2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PURPOSE

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential for significant environmental impacts of the proposed Altamont Motorsports Park Rezoning (AMP Rezoning or proposed project). The intent of this executive summary is to provide the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public with a clear, simple and concise description of the proposed project and its potential significant environmental impacts. Section 15123 of the *State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* requires that the summary identify each significant impact, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would avoid or minimize potential significant impacts of the proposed project. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved. This section focuses on the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed project and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding.

2.2 PROJECT SITE AND LOCATION

The 83-acre project site is located immediately south of the Interstate 580/Interstate 205 interchange, approximately 10 miles east of the City of Livermore, and approximately 7 miles west of the City of Tracy in the eastern portion of Alameda County.

The site is generally bounded by Interstates 205 and 580 to the north, Interstate 580 to the east, and existing rural residential development to the south and west. The open lands in the project area used for cattle grazing and wind farming energy production.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The site at which the Altamont Motorsports Park (AMP) is located opened in 1963 as a half-mile dirt oval. The raceway was paved and reconfigured in 1966 to feature three separate racetracks integrated within the perimeter of the half-mile oval. The site has been in operation since 1963.

Currently, 35 acres of AMP's 83-acre site are developed with a paved racetrack, pit/paddock area, grandstand, and other support facilities. The proposed project includes rezoning the site from the A (Agricultural) District to the PD (Planned Development) District to provide for the continued operation of the facility, with further definition of currently permitted uses and operations, including authorized motorsports activities, and to provide for the installation of a roof over a portion of the existing grandstand, the installation of two caretakers residences, and the installation of freeway signage.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Key objectives of the proposed project are:

- To allow for the continued use of the Altamont Motorsports Park in accordance with all provisions of the 1996 CUP;
- To further define all conditions of the 1996 CUP, including specification of the types of motorsports activities permitted at Altamont Motorsports Park, in a manner that recognizes the evolving nature of the motorsports industry and allows a variety of racing types, including, but not limited to, stock car, autocross, kart, motorcycle, sports car, open-wheel, and drifting, as well as future, unanticipated motorsports activities;
- To permit the construction of the previously approved grandstand roof over a portion of the existing grandstand;
- To permit the installation of the previously approved installation of two mobile homes for use as caretaker residences;
- To permit an increase in the number of RVs/motor home vehicles that may be parked at the site overnight; and
- To provide signage adequate to alert passersby of the location and schedule of events at Altamont Motorsports Park, and to provide advertising and public service announcements.

2.5 TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

In order to receive input from interested public agencies and private parties as to which environmental topics should be addressed in this EIR, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and circulated for 30 days. A copy of the NOP is provided in **Appendix 1.0** of this EIR. Based on the NOP comments, in addition to guidance from interested public agencies and private parties, this EIR addresses the following environmental topics in depth:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

2.6 IMPACT SUMMARY

A detailed discussion regarding potential impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**. In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a summary of the project's impacts is provided in **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**, presented at the end of this section. Also provided in **Table 2.0-1** are mitigation measures that are proposed to avoid or reduce significant project impacts. The table indicates whether implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the level of impact to a less-than-significant level.

2.7 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The alternatives evaluated in this EIR focus on avoiding or further reducing potentially significant and significant project impacts associated with aesthetics and noise. Project alternatives are summarized below. Please refer to **Section 5.0, Alternatives**, for a detailed discussion of these alternatives.

2.7.1 No Project - 1996 Conditional Use Permit

The No Project – 1996 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would retain the status quo as defined by the 1996 CUP, and operation of the raceway in accordance with that entitlement would continue as currently permitted. None of the potentially significant and mitigable or significant and unavoidable impacts identified in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, would occur with the No Project – 1996 Conditional Use Permit Alternative.

2.7.2 No Project – Raceway Closure

The No Project – Raceway Closure would be the closure of the raceway in total. This No Project alternative would stop all activity at the site and would concurrently eliminate any existing operational effects associated with the raceway. The No Project – Raceway Closure would also be expected to result over time in the degradation of the existing raceway facilities, which would be minimally visible from most off-site locations.

2.7.3 Reduced/Eliminated Freeway Signs

The Reduced/Eliminated Freeway Signs alternative would eliminate or significantly reduce the size of the proposed freeway signs to address issues of aesthetic impacts when viewed from the portion of Interstate 580 that is a state designated Scenic Highway. However, reduction of the signs' size and height to a point where they would not intrude into the view shed when viewed from that portion of Interstate 580 would eliminate their usefulness and not satisfy the signs' purpose to advertise the raceway to passing motorists.

2.7.4 Reduce Noise Standard

The 1996 CUP established a noise standard for the raceway, which remains the standard for the proposed project as described in **Section 4.11, Noise**. The Board of Supervisors recently implemented an interim noise standard for the 2008 racing season that establishes a cumulative maximum sound level of 83 dB(A) at the property line for all race vehicles on track at any time. This alternative would be expected to lower the overall noise level generated during motorsports events below the standard established by the 1996 CUP.

2.8 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED/AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This EIR addresses environmental issues associated with the proposed project that are known to the lead agency or were raised by other public agencies or interested parties during the EIR scoping process. The range of issues include impacts to aesthetic resources, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. These issues and others are discussed in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**.

