REGULAR MEETING 7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

2.1. Public Comment
At this time, the public is permitted to address the Planning Commission on non-agendized items. Please step to the podium and clearly state your name for the record. COMMENTS SHOULD NOT EXCEED THREE (3) MINUTES. In accordance with State Law, no action or discussion may take place on any item not appearing on the posted agenda. The Planning Commission may respond to statements made or questions asked, or may request Staff to report back at a future meeting concerning the matter. Any member of the public may contact the Recording Secretary's Office related to the proper procedure to place an item on a future Planning Commission agenda. The exceptions under which the Planning Commission MAY discuss and/or take action on items not appearing on the agenda are contained in Government Code Section 54954.2(b)(1)(2)(3).

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
Consent Calendar items are typically non-controversial in nature and are considered for approval by the Planning Commission with one single action. Members of the audience, Staff or the Planning Commission who would like an item removed from the Consent Calendar for purposes of public input may request the Chair to remove the item.

3.1. Approval of the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the Minutes of the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION - NONE.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

5.1. Westin Hotel (PLPA 2019-00006)
The Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel, including 9,762 square feet of assembly space, and a restaurant on a proposed 5.88-acre site located on the southern portion of Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The application includes a Planned Development Rezone with a Stage 2 Development Plan, a Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Conduct the public hearing, deliberate and adopt the following Resolutions: a) Recommending that the City Council adopt an Ordinance rezoning the Westin Hotel Project site to PD-Planned Development and approving a Stage 2 Development Plan; and b) Recommending that the City Council approve the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Map No. 10949 for the Westin Hotel Project.

6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE.**

7. **NEW BUSINESS - NONE.**

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**
Brief information only reports from Planning Commission and/or Staff, including committee reports and reports by Planning Commission related to meetings attended at City expense (AB1234).

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

This AGENDA is posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a)

If requested, pursuant to Government Code Section 54953.2, this agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. To make a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, please contact the City Clerk’s Office (925) 833-6650 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

*Mission*

The City of Dublin promotes and supports a high quality of life, ensures a safe and secure environment, and fosters new opportunities.

*Vision*

Dublin is a vibrant city committed to its citizens, natural resources and cultural heritage. As Dublin grows, it will balance history with progress, to sustain an enlightened, economically balanced and diverse community.

Dublin is unified in its belief that an engaged and informed community encourages innovation in all aspects of City life, including programs to strengthen our economic vitality, and preserve our natural surroundings through environmental stewardship and sustainability. Dublin is dedicated to promoting an active and healthy lifestyle through the creation of first-class recreational opportunities, facilities and programs.
DATE:         September 24, 2019
TO:           Planning Commission
SUBJECT:      Approval of the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
              Prepared by: Danielle Diaz, Senior Office Assistant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the Minutes of the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes of the August 27, 2019 Regular Planning Commission Meeting.

PUBLIC NOTICING:
N/A

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated August 27, 2019
A Regular Meeting of the Dublin Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 27, 2019, in the Council Chamber. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM, by Commission Chair Wright.

1. **Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Wright</td>
<td>Planning Commission Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amit Kothari</td>
<td>Planning Commission Vice Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Benson</td>
<td>Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Mittan</td>
<td>Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Thalblum</td>
<td>Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catheryn Grier</td>
<td>Alternate Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Plants</td>
<td>Alternate Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Oral Communications**

2.1. Jeff Baker, Community Development Director, introduced Kristie Wheeler, Assistant Community Development Director as well as the newly appointed Alternate Planning Commissioners, Catheryn Grier and Dawn Plants

2.2. **Public Comment**

No public comment provided.

3. **Consent Calendar**

3.1. Approve the Minutes of the June 25, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVED BY: Janine Thalblum
SECOND: Scott Mittan
AYES: Janine Thalblum, Scott Mittan, Stephen Wright, Amit Kothari, Catheryn Grier
ABSENT: Dawn Benson

4. **Written Communication** - None.

5. **Public Hearing**
5.1 Quarry Lane Pre-School SDR (PLPA-2018-00033)

Robert Smith, Associate Planner, made a presentation and responded to questions posed by the Commission.

Aaron Elias, Senior Engineer with Kittelson & Associates, responded to questions posed by the Commission.

Commission Chair Wright opened the public hearing

Guy Houston, Applicant Representative, made a presentation and responded to questions posed by the Commission.

Commission Chair Wright closed the public hearing

Sanjiv Bhandari, President & CEO of BKBC Architects, responded to questions posed by the Commission

On a motion by Commissioner Thalblum and seconded by Commission Chair Wright, the Planning Commission took the following action with a revision to condition 18 to correctly reflect providing public art on-site in accordance with the zoning ordinance provisions

RESOLUTION NO. 19-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN
APPROVING A SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION
OF A 26,000 SQUARE FOOT COMMERCIAL BUILDING ON 2.68 ACRES
LOCATED AT 6085 SCARLETT DRIVE
PLPA-2018-00033

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVED BY: Janine Thalblum
SECOND: Stephen Wright
AYES: Janine Thalblum, Stephen Wright, Scott Mittan, Amit Kothari, Catheryn Grier
ABSENT: Dawn Benson

6. Unfinished Business - None.

7. New Business - None.

8. Other Business
Jeff Baker, Community Development Director, informed the Commissioners that the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 24, 2019.

Commission Chair Wright notified the Planning Commission that he sent an email to the City Council and Staff expressing his disappointment that the Planning Commission was not invited to participate in the City Council Study Session, held on July 16, 2019, to review the Corrie Center project.

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Commission Chair Wright at 7:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Jeff Baker
Community Development Director
DATE: September 24, 2019

TO: Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Westin Hotel (PLPA 2019-00006)
Prepared by: Amy Million, Principal Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel, including 9,762 square feet of assembly space, and a restaurant on a proposed 5.88-acre site located on the southern portion of Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The application includes a Planned Development Rezone with a Stage 2 Development Plan, a Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949.

RECOMMENDATION:

Conduct the public hearing, deliberate and adopt the following Resolutions: a) Recommending that the City Council adopt an Ordinance rezoning the Westin Hotel Project site to PD-Planned Development and approving a Stage 2 Development Plan; and b) Recommending that the City Council approve the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Map No. 10949 for the Westin Hotel Project.

DESCRIPTION:

Background

The Dublin Transit Center area generally is bounded on the north by Dublin Boulevard, on the south by Interstate 580 (I-580) and the existing Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station, on the east by Arnold Road, and on the west by the Iron Horse Trail (Figure 1).

In December 2002, the City Council adopted entitlements establishing the Dublin Transit Center. This included General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (EDSP) Amendments (Resolution No. 216-02) to incorporate this area into the EDSP area and establishing land uses. The project included Planned Development Zoning with a Stage 1 Development Plan (Ordinance No. 21-02) which established the permitted uses; site areas and proposed densities; maximum number of residential units and non-residential square footage; and a Master Landscaping Plan. The approval also included a Master Development Agreement (Ordinance No. 5-03) approved in May 2003.

The Dublin Transit Center project area allows for the development of 1,500 residential units west of Iron Horse Parkway and two million square feet of campus office and up to...
300 residential units to the east of Iron Horse Parkway and up to 70,000 square feet of retail uses at street level along Iron Horse Parkway and a one-acre Village Green. West of Iron Horse Parkway has been developed with the exception of Ashton at Dublin Station, which was approved for residential development in 2018.

