neighborhood.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) The project will not 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.
- b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- The project involves the narrowing of Hampton Road, which is intended to cause a decrease in traffic.
- b) The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. An LOS and Queue Analysis revealed that the alteration of the roadway at the intersection of Hampton Road/Mattox Avenue and Mission Boulevard will not have a significant impact on the LOS at the intersection. A slight increase in delay may occur at the intersection, but LOS will remain at D, which is the LOS standard in Alameda County.
- c) The project will not 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 because the project only involves roadway improvements.
- d) The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). The project is intended to calm traffic in order to increase the safety along the roadway and is not expected to alter the use of the roadway.
- e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access because an emergency access will be maintained at all times during construction.
- f) The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity. Currently on-street parking is available, but not designated, along the length of Hampton Road. A survey revealed that very little cars utilize the available parking due to the unsafe parking conditions. The project proposes new protected parking along the roadway to promote the use of on-street parking.
- g) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a) The project does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board because wastewater will not be generated as a result of the project.
- b) The project will not 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 because wastewater will not be generated.
- c) The project involves the construction of new storm drain conveyance system to contain the stormwater that is currently entering the system from overland flow. No additional capacity will be demanded from downstream facilities.
- d) The project will not require any demand on water supplies other than might be necessary for dust control. This water use would have no bearing or relationship to existing entitlements for water usage in the project vicinity.
- e) The project does not propose development that utilizes wastewater services; therefore no clearance is required from the wastewater treatment provider.
- f) The project will not utilize a landfill.
- g) The project is designed to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) The initial evaluations conducted for this Initial Study reveal that the project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) The proposed project is not expected to have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) The Initial Study reveals no environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

RICHARD E. WINNIE, County Counsel

By Sy htr Deputy

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NUMBER: R-

APPROVE PROJECT FOR ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS UPON APPROVAL BY CALTRANS AND ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION MAKING STATUTORY FINDINGS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH FOR THE CHERRYLAND SIDEWALKS PROJECT PHASE II HAMPTON ROAD IN EDEN TOWNSHIP, ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, in the judgment of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, it is necessary to secure all labor, material, equipment, mechanical workmanship, transportation, and services required for:

The Cherryland Sidewalks Project Phase II Hampton Road in Eden Township, Alameda County, California (Specification No. 2063); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Section 33000 et seq.: the "Redevelopment Law"), the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda has adopted and the County of Alameda Redevelopment Agency (the "Agency") is responsible for implementing the Redevelopment Plan for the Eden Area Redevelopment Project (the "Eden Plan"), as adopted by Ordinance No. 0-2001-1 dated June 8, 2000, pertaining to the Eden Redevelopment Project Area comprised of five non-contiguous Sub-Areas including the Cherryland Sub-Area as described therein (the "Project Area"); and

WHEREAS, to assist in implementing the Eden Plan, the Agency adopted a five-year implementation plan (the "Implementation Plan") pursuant to Section 33490 of the Redevelopment Law; and,

WHEREAS, the Implementation Plan identifies pedestrian improvements included within the Cherryland Sidewalks Project Phase II – Hampton Road (the "Project") located in the public right of way on Hampton Road between Mission Boulevard and Meekland Avenue, the Project Area to be constructed within the Project Area; and,

WHEREAS, Section 33445 of the California Health and Safety Code provides that a redevelopment agency may pay all or part of the cost of the construction of any building, facility, structure or other improvement which is to be publicly owned and is located within or outside of a redevelopment project area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to assist the Alameda County Public Works Agency (Public Works) in the construction of the infrastructure improvements with the use of Agency tax increment revenue generated in the Project Area; and,

WHEREAS, the County owns and maintains the public areas subject to the improvements proposed in the Project; and,

WHEREAS, construction of the project will serve the goals and objectives for redevelopment of the Project Area set forth in the Redevelopment Plan and is consistent with the Implementation Plan, and the County's General Plan (the "General Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Agency has complied with and will comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in connection with its consideration of the Project in the manner set forth below; and

WHEREAS, the Board letter (the "Supporting Document") has been presented to and considered by the Agency in support of the findings and approvals set forth in this Resolution; are hereby incorporated by reference in this Resolution; and, together with the above recitals (the "Recitals"), form the evidentiary basis and establish the analytical route for reaching the ultimate findings and conclusions contained in this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the plans and specifications for the abovementioned work, as approved by the Director of Public Works, as authorized by the Board of Supervisors, be and they are hereby accepted and approved for advertisement upon approval by Caltrans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the bid bond to be submitted with the proposals for the above work shall be in the amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the base bid; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the general prevailing rate of per diem wages and the general prevailing rate for holiday and overtime work shall be as determined by the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations, State of California, for each craft, classification, or type of workman needed to execute the contract as set forth in Sections 1770 and 1773 of the Labor Code of the State of California or the prevailing wage rates as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor in accordance with the Department of Labor Regulations 29 CFR (Code of Regulations), whichever is higher; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon receipt by the Director of Public Works of the approval from Caltrans, the Clerk of this Board is authorized to advertise for proposals for the above-mentioned work, in accordance with law by publishing the same in the Inter-City Express, a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of Alameda, State of California; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Notice to Bidders shall be in the form as follows:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Governing Board of the County of Alameda Redevelopment Agency of the, as follows:

Section 1. Recitals Correct. The Agency finds that the above Recitals are true and correct and have served, together with the Supporting Documents, as the basis for the findings and approvals set forth below.

Section 2. CEQA Actions.

- a. The Agency has prepared a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA (the "Negative Declaration"), a copy of which is on file with the Agency Secretary. The Agency has served as, and complied with the requirements of a "lead agency" pursuant to CEQA in connection with the processing and consideration of the Negative Declaration. The Agency has served as a "responsible agency" pursuant to CEQA in connection with consideration and adoption of the Negative Declaration.
- b. The Agency hereby certifies its review and consideration of the Negative Declaration as a responsible agency in accordance with CEQA.
- c. The Agency hereby finds and determines that the Negative Declaration adequately addresses the environmental issues pertaining to Project, on the basis of the whole record before it (including any comments received on the Negative Declaration), there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment.
- d. The Agency hereby finds, determines and directs that the applicable measures set forth in the Negative Declaration shall be and are incorporated into and will be implemented in connection with the Project.
- e. Based on the foregoing, the Agency hereby approves and adopts the Negative Declaration.
- f. As a result of the foregoing, no further actions or findings are required by the Agency as a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA, and the Negative Declaration may serve and has served as the environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA for the Agency's approval of this Resolution and the actions set forth in this Resolution.
- g. Based on the foregoing CEQA consideration, the Agency Executive Director is authorized and directed to file the appropriate Notice of Determination document and pay all applicable filing fees pursuant to CEQA in connection with the actions and approvals set forth in this Resolution.
- h. The Agency further states its intent to use the Negative Declaration as the environmental documentation for its consideration of future funding decisions pursuant to Section 33445 of the California Health and Safety Code with respect to the Project, to the extent permitted by CEQA.

	, 2009.	
AYES:		
NOES:		
EXCUSED:		
	45	
		President, Board of Supervi
Crystal K. Hishida-		
ATTEST: Crystal K. Hishida- Board of Superviso By:	ors	
Crystal K. Hishida-Board of Supervisor By:	ors	
Crystal K. Hishida- Board of Superviso By:	ors	
Crystal K. Hishida-Board of Supervisor By: Deputy Approved as to For	ors	
Crystal K. Hishida-Board of Supervisor By: Deputy Approved as to For RICHARD E. WIN By:	rm:	
Crystal K. Hishida-Board of Supervisor By: Deputy Approved as to For RICHARD E. WIN By:	rm: NNIE, County Counsel	

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY

NOTICE TO BIDDERS

FEDERAL AID PROJECT ID: CML - 5933 (092)

Sealed proposals for the work shown on the plans entitled:

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY PROJECT PLANS FOR

HAMPTON ROAD STREET IMPROVEMENTS (FROM MEEKLAND AVENUE TO MISSION BOULEVARD) EDEN TOWNSHIP, ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA FEDERAL AID PROJECT ID: CML-5933 (092)

will be received at the Office of the County of Alameda, 951 Turner Court, Room 100, Hayward, CA 94545 until 2:00 p.m. on August 25, 2009, at which time they will be publicly opened and read.

Proposal forms for this work are included in a separate book entitled:

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY
PROPOSAL AND CONTRACT FOR

HAMPTON ROAD STREET IMPROVEMENTS (FROM MEEKLAND AVENUE TO MISSION BOULEVARD) EDEN TOWNSHIP, ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA FEDERAL AID PROJECT ID: CML-5933 (092)

General Work Description: The work to be done consists, in general, of preparing construction schedules; installing temporary traffic control systems; providing construction area signs; furnishing and implementing water pollution control plans; furnishing and applying water; controlling dust; removing existing traffic signs, stripes and markings; installing temporary pavement markings; key cutting, milling, grinding, removing and disposing existing asphalt concrete pavement, curb, gutter and sidewalk, within specified limits; excavating, removing, and disposing unsuitable subgrade material; compacting subgrade; furnishing, placing, and compacting Type A 4-inch thick asphalt concrete; installing new curb, gutter, and sidewalk; installing storm drain main and laterals; coordinating with other contractors and agencies — such as, EMBUD, PG&E, Boston Road Improvements construction; installing permanent thermoplastic traffic striping and pavement markings; installing traffic signal interconnect conduits, cables, pull wires, pull boxes, etc.; installing vehicle and bicycle detector loops, conductors, and conduits; adjusting and modifying existing utility covers, manholes, and survey monuments to grade; pedestrian ramp dome pattern;

tree planters and landscaping; removal and disposal of excess and waste material; and the cleaning of the site at the end of the job.