Table 2.0-1
Summary Table of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics			
Potential Impact 4.1-1			
The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant
Potential Impact 4.1-2			
The proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.1-3			
The proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant
Potential Impact 4.1-4			
The proposed project would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially significant	**AES-1:** The maximum brightness of the LED freeway signs shall be established after their installation for both daylight and nighttime periods. The maximum brightness level during daylight hours shall be set no brighter than field observations by the Alameda County Planning Department determine pose no impacts to motorists on I-205 or I-580. The maximum brightness level during nighttime hours shall be set no brighter than field observations determine pose no impacts to motorists on I-205 or I-580 and that further do not allow the signs to be visible from the City of Tracy's western city boundary.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.2 Agricultural Resources			
Potential Impact 4.2-1			
The project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.2-2			
The project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.2-3			
The project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
4.3 Air Quality and Global Climate Change			
Potential Impact 4.3-1			
The project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.3-2			
The project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.3 Air Quality and Global Climate Change (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.3-3			
The project would 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 standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	Significant	The nature of the proposed project's activities (i.e., motor vehicle racing) limits the range of mitigation measures available to reduce impacts. The majority of the project's GHG emissions would be the result of racing activities. In addition, the proposed project is not located adjacent to any mass transit system that would be convenient for visitors. The closest mass transit service station is the San Joaquin Regional Transit District (SJRTD) Interregional Commuter Bus Service, which is located on Grant Line Road and Naglee Road approximately 2 miles away. This would not be a feasible distance for visitors to walk to project site. Furthermore, the Altamont Motorsports Track currently operates at near full capacity in recent years. The proposed project would add an incremental amount of potential visitors to the existing operation. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measures are suggested to reduce the operational GHG emissions. Other measures that could reduce a project's GHG emissions are not applicable to the proposed project. Such measures typically involve (1) green building techniques, but the project does not involve new building construction (except for caretaker residences), (b) water conservation, but the project does not involve large amounts of water use, (3) land use measures such as high-density residential or mixed-use development, but the project does not change the existing land use, or (4) transportation control measures, but the project is not conducive to such measures. Implementation of these measures is not expected to substantially reduce the project's GHG emissions because these emissions are primarily related to participant, spectator, and employee vehicle trips and racecars.	Unavoidably significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.3 Air Quality and Global Climate Change (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.3-3 (continued)		**AQ-1:** The applicant shall install electrical hook ups for motorhomes visiting the project site to eliminate emissions associated with motorhome generators. **AQ-2:** The applicant shall install photovoltaic solar panels on the project site to reduce the amount of electrical usage. Photovoltaic systems shall provide a minimum of 25 percent of the estimated electrical demand of the Altamont Motorsports Park, including the electrical demands of motorhomes as indicated in Mitigation Measure AQ-1. **AQ-3:** The applicant shall provide receptacles for recycling of beverage containers and other food service items and paper goods.	
Potential Impact 4.3-4			
The project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.3-5			
The project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources			
Potential Impact 4.4-1			
The project would 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 CDFG or USFWS.	Potentially significant	**BIO-1:** The project applicant shall commission the preparation of a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) designed to maintain the current level of special-status species use of the project site. The HMP shall be completed and implemented prior to implementing any increase in site activity or construction of the caretaker residences or freeway signage. The HMP shall be prepared by a qualified biologist (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department). The HMP shall include baseline surveys to determine the full extent of existing use, if any, of special status plants and animals, including but not limited to the following: Swanson's hawk foraging habitat, ferruginous hawk, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, white-tailed kite, Joaquin whipsnake, coast horned lizard, western spadefoot toad, American badger, and San Joaquin pocket mouse. The HMP shall incorporate management of the same species listed above. The HMP shall indicate the methods and funding available to implement Mitigation Measures BIO-2 to BIO-13 and shall detail procedures to guide the land uses authorized at the AMP site. The HMP will recognize current ongoing and decades past land uses and will provide safeguards for avoiding impacts to sensitive-species documented as occurring on site (and in the future). This HMP may be development in conjunction with any Section 10 consultation with USFWS that may be required under the federal Endangered Species Act. The HMP shall be completed prior to construction of the caretaker residences and signs.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-2:** Prior to implementing any increase in site activity or construction of the caretaker residences or freeway signage, the project applicant shall retain a qualified botanist (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) to conduct special-status plant species presence/absence surveys within areas proposed for grading or modification. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified botanist, at the appropriate time of year to ensure that all special-status plants with the potential to occur on site are evident and identifiable. Surveys shall be conducted pursuant to guidelines provided by the CNPS (2001), CDFG (2000), and the USFWS (1996). Survey results shall be submitted to the Alameda County Planning Department. If any sensitive plant species are observed during the presence/absence surveys, and it is determined that such plants would be impacted by project activities, the Alameda County Planning Department, the CDFG, and the USFWS (if the species is on the federal list of sensitive species) should be consulted to determine appropriate measures to ensure the protection of the species and its habitat. Such mitigation should include avoidance or, if avoidance is not possible, relocation of affected plants to a mitigation site located in similar habitat within the project site, in an area where no impacts are expected to occur. The relocation site should be in an area that is protected from impacts through human disturbance by fencing.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-3:** The project applicant shall provide for the on-site protection of suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat through use of fee title or conservation easement. A qualified biologist shall determine the area of habitat to be preserved. Mitigation shall provide for the maintenance of any current usage of the project site. The fee title or conservation easement shall be in place prior to implementing any increase in site activity or construction of the caretaker residences or freeway signage. **BIO-4:** A qualified biologist retained by the project applicant (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) shall conduct an assessment of the wintering population of burrowing owls. Winter surveys shall be conducted before the period when wintering owls are most likely to be present (between October 1 and January 31) as well as during the nesting season (generally between February 1 to August 31). All owl sightings, occupied burrows, and burrows with owl sign shall be counted and mapped to determine the wintering or breeding owl population. The surveys shall be conducted pursuant to the CDFG burrowing owl survey protocol and mitigation guidelines (CDFG 1993). Surveys shall be conducted prior to construction of caretaker residences and signage.