**Project Site**
Site D-2 is located in the southeast corner of the Dublin Transit Center. The 12.3-acre site is located south of Martinelli Way and north of Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road. The site has a General Plan and EDSP land use designation of Campus Office and Planned Development Zoning with a Stage 1 Development Plan (Ordinance No. 21-02). The project site occupies approximately six acres of the southern portion of Site D-2 as shown in Figure 1.

The subject site is a relatively flat and undeveloped field. Following approval of the Dublin Transit Center project, the D-2 site has been disturbed consistently while used as a construction staging area for various other development projects in the Dublin Transit Center, including the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station and associated garage.

The current and approved future uses are provided in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Northern Portion of Site D-2</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>BART Parking Garage Dublin Transit Center Parking Garage</td>
<td>Existing Future/Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Altamirano Avenue/ Interstate 580</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IKEA Retail Center</td>
<td>Approved in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Request**
The Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel, including 9,762 square feet of assembly space, and a 2,125-square foot restaurant on the approximately six acres located on Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center.
The current request for the proposed project includes:

- **Planned Development Zoning** - Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan.
- **Site Development Review Permit** - Site Development Review Permit for a 198-room hotel, including assembly space (conference center), café, restaurant, pool and other related amenities.
- **Tentative Parcel Map** - Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949 to subdivide the parcel into two developable parcels, with the hotel located on the southern parcel adjacent to Altamirano Avenue.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Planned Development Zoning**

The application includes a Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan for the southern portion of Site D-2. The existing Planned Development Zoning Stage 1 Development Plan was approved by City Council on December 3, 2002, as part of the Dublin Transit Center Project (Ordinance No. 21-02). The Stage 1 Development Plan allows for a hotel use and a net floor area ratio of 1.8 on Site D-2.

The proposed Stage 2 Planned Development Zoning is consistent with the existing Stage 1 Development Plan and is in compliance with the requirements of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance. The proposed Stage 2 Development Plan will establish the detailed development plan for the site including a preliminary site plan, development standards, architectural standards, and a preliminary landscape plan.

The project is compatible with the land use concept to maximize transit opportunities presented by the adjacent Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station; conforms to the development standards adopted for the Dublin Transit Center; and contributes to a vibrant, pedestrian friendly environment.

A Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an Ordinance approving the Planned Development Rezone with related Stage 2 Development Plan for the Westin Hotel is included as Attachment 1, with the draft City Council Ordinance included as Attachment 2.

**Site Development Review**

**Site Plan**

The building is located on the east side of the parcel with the front oriented to the south facing Altamirano Avenue and I-580. The property has four access points including two driveways on Arnold Road, one on Altamirano Avenue and one on Campus Drive. The northern most driveway on Arnold Road provides emergency vehicle access along the north side of the building. Parking for the hotel is provided through surface parking on the north, west and south sides of the building. The primary guest entrance is enhanced with a large porte cochere providing for a covered drop off area as guests arrive via automobile. A second drop off area for buses is also provided further to the west. Guests arriving on foot from the Dublin Transit Center area or BART may also enter the building through a covered walkway and outdoor plaza on the west side of the building.
The project includes frontage improvements and landscaping consistent with the improvements throughout the Dublin Transit Center.

The hotel’s amenities, including 9,762 square feet of assembly space, cafe and restaurant are located on the ground floor. The second floor features an outdoor pool and jacuzi as well as an indoor fitness space. The outdoor pool area is located above the main entrance and includes landscaping, outdoor seating, and cabanas. The peaks of these features will be visible from the locations outside the building and add the backdrop of a rooftop garden.

The restaurant, located on the east side of the building along the Arnold Road frontage, includes an entrance from the interior lobby as well as directly from the outside. A covered patio creates a large outdoor dining space along Arnold Road. This ground-floor activity enhances the pedestrian-rich character of the Dublin Transit Center.

The site plan shows are large landscape area along Altamirano Avenue. The additional area is in anticipation of the Valley Link Project. This future project to be undertaken by the Tri-Valley -San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority will connect the San Joaquin Valley with the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station via rail line. Implementation of the project would require widening of I-580, which would likely shift Altamirano Avenue north as well as the southern property line of the project site. The project is designed to accommodate these shifts without impacting the building or parking field.

**Architecture**

The hotel’s architecture has a contemporary aesthetic with angular lines and includes a variety of high-quality exterior materials and colors. Façade treatments include stucco, wood, stone, composite panel with storefront glazing, and metal finishes.

The design focuses on two main features and functions of the building, the “Podium” and the “Tower.” The “Podium” encompasses the ground floor and the main public
functions of the building including the entrance, lobby, restaurant and conference center. The entrances to each functional space are articulated through the various materials. The “Tower” is comprised of the upper five floors of the hotel where the functionality of the hotel rooms is displayed. The design is enhanced with boxes or groups of windows on the façade to appear as if they are floating. According to the applicant, each space within the hotel is strategically placed to emphasize both aesthetics of the overall building and the functionality of each space within.

The main entrance, which is enclosed with the porte cochere, as previously described, and is enhanced by a water feature on the exterior wall. The water feature along with the skylights and wood timber elements help to create a dynamic entry.

The architecture elements described can be seen in the renderings below.

**Figure 2. Elevations**

The massing of the proposed building is consistent with the scale of the adjacent buildings within the Dublin Transit Center as well as the approved IKEA building to the east across Arnold Road.
**Landscaping**

The landscape palette and layout have been designed to be consistent with and completes the streetscape as identified in the Design Guidelines for the overall Dublin Transit Center. Similar to other hotel developments, landscaping and recreational amenities are used to provide quality open areas and visual relief.

An outdoor plaza is located on the west side providing a gathering space outside the conference center as shown in Figure 3. This space integrates a variety of planting areas with seating, plaza space and a covered walkway. Plantings and hardscape elements are used to create an inviting space while helping to define the entries.

**Figure 3. Outdoor Plaza**

The landscape plan includes trees and stormwater treatment facilities in the parking lot to collect and treat on-site runoff and are a highlighted feature along the parking lot edge and Altamirano Avenue. The palette includes a variety of drought tolerant plant materials that are low maintenance and encourage water conservation.

**Parking**

The parking standards set forth in the Stage 1 Planned Development Plan for the Dublin Transit Center allows for a reduction in parking to encourage the use of public transit. They also encourage the shared use of the BART garage within hotel/conference/evening entertainment venues. Reflective of this approach, the hotel has proposed fewer parking spaces than required by the Zoning Ordinance. A parking analysis was conducted to assess the adequacy of the proposed project in accommodating the expected parking demand.

For requests to deviate from the established parking standards, there are various tools available. One, which is commonly used, is a shared parking analysis using the Urban Land Institute (ULI) shared parking tool. The ULI tool incorporates parking observations from multiple mixed-use commercial projects to develop industry parking demand rates that are used as a guide in estimating. The data and generation rates developed for the ULI rates were established before the introduction of Transportation Network.
Companies such as Uber and Lyft and relies heavily on auto-oriented locations with free onsite parking. Based on the proposed location and operation characteristics of the project, it was determined that the ULI parking calculations did not accurately reflect the characteristics of the project.