THIS PROJECT IS SUBJECT TO THE "BUY AMERICA" PROVISIONS OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1982 AS AMENDED BY THE INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1991.

This project is subject to all Local, State, and Federal laws, rules and guidelines contained in the plans and specifications, including but not limited to payment prevailing wages. Contractor must possess either Class A or C-12 licenses at the time this contract is awarded.

There is a mandatory pre-bid meeting required for all prime contractors. The pre-bid meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 11, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. at 951 Turner Court, Room 230A, Hayward. Interested sub-contractors are invited and encouraged to attend pre-bid meetings. Bid Proposals from prime contractors that fail to attend this mandatory pre-bid meeting will be rejected. This meeting is to inform bidders of project requirements and subcontractors of subcontracting and material supply opportunities.

The contract is subject to state contract nondiscrimination and compliance requirements pursuant to Government Code, Section 12990.

DETAILED PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND PROPOSAL FORMS: Are available at the Public Works Agency, 951 Turner Court, Room 100, Hayward, CA 94545, for a non-refundable cost of \$50.00 per set. Technical questions should be directed to <u>Bill Lepere at (510) 670-5431</u>.

Inquiries or questions based on alleged patent ambiguity of the plans, specifications or estimate must be communicated as a bidder inquiry prior to bid opening. Any such inquiries or questions, submitted after bid opening, will not be treated as a bid protest.

The successful bidder shall furnish a payment bond and a performance bond.

The County of Alameda affirms that in any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, disadvantaged business enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation.

The Local Agency Bidder-DBE (Construction Contracts)-Information and UDBE Commitment (Construction Contracts) must be submitted with the Bid Proposal.

Bidders are advised that, as required by federal law, the State has established a statewide overall DBE goal and UDBE goal. This Agency federal-aid contract is considered to be part of the statewide overall DBE goal and UDBE goal. The Agency is required to report to Caltrans on DBE and UDBE firm participation for all Federal-aid contracts each year so that attainment efforts may be evaluated.

Pursuant to Section 1773 of the Labor Code, the general prevailing wage rates in the county, or counties, in which the work is to be done have been determined by the Director of the California Department of Industrial Relations. These wages are set forth in the General Prevailing Wage Rates for this project, available at the Contract Compliance Office at the offices of the Public Works Agency of the County of Alameda. The Federal minimum wage rates for this project as predetermined by the United States Secretary of Labor are set forth in the books issued for bidding purposes entitled "Proposal and Contract," and in copies of said book that may be examined at the

offices described above where project plans, special provisions, and proposal forms may be seen. Addenda to modify the Federal minimum wage rates, if necessary, will be issued to holders of "Proposal and Contract" books. Future effective general prevailing wage rates which have been predetermined and are on file with the California Department of Industrial Relations are referenced but not printed in the general prevailing wage rates.

Attention is directed to the Federal minimum wage rate requirements in the books entitled "Proposal and Contract". If there is a difference between the minimum wage rates predetermined by the Secretary of Labor and the general prevailing wage rates determined by the Director of the California Department of Industrial Relations for similar classifications of labor, the Contractor and subcontractors shall pay not less than the higher wage rate. The Department will not accept lower State wage rates not specifically included in the Federal minimum wage determinations. This includes "helper" (or other classifications based on hours of experience) or any other classification not appearing in the Federal wage determinations. Where Federal wage determinations do not contain the State wage rate determination otherwise available for use by the Contractor and subcontractors, the Contractor and subcontractors shall pay not less than the Federal minimum wage rate which most closely approximates the duties of the employees in question.

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) provides a toll-free "hotline" service to report bid rigging activities. Bid rigging activities can be reported Mondays through Fridays, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., eastern time, Telephone No. 1-800-424-9071. Anyone with knowledge of possible bid rigging, bidder collusion, or other fraudulent activities should use the "hotline" to report these activities. The "hotline" is part of the DOT's continuing effort to identify and investigate highway construction contract fraud and abuse and is operated under the direction of the DOT Inspector General. All information will be treated confidentially and caller anonymity will be respected.