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		If ground disturbing activities associated with mobile home and signage installation are planned to commence during the burrowing owl breeding season (February 1 – August 31), and nesting burrowing owl burrows are found in project impact areas or within 500 feet, ground disturbing activities within 500 feet shall be delayed until the burrow is vacated, juveniles have fledged, and it is determined by the biologist that there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Limits of ground disturbing activities to avoid the active nest shall be established in the field with flagging/stakes, construction fencing, or other appropriate barriers. Personnel working on installation of the caretaker residences and signage shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the nest area. A biological monitor shall serve as construction monitor during those periods that construction activities would occur near active nest areas, to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. The applicant shall record the results of the protective measures taken, to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Documentation of compliance shall be submitted to the Alameda County Planning Department.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		If ground disturbing activities associated with mobile home and signage installation are planned to commence during the non-breeding season for burrowing owl (September 1 - January 31), and non-breeding, active burrowing owl burrows are found in project impact areas or within 500 feet of the site, ground disturbing activities within 160 feet of occupied burrows shall be delayed until the burrow is vacated. The burrow may be vacated through evacuation of owls from the active burrow by a qualified biologist (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department), using evacuation and burrow closure procedures approved by the CDFG (CDFG 1995). Specifically, exclusion devices, utilizing on-way doors, shall be installed in the entrances of active burrows. The devices shall be left in the burrows for at least 48 hours to ensure that all owls have been excluded from the burrows. Each of the burrows shall then be excavated by hand and refilled to prevent reoccupation. Exclusion shall continue until the owls have been successfully excluded from impacted burrows, as determined by a qualified biologist. The management plan will determine the extent of any project site fencing of the 45-acre parking area.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-5:** San Joaquin kit fox site protocol surveys shall be conducted, if concluded to be necessary by the USFWS, between May 1 and November 1, and must include 10 nights of spotlight surveys and the use of scent stations in accordance with the USFWS San Joaquin Kit Fox Protocol for the Northern Ranch (USFWS 1999). Surveys shall be conducted prior to construction of caretaker residences and signage. If the USFWS protocol surveys determine that San Joaquin kit fox does occupy the project site and potential den sites occur within project impact areas or within the vicinity (200 feet) of ground disturbing activities, to avoid the direct loss of any individuals of the species, pre-ground disturbance clearance surveys shall be conducted during mobile home and sign installation. Pre-ground disturbance surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) and shall take place no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to any ground disturbing activities. If an active kit fox den is detected in or within 200 feet of the proposed work area, the USFWS and the CDFG shall be contacted immediately.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		If kit fox is observed utilizing areas to be disturbed through mobile home or sign installation for breeding and denning with young, all ground disturbing work within 200 feet of the active burrow(s) shall be temporarily postponed until direction from the USFWS and the CDFG provides guidance regarding how to proceed. If non-breeding kit fox dens occur within ground disturbance zones, the following measures (from the USFWS Sacramento office Procedures for Protecting San Joaquin Kit Fox Before or During Ground Disturbance) shall be taken to safely exclude individuals from the mobile home and sign installation work area: Through the exclusion of San Joaquin kit fox individuals from impact areas associated with mobile home and sign installation, direct impacts associated with this portion of project activities could be avoided. Due to their high mobility of the species, individuals could be expected to move onto the project site, which is currently the portion of the site that receives the least frequent human disturbance and is likely to remain so after proposed project implementation. The northeastern portion of the site contains burrows that appear most suitable for kit fox dens, making it the likely portion of the site to leave relatively undisturbed for possible kit fox usage. To avoid impacts to kit fox associated with intensified usage of the northwestern portion of the project site for parking, the project applicant shall develop and implement a management plan that includes kit fox.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		The management plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures: Vehicles entering the project site for AMP events should observe a 20 mph speed limit. Stored materials (car parts, pipes, etc.) on the project site should be inspected before they are moved, and if kit fox are found inside, materials can be moved to permit escape once the USFWS has been contacted and the contact biologist is supervising. No firearms allowed on site. Rodenticides and pesticides shall be restricted as much as possible and used as directed, and zine phosphide shall be used for rodent control, if needed. An employee education program for all AMP employees should be provided by a qualified biologist, covering: a description of kit fox and its habitat, occurrence in the area, status and protection under the Endangered Species Act, measures to reduce impacts during usage of the project site for AMP, and a fact sheet with this information for distribution to those working on the AMP project site.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-6:** California Tiger Salamander protocol surveys shall be conducted, if concluded to be necessary by the USFWS, to determine presence/absence of the species on site. Surveys will follow the USFWS guidance ("Interim Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander," USFWS 2003) requiring that two breeding season aquatic larval sampling surveys be conducted, with an intervening winter survey of upland habitat conducted through a drift fence study. Surveys shall be conducted prior to construction of caretaker residences and signage. Results of the survey shall be submitted to the USFWS and Alameda County. If the species is found to be present on the site, impacts associated with mobile home and sign installation to individuals of the species that may occupy upland and grassland habitat for the aestivation portion of its lifecycle shall be minimized and mitigated by erecting temporary silt fencing with the bottom edge buried into the ground, or fencing with comparable exclusion properties, around work areas. Prior to ground-disturbing activities, during the species active/breeding season (starting October 15 or when rain occurs), surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If any individuals are observed during surveys, the USFWS, the CDFG, and the Alameda County shall be notified. A qualified biologist (approved by the USFWS and CDFG) shall relocate California tiger salamander individuals from within work areas to the on-site detention pond. The implementation of a management plan that includes California tiger salamander shall include annual surveys for the species within any exclusionary fenced area within the 45-acre parking area during the beginning of the breeding season.