In order to provide a more practical parking requirement, an evaluation of similar hotel sites was use. For the evaluation of similar hotel sites, the Pleasanton Marriott, Walnut Creek Marriott and Westin Palo Alto were used. These hotels were selected for their similarity in guest room count, composition of onsite land uses (conference space, restaurant, etc.), proximity to BART or other regional transit stations, and room rates. Based on the comparison analysis, the proposed project is expected to generate a peak hour parking demand for approximately 165 spaces.

The project proposes to provide 179 parking spaces which is within the parking demand observed at three peer hotel sites in the Bay Area on a typical weekday. The draft Ordinance reflects this requirement (Attachment 2).

**Public Art Compliance**

The applicant intends to satisfy the City’s public art requirement through the payment of in-lieu fees. Condition of Approval No.17 confirms this intention.

**Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949**

Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949 is proposed to subdivide the parcel into two developable parcels, with the hotel located on the southern parcel adjacent to Altamirano Avenue.

A Resolution recommending that the City Council approve the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Map is included as Attachment 3, with the draft City Council Resolution included as Attachment 4. The Tentative Parcel Map is included as Attachment 7.

**CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE:**

The project site has a current General Plan and EDSP land use designation of Campus Office and Planned Development Zoning (Ordinance No. 21-02). The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation and zoning as a hotel is a type of use permitted in the campus commercial land use designation. The project will contribute to the mix of land uses supported by the Dublin Transit Center.

The proposed project has been reviewed for conformance with the Community Design and Sustainability Element of the General Plan. In addition, the project has been designed to be compatible with adjacent and surrounding development. Pedestrian circulation and gathering spaces have all been linked together with sidewalks and public and private streets. In general, the proposed project furthers the goals of the Community Design and Sustainability Element of the General Plan by providing a high quality of life and preserving resources and opportunities for future generations.

**REVIEW BY APPLICABLE DEPARTMENT AND AGENCIES:**

The Building Division, Fire Prevention Bureau, Public Works Department, and Dublin San Ramon Services District reviewed the project and provided Conditions of Approval.
where appropriate to ensure that the project is established in compliance with all local Ordinances and Regulations. Conditions of Approval from these departments and agencies have been included in the attached Resolution pertaining to the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Map (Attachment 4).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

On May 10, 1993, the Dublin City Council adopted Resolution No. 51-93, certifying an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan (SCH #91103064). Upon approval of the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan EIR, the City Council adopted mitigation measures, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

On November 19, 2002, the Dublin City Council adopted Resolution No. 215-02, certifying an EIR for the Dublin Transit Center. This EIR analyzed amendments to the Dublin General Plan and Specific Plan, a Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning, a Parcel Map and a Development Agreement for the Dublin Transit Center project. The Planned Development zoning for the D-2 site allocated 950,000 square feet of office use. Subsequent to the approval of the Dublin Transit Center project, it was incorporated into the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area. The EIR contains mitigation measures to be applied to any development within the project area, including the project. The EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to project exceedances of Bay Area Air Quality Management District air quality standards on a project and cumulative level, cumulative traffic impacts, and impacts to mainline freeway segments.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed project was examined to determine if another environmental document should be prepared.

The City conducted a review to determine if the proposed project met any of the standards requiring the preparation of supplemental environmental review under CEQA. Based on a review of the project, the environmental analysis in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and all the information in the project record as a whole, the City has determined that there is no substantial evidence that any of the standards are met. The proposed project is within the scope of the project covered by the Dublin Transit Center EIR. Approval of the project will not create any site-specific operations giving rise to environmental effects different from those examined by the EIR. The mitigation measures adopted as part of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program addressed the impacts of the project site. Specific mitigation measures from the Dublin Transit Center EIR that are applicable to the project are noted in an Addendum to the Dublin Transit Center EIR prepared for the project.

The Addendum is included as Attachment 5. The 2002 Dublin Transit Center EIR, upon which the Addendum relies, is available for review at the Planning Division in City Hall during normal business hours.

PUBLIC NOTICING:

In accordance with State law, a public notice was mailed to all property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the project site. A public notice also was published in the
East Bay Times and posted at several locations throughout the City. A Planning Application sign was posted on the project site and the project was also included on the City’s development projects webpage. A copy of this Staff Report has been provided to the Applicant.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Planning Commission Resolution Recommending that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Rezoning the Westin Hotel
2. Planned Development Ordinance
3. Planning Commission Resolution Recommending that the City Council Approve the SDR and Tentative Map for Westin
4. City Council Resolution Approving a Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Map for Westin
5. Westin Hotel CEQA Analysis - Addendum
6. Project Plans Site Development Review
7. Tentative Parcel Map 10949
RESOLUTION NO. 19-XX
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN

RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONE AND RELATED STAGE 2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE WESTIN HOTEL PROJECT
APN: 986-0034-014-00
PLPA 2019-00006

WHEREAS, the Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel, including lobby, café, assembly space, and a restaurant on a proposed 5.88-acre site located on a portion of Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The proposed development and applications are collectively known as the “Project”; and

WHEREAS, the applications include a Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review Permit, and Tentative Map No. 10949; and

WHEREAS, the Project Site is located on Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road within the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area, and more specifically within the Dublin Transit Center Village area; and

WHEREAS, the project site is located within Planned Development Zoning District (Ordinance 21-02) for which a Stage 1 Planned Development Plan was approved for the subject site identified as Site D-2; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2002, the City Council certified the Dublin Transit Center EIR which included the subject site identified as a portion of Site D-2. Upon approval of the Dublin Transit Center EIR, the City Council adopted mitigation measures, a mitigation monitoring program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Resolution No. 215-02, incorporated herein by reference); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2), the project was examined to determine if another environmental document should be prepared. The analysis concluded that the environmental impacts of the Project were analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. There is no substantial evidence in the record that any new effects would occur, that any new mitigation measures would be required, or that any of the conditions triggering supplemental environmental review under CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exists; and

WHEREAS, a Staff Report, dated September 24, 2019, was submitted to the Planning Commission recommending City Council approval of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a properly noticed public hearing on the project on September 24, 2019, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did hear and use its independent judgement and considered all said reports, recommendations, and testimony hereinabove set forth prior to making its recommendation on the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and made a part of this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dublin Planning Commission does hereby recommend that the City Council adopt an Ordinance (attached as Exhibit A) approving the Planned Development Zoning District Stage 2 Development Plan, based on findings, including but not limited to, that the Planned Development zoning and project as a whole is consistent and in conformance with the Dublin Transit Center Planned Development with Stage 1 Development Plan, General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Planned Development Zoning District, and that development of the proposed project will be harmonious and compatible with existing and future development in the surrounding area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 24th day of September 2019, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

______________________________
Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Assistant Community Development Director
ORDINANCE NO. xx – 19

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN

*** * *** * *** * * * * ***

AMENDING THE ZONING MAP AND APPROVING A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
ZONING DISTRICT WITH A RELATED STAGE 2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE
WESTIN HOTEL PROJECT
APN: 986-0034-014-00
PLPA 2019-00006

The Dublin City Council does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. RECITALS