The Board of Supervisors reserves the right to reject any or all bids and any or all items of such bids.

BY ORDER OF THE BOA	RD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA,	, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ON TUESDAY,	, 2009

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors County of Alameda, State of California

END OF NOTICE TO BIDDERS

SUMMARY OF BID ITEMS

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT
101	Construction Staking	1	LS
102	Mobilization	1	LS_
103	Water Pollution Control Work	11	LS
104	Traffic Control	1_	LS
105	Clearing and Grubbing	52,400	SF
106	Roadway Excavation	10,300	CY
107_	Remove Concrete Curb & Gutter	4,900	LF
108	Remove Asphalt Concrete Dike	3,600	LF
109	Remove Miscellaneous Asphalt Concrete	5,700	SF_
110	Remove PCC Sidewalk, Driveways, & Pedestrian Ramps	23,000	SF
111	Remove and Salvage Sign	28	EA_
112	Remove Miscellaneous Items	1	LS
113_	Asphalt Concrete Pavement	2,600	TON
114	Aggregate Base	7,600	TON
115	PCC Sidewalk	2,458	SF
116_	PCC Miscellaneous Pavement	15,700	SF
117	PCC Driveway	15,100	SF
118	PCC Curb and Gutter	6,100	LF
119	PCC Vertical Curb	2,100	LF
120	Accessible Pedestrian Ramp	32	EA
121	Pavement Conform Grinding	15,000	SF
122	Driveway Conform (Asphalt)	2,100	SF
123	Driveway Conform (Concrete)	3,700	SF
124	Driveway Conform (Gravel)	100	SF
125	Driveway Conform (Special Concrete)	100	SF

^{*}Contingent Bid Item

126	*	Walkway Conform (Asphalt)	100	SF
127	*	Walkway Conform (Concrete)	400	SF
128	*	Walkway Conform (Gravel)	100	SF_
129	*	Walkway Conform (Special Concrete)	100	SF
130		Finished Grading (Back of walk conform)	1	LS
131_		Curb Inlet	23	EA
132	_	Drainage Inlet	7	EA
133		Storm Drain Manhole	18	EA_
134		Storm Drain Outfall	1	LS
135		18-in Reinforced Concrete Pipe	3,900	LF_
136		Relocate Fire Structures	1	LS_
137	*	Relocate Sanitary Sewer Laterals	300	LF
138	*	Relocate Gas Laterals	300	LF
139	*	Relocate Water Laterals	300	LF
140		Trench Safety	3,900	LF
141		Adjust to Grade (Storm Drain Manhole)	14	EA
142		Adjust to Grade (Sanitary Sewer Manhole)	13	EA
143		Adjust to Grade (Monument)	5	EA_
144	*	Standard Survey Monument	5	EA_
145		Adjust to Grade (Water Meter)	86	EA_
146		Adjust to Grade (Water Valve)	23	EA_
147		Adjust to Grade (Gas Valve)	4	EA
148		8" White Thermoplastic Stripe	200	LF
149		12" White Thermoplastic Stripe	1,400	LF
150		Install Pavement Marking (STOP)	23	EA

^{*}Contingent Bid Item

151	Install Pavement Marking (AHEAD)	1	EΑ
152	Install Pavement Marking (Three-way Arrow)	1	EA
153	Install Pavement Marking (Railroad Xing)	2	EA
154	Install Blue Reflector (See MUTCD)	8	EA
155	Install Sign (STOP)	15	EA
156	Install Sign (NO PARKING, with Double Arrow)	38	EA
157	Install Sign (NO PARKING, with Single Arrow)	14	EA
158	Install Sign (NO PARKING HERE TO CORNER)	21	EA
159	Install Sign (School Crossing)	1	EA
160	Install Sign (TRAFFIC FINES DOUBLE)	1_	EA
161	Install Sign (Pedestrian Crossing and Diagonal Arrow)	1	EA
162_	Install Sign (Highway-rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning)	2	EA
163	Install Sign (STOP AHEAD)	1	EΑ
164	Install Sign (NO TRUCKS)	1	EA_
165	Install Sign (COMMERCIAL VEHICLES OVER 7 TONS PROHIBITED)	1	EA
166	Install Sign (SPEED LIMIT 25)	. 1	EA
167	Install Project Sign	2	EA
168	Traffic Signal Modifications	1	LS
169	Gateway Landscaping	1	LS
170	Gateway Amended Topsoil Mix	180	CY
171	Gateway Irrigation System	2,500	SF
172	Street Tree	143	EA
173	Chain Link Fence - 8' vinyl coated	380	LF
174	Landscape Maintenance	1	LS
175	Landscape Watering	1	LS

^{*}Contingent Bid Item