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		Instead of conducting the two-year protocol survey, and with the approval of the USFWS, the presence of California tiger salamander on the project site shall be assumed. This assumes that the species breeds in the seasonal pond on the project site when water is present, and that it occupies all surrounding grassland area as upland habitat during the post-metamorphic stages of its lifecycle. Assuming this, and that surveys conducted determined the species to be present, compensatory lands would be purchased at a minimum of a 3:1 basis (or at a ratio determined to be suitable by the USFWS), in order to mitigate for the loss of a portion of the on-site grassland habitat through project activities. This mitigation could be achieved through the purchase of credits at a USFWS-approved mitigation bank, or through the placement of a conservation easement over occupied California tiger salamander habitat. The Natural Resources Conservation District, through the Alameda County Conservation Partnership, provides opportunities for in-lieu fee payments to fund restoration/preservation of California tiger salamander habitat in Alameda County.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-7:** California Red-Legged Frog protocol surveys shall be conducted, if concluded to be necessary by the USFWS, to determine presence/absence of the species, in accordance with the USFWS guidance ("USFWS Revised Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for the California Red-Legged Frog," USFWS 2005b). USFWS guidance requires that up to eight individual surveys be conducted within potential habitat, including six surveys within the breeding season (October 1 – June 30) and two surveys during the non-breeding season (July 1 – September 30). California Red-Legged Frog protocol surveys shall be completed prior to construction of caretaker residences and signage. If the species is found through surveys to be present on the site, impacts associated with mobile home and sign installation to individuals of the species that may occupy upland and grassland habitat for a portion of its lifecycle shall be minimized and mitigated by erecting temporary silt fencing with the bottom edge buried into the ground, or fencing with comparable exclusion properties, around work areas. Prior to ground-disturbing activities, during the species active/breeding season (October 1 – June 30), surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If any individuals are observed during surveys, the USFWS, the CDFG, and Alameda County shall be notified. A qualified biologist (approved by the USFWS and CDFG) shall relocate California red-legged frog individuals from within work areas to the on-site detention pond. If the California red-legged frog is found to occur on the project site, a management plan shall be developed and implemented and shall include annual surveys for California red-legged frog within any exclusionary fencing of the parking area during the beginning of the breeding season and the beginning of the non-breeding season.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-8:** To avoid impacts to those special-status bird species with the potential to nest on the project site, which include California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, and white-tailed kite, the project applicant shall retain a biologist who will include a reconnaissance for these special-status species in the general nesting bird surveys, described below in Mitigation Measure BIO-14. **BIO-9:** San Joaquin whipsnake and coast horned lizard shall be excluded from construction areas using temporary fencing (designed to prevent entry of San Joaquin whipsnake and coast horned lizard) installed around the perimeter of all areas proposed for construction. Silt fencing with the bottom edge buried into the ground, or a fence providing comparable exclusion properties, shall be erected. Once temporary fencing is installed, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-ground disturbing activities survey to locate any San Joaquin whipsnake or coast horned lizard individuals within the enclosed area. Capture and translocation of any such animals shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. All animals removed from the disturbance zone shall be relocated to suitable habitat on the project site, in an area that will not be impacted by project activities. Construction of temporary fencing and capture and translocation of any animals shall be conducted prior to construction activities associated with the caretaker residences and signs.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-10:** A qualified biologist (reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) shall survey areas of suitable habitat for western spadefoot toad on the project site, including ruts or small pools within on-site grassland, as well as the seasonal detention pond. The survey shall be conducted during the active season of western spadefoot toad (which corresponds with the rainy season). The survey results shall be submitted to the Alameda County Planning Department and CDFG prior to construction of the two caretaker residences and signage. If surveys result in the observation of western spadefoot toad within project impact areas in on-site grassland, observed individuals and/or eggs shall be removed from project impact areas (with the prior approval of the CDFG) and be relocated to pre-determined suitable habitat in an appropriate area that will not be impacted. If advisable, the individuals and/or eggs shall be relocated to the shallow edges of the on-site seasonal detention pond or the swale located to the southeast of the pond.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-11:** A qualified biologist (with selection reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) shall conduct pre-ground disturbing clearance surveys within on-site suitable habitat for American badger (burrows within grasslands). Surveys shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbing activities, including grading, construction, or site preparation activities. Specifically, within no more than three days of ground disturbing activities associated with mobile home and sign installation, the qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to see if American badger occurs on the property. If surveys result in the observation of American badger within project impact areas in on-site grassland or within 200 feet, observed individuals shall be captured, removed from project impact areas through humane exclusion from burrows (with the prior approval of the CDFG), and relocated to suitable habitat in an appropriate area that will not be impacted. This relocation area may be land in the northeastern portion of the project site, which is currently the portion of the site that receives the least frequent human disturbance and is likely to remain so after proposed project implementation. This relocation area may also include off-site lands, such as, if approved by Wildlands Environmental Solutions, Inc., Haera Wildlife Conservation Bank, a 299-acre preserve located in Alameda County, that contains grassland habitat suitable for American badger. If American badger is observed utilizing the site for breeding and denning with young, all ground-disturbing work within 200 feet of the active burrow(s) shall be temporarily postponed until direction from CDFG provides guidance regarding how to proceed.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		**BIO-12:** Surveys for San Joaquin pocket mouse shall be conducted prior to installation of two caretaker residences and signage. Where necessary, temporary fencing (designed to prevent entry of San Joaquin pocket mouse into the work area from surrounding grassland) shall be installed around the perimeter of all areas proposed for construction. Silt fencing with the bottom edge buried into the ground, or a fence providing comparable exclusion properties, shall be erected. Once temporary fencing is installed, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-ground disturbing trapping survey to locate any San Joaquin pocket mouse individuals within the enclosed area. Small mammal trapping shall follow the protocol established for the Pacific pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris pacificus) and currently accepted for other pocket mice, such as Los Angeles pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris brevinasus). Such protocol calls for five consecutive nights of trapping, unless the target species is captured in less than five nights, conducted when the animal is active above ground at night, and preferably during a new moon phase. Capture and translocation of any such animals shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. All animals removed from the construction zone shall be relocated to suitable habitat in an area that will not be impacted by project activities. The translocation process shall be conducted until it is determined that all special-status animal species have been removed from the disturbance area boundary.