A. The Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel, including lobby, café, assembly space, and restaurant on a proposed approximately 5.88-acre site located on a portion of Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The proposed development and applications are collectively known as the “Project”; and

B. The Project Site is located on Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road within the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area, and more specifically within the Dublin Transit Center Village area; and

C. On November 19, 2002, the City Council certified the Dublin Transit Center EIR which included the subject site identified as a portion of Site D-2. Upon approval of the Dublin Transit Center EIR, the City Council adopted mitigation measures, a mitigation monitoring program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Resolution No. 215-02, incorporated herein by reference); and

C. On December 3, 2002, City Council approved the Planned Development Stage 1 Development Plan for the Dublin Transit Center Project, which included the subject site identified as a portion of Site D-2 (Ordinance No. 21-02);

D. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2), the project was examined to determine if another environmental document should be prepared. The analysis concluded that the environmental impacts of the Project were analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. There is no substantial evidence in the record that any new effects would occur, that any new mitigation measures would be required, or that any of the conditions triggering supplemental environmental review under CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exists; and

E. Following a properly noticed public hearing on September 24, 2019, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 19-XX, recommending approval of the Planned Development Rezone and related Stage 2 Development Plan, which resolution is incorporated herein by reference and available for review at City Hall during normal business hours; and

F. On _________, the City Council held a properly noticed public hearing on the project, including the proposed Planned Development Zoning Stage 2 Development Plan, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and
G. Staff Report dated ________, and incorporated herein by reference, described and analyzed the Project, including the Planned Development Rezone and related Stage 2 Development Plan, for the City Council; and

SECTION 2. FINDINGS

A. Pursuant to Section 8.32.070 of the Dublin Municipal Code, the City Council finds as follows.

1. The Project PD-Planned Development zoning meets the purpose and intent of Chapter 8.32 in that it provides a comprehensive development plan that creates a desirable use of land that is sensitive to surrounding land uses by virtue of the layout and design of the site plan.

2. Development of the Project under the PD-Planned Development zoning will be harmonious and compatible with existing and future development in the surrounding area in that the site will provide a new commercial use in an area that has similar uses nearby and is also adjacent to existing and future workplaces and residential neighborhoods.

B. Pursuant to Sections 8.120.050.A and B of the Dublin Municipal Code, the City Council finds as follows.

1. The PD-Planned Development zoning for Project will be harmonious and compatible with existing and potential development in the surrounding area in that the proposed Site Plan has considered a land use type and intensity that is compatible with the adjacent development. The land use and site plan take advantage of the existing BART station and bus transfer center to provide, encourage and facilitate use of transit facilities. The purpose and intent provides a comprehensive plan that is tailored to the transit orientation of the site and creates a desirable use of land that is sensitive to the surrounding uses, from campus office, multi-family residential, neighborhood park, and public/semipublic uses.

2. The project site is physically suitable for the type and intensity of the zoning district being proposed in that the project site is flat with existing transit facilities and no major or unusual physical or topographic constraints and, thus, is physically suitable for the type and intensity proposed. Utility and street connections exist or can be easily extended to the property. The project site conditions were documented in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was previously certified, and the environmental impacts that have been identified will be mitigated to the greatest degree possible. There are no site challenges that were identified in the EIR that will present an impediment to utilization of the site for the intended purposes. There are no major physical or topographic constraints and thus the site is physically suitable for the type and intensity of the commercial uses approved through the PD zoning.

3. The PD-Planned Development zoning will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare in that the project will comply with all applicable development regulations and standards and will implement all adopted mitigation measures.

4. The PD-Planned Development zoning is consistent with and in conformance with the
Dublin General Plan, in that the proposed hotel is consistent with the Campus Office land use designation for the site.

C. On November 19, 2002, the City Council certified the Dublin Transit Center EIR which included the subject parcel identified as Site D-2 (Resolution No. 215-02). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2), the project was examined to determine if another environmental document should be prepared. The analysis concluded that the environmental impacts of the Project were analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. There is no substantial evidence in the record that any new effects would occur, that any new mitigation measures would be required, or that any of the conditions triggering supplemental environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 exist.

SECTION 3: ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

Pursuant to Chapter 8.32, Title 8 of the City of Dublin Municipal Code, the City of Dublin Zoning Map is amended to rezone the property described below to a Planned Development Zoning District and supersedes and replaces the previously adopted zoning (Ordinance No. 21-02):

Approximately 5.88 acres of the 12.3-acre parcel (referred to as Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center) located on Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road. The subject site is the southern portion of Assessor Parcel Number 986-0034-014-00 (“the Property”).

A map of the rezoning area is shown below:

SECTION 4. APPROVAL OF STAGE 2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The regulations for the use, development, improvement and maintenance of the project site are set forth in the following Stage 2 Development Plan, which is hereby approved. Any amendments to the Stage 2 Development Plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 8.32 of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance or its successors.
Stage 2 Development Plan for Project

This is a Stage 2 Development Plan pursuant to Chapter 8.32 of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance. This Development Plan meets all the requirements for the Stage 2 Development Plan set forth in Chapter 8.32 of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance and is adopted as part of the Planned Development Zoning for the Westin Hotel Project (PLPA-2019-00006). This Stage 2 Development Plan is consistent with the Stage 1 Development Plan adopted for this site by Ordinance No. 21-02.

The Planned District and this Stage 2 Development Plan provides flexibility needed to encourage innovative development while ensuring the goals, policies and action programs of the General Plan, Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, and provisions of Chapter 8.32, Planned Development Zoning District of the Zoning Ordinance are satisfied.

1. Statement of Compatibility with Stage 1 Development Plan.
   The Westin Hotel Stage 2 Development Plan is consistent with the Stage 1 Development Plan for D-2 of the Dublin Transit Center, in that it provides for a hotel use as approved in Ordinance No. 21-02.

2. Statement of Uses.
   Permitted, Conditional and Accessory Uses shall be as adopted by Ordinance No. 21-02, the Dublin Transit Center Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning Development Plan (PA00-013).

3. Stage 2 Site Plan.
   The following Stage 2 Site Plan is conceptual. Final site design shall be determined by the Site Development Review Permit.
4. Site area and proposed densities.

Site area and densities shall be as adopted by Ordinance No. 21-02, the Dublin Transit Center Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning Development Plan (PA00-013).

5. Development regulations.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lot coverage</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.26 (net) and 1.80 (gross)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Property Line</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Property Line</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Property Line</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Property Line</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces (minimum)</td>
<td>179 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Pursuant to an approved Master Sign Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The architectural style is modern with clean lines and enhanced bold geometry using high-quality materials and a complimentary color palette. The architectural design shall reflect the following standards:

- Employ high quality materials to provide visual interest in the project and to complement its surroundings.
- The architecture is articulated through unique materiality but a common architectural expression of wood, stone, and synthetic stucco finishes.
- The overall character and feel of the area shall use a variety of cohesive styles, materials, colors and textures.
- Use diversity of textures in the building finishes providing a varied and interesting base form for the buildings.
- The simple form of the building is enhanced by the juxtaposition of protruding planes, material textures, and colors.
- The design for the entries to parking area should be articulated and detailed such that employees and visitors can easily identify pedestrian and vehicular access points.
- Provide functional amenities and spaces where hotel guests and visitors will gather and socialize, with landscaping, outdoor seating, enhanced paving treatment, and other features to provide an appropriate urban scale for the development.
• Incorporate features such as different wall planes, heights, wall textures, roof elements, signs, light fixtures and landscaping to contribute layers of detail at the pedestrian level.