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		To minimize impacts to San Joaquin pocket mouse associated with potential intensified usage of the northwestern portion of the project site for parking, a qualified biologist shall conduct a trapping survey for San Joaquin pocket mouse individuals at the beginning of the species' active period (the active period is generally from February - September). If individuals of this species are found within parking areas, they shall be captured and relocated to the northeastern portion of the project site, the least disturbed on-site location. Small mammal trapping studies for this species shall continue annually within the unpaved parking area. **BIO-13:** A qualified biologist (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) to conduct roosting ferruginous hawk surveys within suitable habitat (lighting poles and grasslands) throughout the project site. Surveys shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbing activities. Specifically, within no more than three days of ground disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to see if ferruginous hawk appears to be utilizing the site for winter roosting.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		If a roosting ferruginous hawk individual is observed during surveys, communications with the CDFG shall occur to determine how best to avoid impacts to the species. Because ferruginous hawk is a highly mobile species, direct impacts to fledged individuals of the species would be unlikely to occur. Potential impacts to nesting or non-fledged individuals of this species are addressed under Mitigation Measure BIO-14, below. If the roost appears to be prominent (several individual ferruginous hawks are using the roost, or the same individual has been utilizing the roost for a period of several days), and project activities would disturb the roost through indirect impacts, the applicant shall provide for the protection of suitable ferruginous hawk winter roosting habitat through fee title or a conservation easement. Communications with the CDFG shall be carried out to determine a suitable location for such mitigation. **BIO-14:** To avoid impacts to nesting birds associated with installation of the caretaker residences and freeway signage, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist (with selection to be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Planning Department) to conduct nesting bird surveys within suitable habitat (willow-cattail stand and grasslands) throughout the project site. Surveys shall be conducted prior to ground disturbing activities. Specifically, within 30 days of initiation of ground disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall conduct weekly surveys to determine if active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the impact area or within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors).	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		Because several birds known to occur in the project area (including raptors, such as Cooper's hawk, and several species of hummingbird) may nest during the late winter, nesting bird surveys shall be carried out both during the typical nesting bird season (mid-March through September) and during late winter (February and early March). The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis, with the last survey being conducted no more than three days prior to initiation of commencement of ground disturbing activities. If ground disturbing activities are delayed, then additional pre-construction surveys will be conducted such that no more than three days have elapsed between the last survey and the commencement of such activities. Surveys shall include examination of trees and the ground with grassland areas for nesting birds, as several bird species known to the area are ground nesters, including mourning dove. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest (500 feet for raptor nests) or as designated appropriate by a biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting, as determined by a qualified biologist. Limits of construction to avoid a nest should be established in the field with flagging and stakes or construction fencing. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The project proponent should record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-1 (continued)		To avoid impacts to nesting birds associated with intensified usage of the northwestern portion of the project site for parking, during the on-going spring surveys conducted for burrowing owl, as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-4, above, the biologist shall include reconnaissance for nesting birds. If nesting birds are found within parking areas, a buffer shall be established around the nest and the buffer area shall be avoided, as described above, until juveniles have fledged and no attempt at further nesting is observed by the biologist.	
Potential Impact 4.4-2			
The project would 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Potentially significant	**BIO-15:** To mitigate for indirect impacts to riparian habitat, the project applicant shall install wildlife permeable fencing around the on-site drainage areas associated with the seasonal detention pond prior to construction of the caretaker facilities and signage proposed by the project. The fencing may be composed of standard fencing material (wood, vinyl, wrought iron, chain link, or aluminum) and may be post and rail design, or any other design that would discourage human entry into the pond and riparian area but would allow animal movement in and out of the pond. Signage stating that entry into the seasonal detention pond and riparian area is prohibited due to the presence of sensitive biological resources shall be posted near the fencing. To avoid impacting the seasonal detention pond and associated riparian habitat during fencing and sign installation, a biological monitor shall delineate and approve work areas around the pond, and construction shall take place during the dry season or when no rain is forecast for a week. Biological resources associated with the detention pond will be included in the habitat management plan.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-3			
The project would 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.	Potentially significant	**BIO-16:** To mitigate for indirect impacts to waters of the U.S. associated with runoff contamination from vehicles, prior to allowing an increased number of visitors, including RV parking, on the project site through approval the rezoning approval, the project applicant shall comply with all existing water quality control regulations and shall install fencing around the on-site seasonal detention pond. Fencing shall be installed as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-4. It is noted that, since the swale associated with the seasonal detention pond is located on the opposite side of the pond from where the increased parking and over-night RV parking would occur (the swale lies to the east of the pond), this area is unlikely to be impacted by increased usage of the site for parking, and fencing around the swale is unlikely to be necessary. A qualified biologist shall determine if fencing around the swale is necessary.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-4			
The project would 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.	Potentially significant	Refer to Mitigation Measures **BIO-5** and **BIO-11**	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-5			
The project would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4 Biological Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.4-6			
The project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-7			
The project would substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-8			
The project would cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-9			
The project would threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.4-10			
The project would reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.5 Cultural Resources			
Potential Impact 4.5-1			
The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.5-2			
The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	Potentially significant	**CUL-1a:** Prior to excavation and construction on the project site, the prime construction contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall be cautioned by the County on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying cultural resources or removing artifacts, human remains, bottles, and other cultural materials from the project site. **CUL-1b:** The project applicant shall identify a qualified archaeologist prior to any demolition, excavation, or construction. The County shall approve the selected archaeologist prior to issuance of the grading permit. The archaeologist shall have the authority to perform spot check monitoring of subsurface construction and watch for and evaluate artifacts or resources that may be uncovered. The archaeologist shall also have the authority to temporarily halt excavation and construction activities in the immediate vicinity (within a 50-meter radius) of a find if significant or potentially significant cultural resources are exposed and/or adversely affected by construction operations. **CUL-1c:** Reasonable time will be allowed for the qualified archaeologist to notify the proper authorities for a more detailed inspection and examination of the exposed cultural resources. During this time, excavation and construction would not be allowed in the immediate vicinity of the find; however, those activities could continue in other areas of the project site.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.5 Cultural Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.5-2 (continued)		**CUL-1d:** If any find were determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist, representatives of the project applicant or construction contractor and the County, and the qualified archaeologist, will meet to determine the appropriate course of action. **CUL-1e:** All cultural materials recovered as part of the monitoring program will be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared according to current professional standards. **CUL-1f:** If human remains are discovered at the project site during construction, work at the specific construction site at which the remains have been uncovered shall be suspended, and the Alameda County coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.	
Potential Impact 4.5-3			
The project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	Potentially significant	**CUL-2a:** The project applicant shall identify a qualified paleontologist prior to any excavation or construction. The County shall approve the selected paleontologist prior to issuance of the grading permit. The project paleontologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting to discuss how to recognize paleontological resources in the soil during grading activities. The prime construction contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall be cautioned by the County on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying paleontological resources or removing paleontological resources from the project site.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.5 Cultural Resources (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.5-3 (continued)		**CUL-2b:** If paleontological resources are encountered during the course of site development activities, work in that area shall be halted and the project paleontologist shall be notified of the find. The project paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily divert or redirect grading to allow time to evaluate any exposed fossil material. **CUL-2c:** If the project paleontologist determines that the resource is significant, any scientifically significant specimens shall be properly collected by the project paleontologist. During collection activities, contextual stratigraphic data shall also be collected. The data will include lithologic descriptions, photographs, measured stratigraphic sections, and field notes. **CUL-2d:** Scientifically significant specimens shall be prepared to the point of identification (not exhibition), stabilized, identified, and offered for curation to a suitable repository that has a retrievable storage system, such as the University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology. **CUL-2e:** The project paleontologist shall prepare a final report at the end of the earthmoving activities; the report shall include an itemized inventory of recovered fossils and appropriate stratigraphic and locality data. The project paleontologist shall send one copy of the report to Alameda County; another copy shall accompany any fossils, along with field logs and photographs, to the designated repository.	
Potential Impact 4.5-4			
The project would disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	Potentially significant	The mitigation measures for the impact to unknown historic archaeological resources (**CUL-1a** through **CUL-1f**) would also be applicable to unknown human remains.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.6 Geology and Soils			
Potential Impact 4.6-1			
The project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.6-2			
The project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.6-3			
The project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	Potentially significant	**GEO-1:** Prior to issuance of a building permit for installation of the grandstand roof, the raceway operator shall commission a geotechnical study for the locations of the grandstand support posts. The study shall be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer. The study shall evaluate the soil characteristics at the locations of each of the grandstand roof posts and identify foundation design parameters, based on the underlying soil characteristics that will assure the grandstand roof posts do not fail in the event of a seismically induced ground failure. The report shall be submitted to the Alameda County Building Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit for the grandstand roof.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.6 Geology and Soils (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.6-4			
The project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.	Potentially significant	**GEO-2:** The following subdrains and surface drainage improvements shall be installed to reduce the introduction of water into fill slope material: Within 30 days of project approval, the project applicant shall submit drainage plans to the County Public Works Agency. The plans shall be prepared by a licensed engineer with expertise in the design of drainage systems. The intent of the drainage plans shall be to reduce the potential for ponding of water and infiltration of surface water into the existing valley fill at the northeast end of the racetrack and grandstand areas; Within 30 days of project approval, the project applicant shall submit to the County Public Works Agency a plan, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, to construct a fill buttress at the northeastern end of the racetrack outside the toe of the slope to effectively flatten the slope inclination. The fill buttress shall be installed within 30 days of the County's approval of the plan; and Within 30 days of project approval, the project applicant shall repair all existing cracks in the paved pit/paddock area to prevent further infiltration of stormwater to underlying soils.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.6-5			
The project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Less than significant	No additional mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.6-6			
The project would 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.	Less than significant	No additional mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.6 Geology and Soils (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.6-7			
The project would 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.	Potentially significant	**GEO-3:** Prior to approval of building permits for the grandstand roof, installation of caretaker residences, and freeway signs, the project applicant shall commission a detailed geotechnical investigation to be prepared by a licensed engineering geologist. The report shall evaluate the soils underlying the sites of the grandstand roof, caretaker residences, and freeway signs, and based on findings, identify specific measures to minimize the effects of expansive soils if such soils are specifically encountered. The report shall be submitted to Alameda County and implementation of identified measures identified will be required.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.6-8			
The project would have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	Potentially significant	**GEO-4:** For all events, the project applicant shall provide sufficient port-o-lets and portable restrooms at a number to be determined by geotechnical and wastewater engineers in consultation with the County Department of Environmental Health.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Potential Impact 4.7-1			
The project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Potentially significant	**HAZ-1:** Prior to the increase in spectator attendance, the project applicant shall commission the preparation of a stormwater collection and filtration system designed by a qualified engineer. The purpose of the system shall be to collect all stormwater flows from all parking areas and convey those waters to a centralized area for filtering out all hazardous materials and fluids prior to stormwater entering either the groundwater system or the on-site detention basin. The stormwater collection and filtration system plan shall be submitted to ACDEH for review and approval. The stormwater collection and filtration system shall be installed prior to the increase in spectator attendance.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.7-2			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.7-3			