• The hotel entrance is designed with architectural elements that portray a welcoming gesture of the functionality of the space and its charismatic ambiance to celebrate the arrival. Details may include a porte cochere, skylights, a water feature or art to create an atmosphere that allows for natural lighting, tranquility and serenity.

Illustrative examples of architectural style:
7. Preliminary Landscape Plan.

The landscape design of the project shall include the following:

- Native and/or drought-tolerant plants and trees are strongly encouraged to minimize the amount of water for irrigation. Landscaping treatments should include a variety of trees, grasses, shrubs, and groundcovers as well as a diversity of species.
- All areas not used by buildings, walkways, driveways, parking, storage or loading/unloading should be landscaped. Landscaping includes live material, which may be accented with non-living material such as rock or gravel.
- Soil type, sun and wind exposure, and other such factors should be considered when choosing landscaping species and locations.
- Landscaping should be planted in a manner that at maturity will not damage neighboring properties, block sunlight from surrounding buildings, or otherwise degrade the integrity of adjacent uses.
- Groundcover should be planted so that 100 percent coverage will be achieved within two years.
- The base of the buildings should be landscaped to soften the edges. Accent landscaping should be provided at major focal points, such as near entries and pedestrian gathering areas.
- Large deciduous trees are encouraged on the west and south sides of buildings to block wind and summer heat and to utilize winter solar heat. Evergreen trees are encouraged for areas needing windbreaks.
- The public right-of-way, sidewalks, and on-site pedestrian walkways should be lined with a landscaped strip and shade trees are encouraged along sidewalks to minimize the impacts of the sun on pedestrians.
- Driveway entrances to parking lots should have an attractive and defined design. Landscape treatments and decorative paving materials are encouraged at driveway entrances.

Illustrative example of landscape layout:
8. **Consistency with General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan.**
The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan
land use Campus Office, which permits a floor area ratio of 0.25 to 0.80 and accommodates
a range of office and other non-retail commercial use. In addition, the project will not be
detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or welfare of the City.

9. **Inclusionary Zoning Regulations.**
The Inclusionary Zoning Regulations do not regulate non-residential projects, so therefore
this is not applicable.

10. **Applicable Requirements of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance.**
Except as specifically provided in the Stage 1 Development Plan (Ordinance 21-02) and this
Stage 2 Development Plan, the use, development, improvement and maintenance of the
Property shall be governed by the closest comparable zoning district pursuant to section
8.32.060C or its successor.

**SECTION 5. POSTING OF ORDINANCE**

The City Clerk of the City of Dublin shall cause this Ordinance to be posted in at least three (3)
public spaces in the City of Dublin in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code of
the State of California.

**SECTION 6. EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days following its adoption.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY** the City Council of the City of Dublin, on this _____ day of
______, 2019, by the following votes:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSENT:**

**ABSTAIN:**

__________________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 19-XX

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE A SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 10949 FOR THE WESTIN HOTEL PROJECT
APN: 986-0034-014-00
PLPA-2019-00006

WHEREAS, the Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel including lobby, café, assembly space, and a restaurant on a proposed 5.88-acre site located on a portion of the Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The proposed development and applications are collectively known as the “Project”; and

WHEREAS, the applications include a Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review Permit, and Tentative Map No. 10949; and

WHEREAS, the Project Site is located on Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road within the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area, and more specifically within the Dublin Transit Center; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2002, the City Council certified the Dublin Transit Center EIR, which included the subject site identified as Site D-2. Upon approval of the Dublin Transit Center EIR, the City Council adopted mitigation measures, a mitigation monitoring program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Resolution No. 215-02), incorporated herein by reference); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168(c)(2), the project was examined to determine if another environmental document should be prepared. The analysis concluded that the environmental impacts of the Project were analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. There is no substantial evidence in the record that any new effects would occur, that any new mitigation measures would be required, or that any of the conditions triggering supplemental environmental review under CEQA Guidelines section 15162 exists; and

WHEREAS, a Staff Report dated September 24, 2019, was submitted to the Planning Commission recommending City Council approval of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on said applications on September 24, 2019, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, proper notice of said hearing was given in all respects as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did hear and use its independent judgement and considered all said reports, recommendations, and testimony hereinabove set forth prior to making its recommendation on the project.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and made a part of this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Dublin, based on the findings and conditions of approval in the attached Resolution, recommends that the City Council adopt the Resolution attached as Exhibit A, which Resolution approves the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949 for the Westin Hotel Project.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 24th day of September 2019, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Assistant Community Development Director
RESOLUTION NO. xx-19

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN

***************
APPROVING A SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP
NO. 10949 FOR WESTIN HOTEL PROJECT
APN: 986-0034-014-00
PLPA-2019-00006

WHEREAS, the Applicant, LN Hospitality, LLC, is proposing to construct a 198-room hotel including lobby, café, assembly space, and restaurant on a proposed 5.88-acre site located on a portion of Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center. The proposed development and applications are collectively known as the “Project”; and

WHEREAS, the applications include Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review, and Tentative Map 10949; and

WHEREAS, the Project Site is located on Altamirano Avenue between Campus Drive and Arnold Road within the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area, and more specifically within the Dublin Transit Center; and

WHEREAS, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), together with the CEQA Guidelines and City environmental regulations, require that certain projects be reviewed for environmental impacts and that environmental documents be prepared. To comply with CEQA, the City prepared a CEQA Analysis in Support of an Addendum to the Dublin Transit Center Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and

WHEREAS, the project is within the scope of the Final EIR the Dublin Transit Center General Plan Amendment, Eastern Dublin Specific Plan Amendment, Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning, Tentative Parcel Map, and Development Agreement (SCH# 2001120395), which was certified by the City Council (Resolution No. 215-02) on November 19, 2002. The CEQA analysis prepared for the project is incorporated herein by this reference and determined that no event as specified in Section 21166 of the Public Recourses Code has occurred since the certification of the Dublin Transit Specific Plan EIR that requires preparation of a Supplemental CEQA document; and

WHEREAS, a Staff Report, dated September 24, 2019, was submitted to the Planning Commission recommending City Council approval of the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a properly noticed public hearing on the project on September 24, 2019, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 19-XX recommending the City Council adopt an Ordinance approving the Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan; and
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 19-XX recommending the City Council adopt a Resolution approving the Site Development Review Permit and Tentative Parcel Map 10949 for Westin Hotel; and

WHEREAS, on __________, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing on the Project at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, a Staff Report dated __________ and incorporated herein by reference, described and analyzed the Project; and

WHEREAS, the City Council did hear and use its independent judgement and considered all said reports, recommendations, and testimony hereinabove set forth before approving the Project; and

WHEREAS, following the public hearing, the City Council adopted Ordinance xx-19 approving the Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan. The above Ordinance is incorporated herein by reference and is available for review at City Hall during normal business hours.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the above recitals are true and correct and made a part of this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Dublin hereby makes the following findings and determinations regarding the proposed Site Development Review Permit for Site D-2 of the Dublin Transit Center:

A. The proposal is consistent with the purposes of Chapter 8.104 of the Zoning Ordinance, with the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plans and design guidelines because: 1) the project is compatible with the architectural character and scale of development in the immediate area in which the proposed project is to be located; 2) the project is utilizing contemporary, high-quality materials and finishes; 3) the project will provide a new commercial opportunity and lodging adjacent to the East Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station; 4) the project is consistent with the General Plan and Eastern Dublin Specific Plan land use designation of Campus Office; and 5) the project is consistent with the Transit Center Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning in that it provides additional housing opportunities in close proximity to the East Dublin/Pleasanton BART station.