The project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.7-4			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.7-5			
The project would be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, The project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.7-6			
The project would be within the vicinity of a private airstrip, The project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.7-7			
The project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.7-8			
The project would 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.	Potentially significant	**HAZ-2:** The raceway operators shall develop a fire and emergency plan that addresses fire risks and mitigation practices to reduce those risks. The plan should address and provide for on site rescue, medical, and first aid, and fire fighting. The plan shall also include provisions to increase on-site storage of water for fire suppression in accordance with recommendations of the Alameda County Fire Department. The plan shall be developed by the raceway operator within 1 month of approval of the proposed project, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Alameda County Fire Department prior to the start of the 2009 racing season.	Less than significant
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Potential Impact 4.8-1			
The project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Potentially significant	**HYDRO-1:** The project applicant shall fully comply with the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program that maintains compliance with the NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to, designing BMPs into the project features and operation to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality associated with operation of the project. These features shall be included in the project drainage plan and final development drawings. Specifically, the final design shall include measures designed to mitigate potential water quality degradation of runoff from all portions of the completed development. The Alameda County Public Works Agency shall review and approve these measures prior to implementation of the caretaker residences and signage.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.8-1 (continued)		The project applicant shall review and incorporate as many concepts as practicable from the Start at the Source, Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection (Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association 1999). Passive, low-maintenance BMPs (e.g., grassy swales, porous pavements) are preferred in all areas. Higher maintenance BMPs may only be used if the development of at-grade treatment systems is not possible, or would not adequately treat runoff. The project applicant must fund long-term maintenance of all BMPs (as the County will not assume maintenance responsibilities for these features). The project applicant shall establish a self-perpetuating drainage system maintenance program that includes annual inspections of any stormwater detention devices (if any), and drainage inlets. Any accumulation of sediment or other debris shall be promptly removed. In addition, an annual report documenting the inspection and any remedial action conducted shall be submitted to the Alameda County Public Works Agency for review. The Alameda County Public Works Agency shall ensure that the drainage plan is prepared and is constructed within six months of approval of the proposed project.	
Potential Impact 4.8-2			
The project would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.	Potentially significant	**HYDRO-2:** Within 2 months of the approval of the rezoning, a qualified professional hydrologist shall perform a complete assessment of the water and wastewater systems and shall determine the adequacy of the well water supply for the existing toilet/restroom facilities and the proposed well(s) for the caretaker residences. Based on the results of the assessment, the project applicant shall augment the existing toilet/restroom facilities with additional chemical toilets for large events, based on the recommendations of the hydrologist and subject to the approval of Alameda County.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.8-3			
The project would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Potentially significant	**HYDRO-3:** Within 30 days of approval of the proposed rezoning, the project applicant shall submit a plan to ACDEH that identifies how all fuel and other automotive fluids utilized and stored on site will be contained to ensure that the accidental spill of any such fluids is contained and does not contact bare soil. Upon approval by ACDEH, the plan shall be immediately implemented. **HYDRO-4:** Prior to construction of caretaker residences and signage, site drainage shall be improved and treatment of surface water shall be implemented to current clean water standards set forth in the NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit. Drainage and treatment shall reduce the potential for ponding of water and infiltration of surface water into the existing valley fill. This includes the repair of cracks and other vertical pathways within all paved surfaces. **HYDRO-5:** All recommendations outlined in the project geotechnical report shall be implemented immediately, including: The existing catch basin west of the track shall be cleaned to unplug the catch basin and an outlet shall be identified and constructed; a bioswale shall be placed uphill from the existing detention basin to collect and filter all surface water from the project site prior to release into the detention basin below; and additional catch basins should be installed in the areas surrounding the racetrack and pit area to convey water towards the site drainage system. Areas between catch basins should be sloped to drain to the catch basins or if appropriate to sheet flow away from the fill located on the southern corner of the project site.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.8-4			
The project would place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.8-5			
The project would 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	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.8-6			
The project would expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
4.9 Land Use and Planning			
Potential Impact 4.9-1			
The project would physically divide an established community.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.9-2			
The project would 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.	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.9 Land Use and Planning (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.9-3			
The project would conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
4.10 Mineral Resources			
Potential Impact 4.10-1			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.10-2			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
4.11 Noise			
Potential Impact 4.11-1			
The project would result in 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.	Potentially significant	**NOI-1:** The maximum noise level of every race vehicle or motorcycle that is operated on any of the raceway's race tracks shall not exceed 95 dB(A) measured 100 feet from the vehicle on the race track. The project applicant shall measure the maximum noise level from each race vehicle prior to that vehicle being permitted on the race track. The project applicant shall submit a report of all measurements on a monthly basis to the ACDEH for review.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.11 Noise (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.11-2			
The project would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.11-3			
The project would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.11-4			
The project would expose people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.11-5			
The project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in a private airstrip.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.12 Population and Housing			
Potential Impact 4.12-1			
The project would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.12-2			
The project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.12-3			
The project would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
4.13 Public Services			
Potential Impact 4.13-1			
The project would 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 for fire protection.	Potentially significant	Refer to Mitigation Measure **HAZ-2**	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.13 Public Services (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.13-2			
The project would 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 for police services.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.13-3			
The project would 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 for schools.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.13 Public Services (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.13-4			
The project would 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 for parks.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
4.14 Recreation			
Potential Impact 4.14-1			
The project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.14-2			
The project would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Transportation and Traffic			
Potential Impact 4.15-1			
The project would 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.	Significant	**TRA-1:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall contribute a proportional "fair share" toward the costs of signalization of the Grant Line Road/I-580 Eastbound ramps intersection to be determined by the County of Alameda. **TRA-2:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall contribute a proportional "fair share" toward the costs of signalization of the Grant Line Road/Altamont Pass Road intersection ramps intersection to be determined by the County of Alameda.	Unavoidably significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Transportation and Traffic (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.15-1 (continued)		**TRA-3:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for the Grant Line Road/Midway Road intersection. The TMP shall be submitted to Alameda County for review and approval prior to implementation. **TRA-4a :** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for the Midway Road/AMP driveway. The TMP shall be submitted to Alameda County for review and approval prior to implementation. **TRA-4b:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for the Patterson Pass Road/Midway Road intersection. The TMP shall be submitted to Alameda County for review and approval prior to implementation. **TRA-5:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall contribute a proportional "fair share" toward the costs of widening the I-580 overcrossing and install a traffic signal at the Patterson Pass Road/I-580 Southbound Ramp intersection. **TRA-6:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall contribute a proportional "fair share" toward the costs of widening the I-580 overcrossing and install a traffic signal at the Mountain House Parkway/I-580 Northbound Ramp intersection.	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Transportation and Traffic (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.15-1 (continued)		**TRA-7:** Prior to increasing operation levels to 8,000 people the project applicant shall prepare a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to be implemented during regionally significant events, utilizing the following language: "Transportation management combines trained and authorized personnel-based services, motorist and guest incentives, roadway and/or intersection modifications (permanent or temporary), and/or mechanical devices (e.g. portable information message signs) that disperse traffic and facilitate traffic flow to help relieve traffic congestion, and maximize utilization of existing transportation resources. The three basic goals of the Traffic and Circulation Management Plan include: • Traffic dispersement through alternative or designated routes, so as not to increase congestion on individual roadways; • Time-based traffic-dispersement, so as not to increase congestion during peak travel periods; and, • Converting automotive vehicular trips to alternative modes of transportation. The TMP includes as assessment of the existing transportation infrastructure in the region, potential road and intersection modifications, and potential operational requirements. Some of the operational requirements that would be applied to the site include: • Engineered road improvements within the immediate project area; • Advanced neighborhood, community, and regional public notice of anticipated events and traffic conditions, published and announced through a variety of mediums;	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Transportation and Traffic (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.15-1 (continued)		• Local information systems, such as changeable message and fixed directional signage, printed materials, and local radio transmissions; • Temporary traffic control procedures involving the Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, or other qualified traffic management personnel for• intersection control, conversion of lanes and roadways to one-way travel, street closures, and other actions. Qualified traffic management personnel would be identified and/or authorized by the California Highway Patrol or other law enforcement agencies having legal jurisdiction. • Advance traffic directions to guests by means of printed collateral material, website maps and directions, printed directions on tickets, and other methods. Review and approval of the TMP annually by the Alameda County Public Works Agency would be required as part of the annual review of any Conditional Use Permit that may be issued for featured or major feature events at the site."	
Potential Impact 4.15-2			
The project would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant
Potential Impact 4.15-3			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Transportation and Traffic (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.15-4			
The project would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.15-5			
The project would result in inadequate emergency access.	Potentially significant	**TRA-9:** The project applicant shall establish an emergency vehicle access with the lead Fire Emergency authority (Alameda County Fire Department, San Joaquin County, and/or the California Department of Forestry [CDF]) that oversees the Altamont area. The design and construction of the secondary access shall be review and approved by Alameda County.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.15-6			
The project would result in inadequate parking capacity.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.15-7			
The project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Cumulative Impacts			
Year 2030 Cumulative (No project) Intersection Operation	Significant	Refer to mitigation measures **TRA-3, TRA-4,** and **TRA-7**	Less than significant
Year 2030 Cumulative (No project) Freeway Segment Operation	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant
Year 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Operation	Significant	Refer to mitigation measures **TRA-3, TRA-4,** and **TRA-7**	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Year 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Freeway Segment Operation	Significant	No feasible mitigation	Unavoidably significant
4.16 Utilities and Service Systems			
Potential Impact 4.16-1			
The project would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.16-2			
The project would require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.16-3			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.16 Utilities and Service Systems (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.16-4			
The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.	Potentially significant	**UTILS-1:** Upon project approval, under direction of the ACDEH, a professional hydrologist retained by the raceway operator shall study the groundwater aquifer for the project site and make a determination of the adequacy of the groundwater supply and allowable amount to be pumped by the project applicant. A meter shall be installed on all on-site wells and the ACDEH shall monitor flows from the wells to confirm that ground water extraction rates and volumes do not exceed safe yield levels. **UTILS-2:** A supply of water at the site with chemical contents less than allowed by the U.S. Public Health Service allows as maximum for public suppliers shall be provided. This supply shall be adequate in quantity to furnish water for a maximum attendance as determined by ACDEH.	Less than significant
Potential Impact 4.16-5			
The project would 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.	No impact	No mitigation required	No impact
Potential Impact 4.16-6			
The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.16 Utilities and Service Systems (continued)			
Potential Impact 4.16-7			
The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less than significant	No mitigation required	Less than significant

Source: Impact Sciences, 2008.