B. The proposal is consistent with the provisions of Title 8, Zoning Ordinance because: 1) the project contributes to the orderly, attractive, and harmonious site and architectural development that is compatible with the architectural style, intensity of development, and context of surrounding and adjacent properties; and 2) the project complies with the development standards established in the Planned Development Ordinance for the project site.

C. The design of the project is appropriate to the City, the vicinity, surrounding properties, and the lot(s) in which the project is proposed because: 1) the size and mass of the proposed buildings are consistent with other development in the immediate vicinity and in compliance with the permitted development density/intensity;
2) the project will contribute to a mix of commercial uses as a complement to the surrounding neighborhoods; and 3) the project includes landscaping and recreational amenities that provide high quality open areas and visual relief.

D. *The subject site is suitable for the type and intensity of the approved development because:* 1) the project site is flat and contains no physical impediments to the proposed residential development; 2) the project will implement all applicable prior adopted mitigation measures; 3) the project site is fully served by public services and existing roadways; and 4) the project design and intensity complements the major public investment in transit.

E. *Impacts to existing slopes and topographic features are addressed because:* 1) the project site is already urbanized and relatively flat; 2) the roadway and utility infrastructure to serve the site already exists, and 3) the project site has been previously graded and is relatively flat.

F. *Architectural considerations including the character, scale and quality of the design, site layout, the architectural relationship with the site and other buildings, screening of unsightly uses, lighting, building materials and colors and similar elements result in a project that is harmonious with its surroundings and compatible with other developments in the vicinity because:* 1) the architectural style and materials will be consistent and compatible with the contemporary architectural style, colors, and materials being utilized on other developments in the immediate vicinity; 2) the project is utilizing contemporary, high-quality materials and finishes; 3) the project’s design provides visual interest as viewed from Interstate 580 and Altamirano Avenue to the south, Arnold Road and Campus Drive to the east and west as well as Martinelli Road and Dublin Boulevard to the north until the parcels to the north are developed; and 4) the size and scale of the development will be similar to the existing multi-family projects and BART parking garage already constructed as well as the future IKEA retail building in the immediate project vicinity.

G. *Landscape considerations, including the location, type, size, color, texture and coverage of plant materials, and similar elements have been incorporated into the project to ensure visual relief, adequate screening and an attractive environment for the public because:* 1) landscaping is proposed to provide visual relief within an urban development; 2) the landscaping has been designed to be consistent with the Design Guidelines for the overall Dublin Transit Center; 3) the project’s landscaping provides open space and visual relief; and 4) the project will conform to the requirements of the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

H. *The site has been adequately designed to ensure the proper circulation for bicyclist, pedestrians, and automobiles because:* 1) all infrastructure including driveways, pathways, sidewalks, and street lighting have been reviewed for conformance with City policies, regulations, and best practices and have been designed with multi-modal travel in mind; 2) the project site provides opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle circulation; and 3) the project will provide links to transit oriented systems and regional trails.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Dublin hereby makes the following findings and determinations regarding Tentative Map No. 10949:

A. Tentative Map No. 10949 together with the provisions for its design and improvements is consistent with the intent of applicable subdivision regulations and related ordinances for the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and Dublin Transit Center.

B. The project site is physically suitable for the type and proposed intensity of development as the proposed hotel use, along with the associated improvements are consistent with the Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning and the adjacent commercial and residential developments, existing and approved.

C. Tentative Map No. 10949 is consistent with the intent of applicable improvements of the Tentative Tract Map and Planned Development zoning approved for Project and therefore consistent with the City of Dublin General Plan and Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning.

D. Tentative Map No. 10949 will not result in environmental damage or substantially injure fish or wildlife or their habitat or cause public health concerns subject to existing adopted Mitigation Measures and Conditions of Approval.

E. The project design will not cause serious public health concerns as it has been conditioned to comply with all building codes and ordinances in effect at the time of permit issuance because the design and type of improvements will not cause serious public health concerns as it has been conditioned to comply with all building codes and ordinances in effect at the time of permit issuance. In addition, the City conducted a review to evaluate the project’s impacts and determined that the scope of the project is covered by the Dublin Transit Center EIR which mitigated any potential impacts to public.

F. The design of the project will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, or access through or use of property within the proposed project site. The City Engineer has reviewed the map and title report and has determined that the future proposed buildings will not conflict with existing or new easements nor with future property lines.

G. The design or improvements of the Tentative Map are consistent with the City’s General Plan and the Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning for the Dublin Transit Center.

H. The subdivision is designed to provide for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities as the proposed development is located very closely to mass transit (BART) where it will be a part of a sustainable infrastructure system, the proposed hotel is designed for compliance with California Green Building Code Tier 1 requirements and landscaping will be provided throughout the project site including the surface parking lot providing natural shading.

I. The project design and improvement complies with all the applicable provisions and requirements of the zoning ordinance, the latest municipal stormwater permit issued to the city by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, this title, any other ordinance of the city, and the Subdivision Map Act because the project is compliant with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional
Stormwater NPDES Permit, the project would include bioretention areas and stormwater treatment vaults to ensure consistency with regional C.3 stormwater treatment; and the project would include full trash capture devices to ensure consistency with regional C.10 stormwater treatment requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dublin City Council hereby approves the Site Development Review Permit for the Westin Hotel as shown on plans prepared by PFVS Architects + Interiors, LLC dated received September 19, 2019, attached as Exhibit A and subject to the conditions included below.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dublin City Council hereby approves Tentative Map No. 10949 prepared by Kier & Wright, LLC dated received September 19, 2019, attached as Exhibit B and subject to the conditions included below.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Approval.</strong> This approval shall be as generally depicted and indicated on the plan set prepared by PFVS Architects + Interiors, LLC and Reed Associates Landscape Architecture received on September 19, 2019 and attached as Exhibit A (Site Development Review Plans) by as generally depicted by the color and material samples submitted along with the project and Tentative Parcel Map No. 10949 prepared by Kier &amp; Wright received on September 19, 2019 and attached as Exhibit B (Tentative Parcel Map). The project plans and color and material samples are on file in the Community Development Department. This Site Development Review and Tentative Parcel Map approval is as further specified by the following Conditions of Approval for this project.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Effective Date.</strong> This SDR approval becomes effective once the Planned Development Zoning District has been approved by City Council and is effective.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Permit Expiration - Site Development Review Permit.</strong> Construction or use shall commence within one (1) year of Site Development Review approval or the Site Development Review shall lapse and become null and void. If there is a dispute as to whether the Site Development Review has expired, the City may hold a noticed public hearing to determine the matter. Such a determination may be processed concurrently with revocation proceedings in</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>One Year After Effective Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Permit Expiration – Vesting Tentative Map. Approval of the Vesting Tentative Map shall be valid for 36 months from the effective date as set forth in Section 9.08.130.A of the Dublin Municipal Code.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>36 months after Effective Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Time Extension – Site Development Review Permit. The Director of Community Development may, upon the Applicant’s written request for an extension of approval prior to expiration, and upon the determination that any Conditions of Approval remain adequate to assure that applicable findings of approval will continue to be met, grant a time extension of approval for a period not to exceed 12 months. The Director of Community Development may grant a maximum of two extensions of approval, and additional extensions may be granted by the original decision maker.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Prior to Expiration Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Compliance. The Applicant/Property Owner shall operate this use in compliance with the Conditions of Approval of this Site Development Review Permit, the approved plans and the regulations established in the Zoning Ordinance. Any violation of the terms or conditions specified may be subject to enforcement action.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Revocation of Permit. The Site Development Review approval shall be revocable for cause in accordance with Section 8.96.020.I of the Dublin Zoning Ordinance. Any violation of the terms or conditions of this permit shall be subject to citation.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Requirements and Standard Conditions. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with applicable City of Dublin Fire Prevention Bureau, Dublin Public Works Department, Dublin Building Department, Dublin Police Services, Alameda County Flood Control District Zone 7, Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority, Alameda County Public and Environmental Health, Dublin San Ramon Services District and the California Department of Health Services requirements and standard conditions. Prior to issuance of building permits or the installation of any improvements related to this project, the Developer shall supply written statements from each such agency or department to the Planning Department, indicating that all applicable conditions required have been or will be met.</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Required Permits. Developer shall obtain all permits required by other agencies, if applicable, including, but not limited to Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 7, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Caltrans and provide copies of the permits to the Public Works Department.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fees. Applicant/Developer shall pay all applicable fees in effect at the time of building permit issuance, including, but not limited to, Planning fees, Building fees, Traffic Impact Fees, TVTC fees, Dublin San Ramon Services District fees,</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ'D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.d</td>
<td>Public Facilities fees, Dublin Unified School District School Impact fees, Fire Facilities Impact fees, Alameda County Flood and Water Conservation District (Zone 7) Drainage and Water Connection fees; or any other fee that may be adopted and applicable.</td>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>Indemnification.</strong> The Developer shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Dublin and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City of Dublin or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the City of Dublin or its advisory agency, appeal board, Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, or any other department, committee, or agency of the City to the extent such actions are brought within the time period required by Government Code Section 66499.37 or other applicable law; provided, however, that the Developer's duty to so defend, indemnify, and hold harmless shall be subject to the City's promptly notifying the Developer of any said claim, action, or proceeding and the City's full cooperation in the defense of such actions or proceedings.</td>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td><strong>Clarification of Conditions.</strong> In the event that there needs to be clarification to the Conditions of Approval, the Director of Community Development and the City Engineer have the authority to clarify the intent of these Conditions of Approval to the Developer without going to a public hearing. The Director of Community Development and the City Engineer also have the authority to make minor modifications to these conditions without going to a public hearing in order for the Developer to fulfill needed improvements or mitigations resulting from impacts to this project.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>Modifications.</strong> Modifications or changes to this Site Development Review approval may be considered by the Community Development Director if the modifications or changes proposed comply with Section 8.104.100 of the Zoning Ordinance and with the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><strong>Equipment Screening.</strong> All electrical equipment, fire risers, and/or mechanical equipment shall be screened from public view by landscaping and/or architectural features. Any roof-mounted equipment shall be completely screened from adjacent street view by materials architecturally compatible with the building and to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The Building Permit plans shall show the location of all equipment and screening for review and approval by the Director of Community Development.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance and Through Completion/ On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>Master Sign Program.</strong> A Master Sign Program/Site Development Review Permit shall be reviewed and approved for all project-related signage including, but not limited to, wall signs, monument signs, directional signage, parking signage, speed limit signage, and other signage deemed necessary by the City. The signs shown in the Project Plans are for illustrative purposes only and the full details of the sign sizes, materials, and construction shall be shown in the separate sign package.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Installation of any project-related signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Construction Trailer.</strong> The Applicant/Developer shall obtain a Temporary Use Permit prior to the establishment of any construction trailer, storage shed, or container units on the project site.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Establishment of the temporary use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Public Art.</strong> The project is required to comply with Sections 8.58.05A and 8.58.05D of Chapter 8.58 (Public Art Program) of the Dublin Municipal Code. The Project will make a monetary contribution in-lieu of acquiring and installing a public art project on the property, as provided by the Dublin Municipal Code section 8.58.050D. The in-lieu contribution shall be as provided in the Dublin Municipal Code, Chapter 8.58.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Issuance of Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Lighting.</strong> Lighting is required over exterior entrances/doors. Exterior lighting used after daylight hours shall be adequate to provide for security needs.</td>
<td>PL, PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Monitoring Program.</strong> The Applicant/Developer shall comply with Dublin Transit Center Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) certified by City Council Resolution 215-02, including all mitigation measures, action programs, and implementation measures contained therein as applicable to Site D-2. The EIR is on file with the Community Development Department.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Short-Term Bicycle Parking (Racks).</strong> Short-term bike racks shall be designed to complement the location in which they are sited (i.e. building architecture or the landscaping areas). The number of bike racks shall be as required by the Green Building Ordinance. Design must have a two-point connection per Dublin Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Final design and material sample shall approval by staff.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Long-Term Bicycle Parking (Lockers).</strong> Any exterior long-term bicycle facility (locker) shall be designed to complement the location in which it is sited (i.e. building architecture or the landscaping areas). The number of bicycle lockers shall be as required by the Green Building Ordinance. Final design and material sample shall approval by staff.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING – LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Final landscape and irrigation system plans.</strong> A Final Landscape and Irrigation Plan prepared and stamped by a State licensed landscape architect or registered engineer shall be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Director and shall comply with Section 8.72.030 of the Dublin Municipal Code. Note that the plant species and/or location may need to be modified to comply with the Traffic Visibility Area at the driveway entrances to ensure that the taller plants are placed outside the Traffic Visibility Area.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Water Efficient Landscaping Regulations.</strong> The Applicant shall meet all requirements of the City of Dublin’s Water-Efficient Landscaping Regulations, Section 8.88 of the Dublin Municipal Code.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Walls and Fences.</strong> All walls and fences shall be made of high-quality materials such as masonry, stone, wrought</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><strong>Bioretention Area.</strong> Emergent, grass and herbaceous species shall be located at the basin bottoms and locate trees and shrubs to the tops of treatment areas.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td><strong>Parking Area Trees.</strong> The trees within the parking areas shall also include interspersed tall evergreen trees for year-round interest, shade, and screening from the I-580 scenic corridor. Fast growing evergreen trees that grow to least 50 feet in height are suggested to soften and step down the height of the building.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td><strong>Tree Grates.</strong> All street trees shall be placed in 6’ x 6’ tree grates next to the curb as required by the Dublin Transit Center Stage 1 Planned Development Plan.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td><strong>Arnold Road Street Trees.</strong> The west side of Arnold Road along the project frontage shall be planted with Zelkova spaced 30’ apart and placed in a single row in the curb edge planter.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td><strong>Campus Drive Street Trees.</strong> The east side of Camus Drive along the project frontage shall be planted with Pyrus callerya spaced 30’ apart and placed in a single row in the curb edge planter.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td><strong>Altamirano Avenue Street Trees.</strong> The north side of Altamirano Avenue along the project frontage shall be planted with Zelkova spaced 30’ apart and placed in a single row in the curb edge planter.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td><strong>Landscaping at Street/Drive Aisle Intersections.</strong> Landscaping shall not obstruct the sight distance of motorists, pedestrians or bicyclists. Except for trees, landscaping (and/or landscape structures such as walls) at drive aisle intersections shall not be taller than 30 inches above the curb. Landscaping shall be kept at a minimum height and fullness giving patrol officers and the general public surveillance capabilities of the area.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans and Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td><strong>Plan Coordination.</strong> Civil Improvement Plans, Joint Trench Plans, Street Lighting Plans and Landscape Improvement Plans shall be submitted on the same size sheet and plotted at the same drawing scale for consistency, improved legibility and interdisciplinary coordination. The landscape plans shall be consistent with the Vesting Tentative Map which shows continues sidewalk on all street frontage.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td><strong>Backflow Prevention Devices.</strong> The Landscape Plan shall show the location of all backflow prevention devises. They shall be screened with fast growing and dense evergreen vegetation. The location and screening of the backflow prevention devices shall be reviewed and approved by City staff.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Approval of Final Landscape Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Landscape.</strong> All landscape areas on the site shall be enhanced and properly maintained at all times. Any proposed or modified landscaping to the site, including the removal or replacement of trees, shall require prior review and written approval from the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILDING CONDITIONS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Building Codes and Ordinances.  All project construction shall conform to all building codes and ordinances in effect at the time of building permit.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Construction Drawings.  Construction plans shall be fully dimensioned (including building elevations) accurately drawn (depicting all existing and proposed conditions on site), and prepared and signed by a California licensed Architect or Engineer.  All structural calculations shall be prepared and signed by a California licensed Architect or Engineer.  The site plan, landscape plan and details shall be consistent with each other.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Issuance of Building Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Building Permits.  To apply for building permits, Applicant/Developer shall submit electronic drawings and specifications, and the number of hard copies - as determined by the Building Official - for plan check.  Each set of plans shall have attached an annotated copy of these Conditions of Approval.  The notations shall clearly indicate how all Conditions of Approval will or have been complied with.  Construction plans will not be accepted without the annotated resolutions attached to each set of plans. Applicant/Developer will be responsible for obtaining the approvals of all participation non-City agencies prior to the issuance of building permits.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Issuance of Building Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>As-Built Drawings.  All revisions made to the building plans during the project shall be incorporated into an “As Built” electronic file and submitted prior to the issuance of the final occupancy.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 39 | Addressing  
   a.  Provide a site plan with the City of Dublin’s address grid overlaid on the plans (1 to 30 scale).  Highlight all exterior door openings on plans (front, rear, garage, etc.).  The site plan shall include a single large format page showing the entire project and individual sheets for each neighborhood.  3 copies on full size sheets and 5 copies reduced sheets.  See new address application form for additional requirements.  
   b.  Address signage shall be provided as per the Dublin Municipal Code.  
   c)  Address will be required on all doors leading to the exterior of the building.  Addresses shall be illuminated and be able to be seen from the street, 4 inches in height minimum.                                     | B             | Prior to Release of Addresses             |
<p>|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |               | Prior to Permitting                       |
|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |               | Prior to Occupancy                        |
| 40 | Engineer Observation.  The Engineer of record shall be retained to provide observation services for all components of the lateral and vertical design of the building, including nailing, hold-downs, straps, shear, roof diaphragm and structural frame of building.  A written report shall be submitted to the City Inspector prior to scheduling the final frame inspection.                                           | B             | Prior to Scheduling the Final Frame Inspection |
| 41 | Foundation.  Geotechnical Engineer for the soils report shall review and approve the foundation design.  A letter shall be submitted to the Building Division on the approval.                                                                                                                                                                                      | B             | Prior to Permit Issuance                  |
| 42 | CASp Reports.  Applicant shall obtain the services of a                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | B             | Prior to Permitting                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>Air Conditioning Units.</strong> Air conditioning units and ventilation ducts shall be screened from public view with materials compatible to the main building and shall not be roof mounted. Units shall be permanently installed on concrete pads or other non-movable materials approved by the Chief Building Official and Director of Community Development.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Occupancy of Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Solar Zone – CA Energy Code.</strong> Show the location of the Solar Zone on the site plan. Detail the orientation of the Solar Zone. This condition of approval will be waived if the project meets the exceptions provided in the CA Energy Code.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>Parking.</strong> The required number of accessible parking stalls, the design and location of the accessible parking stalls shall be as required by the CA Building Code. The design and number of clean air / EV ready stalls shall be as required by the CA Green Building Standards Code. The above information shall be shown on the Architectural drawings.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>Retaining Walls.</strong> All retaining walls over 30 inches in height and in a walkway shall be provided with guardrails. All retaining walls over 36 inches or with a surcharge shall obtain permits and inspections from the Building &amp; Safety Division.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><strong>Accessory Structures.</strong> Building permits are required for all trash enclosures and associated amenities / structures and are required to meet the accessibility and building codes.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><strong>Temporary Fencing.</strong> Temporary construction fencing shall be installed along perimeter of all work under construction.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Through Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><strong>Copies of Approved Plans.</strong> Applicant shall provide City with one reduced (1/2 size) copy of the City of Dublin stamped approved plan. Verify with Building Official if electronic copy is acceptable prior to submittal. <em>Option: 1 (1/2 sized) plan set and one electronic copy.</em></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30 Days After Permit and Each Revision Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIRE PREVENTION**

<p>| 50 | No fire service lines shall pass beneath buildings. | F             | Approval of Improvement Plans |
| 51 | <strong>New Fire Sprinkler System &amp; Monitoring Requirements.</strong> In accordance with The Dublin Fire Code, fire sprinklers shall be installed in the building. The system shall be in accordance with the NFPA 13, the CA Fire Code and CA Building Code. Plans and specifications showing detailed | F             | Building Permit issuance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ'D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Fire Access During Construction.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | a) Fire Access. Access roads, turnaround, pullouts, and fire operation areas are fire lanes and shall be maintained clear and free of obstructions, including the parking of vehicles.  
    | b) Entrances. Entrances to job sites shall not be blocked, including after hours, other than by approved gates/barriers that provide for emergency access.  
    | c) Site Utilities. Site utilities that would require the access road to be dug up or made impassible shall be installed prior to construction commencing.  
    | d) Entrance flare, angle of departure, width, turning radii, grades, turnaround, vertical clearances, road surface, bridges/crossings, gates/key-switch, within a 150-foot distance to Fire Lane shall be maintained.  
    | e) Personnel Access. Route width, slope, surface and obstructions must be considered for the approved route to furthermost portion of the exterior wall.  
<pre><code>| f) All-weather access. Fire access is required to be all- |               |                     |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td><strong>Fire Alarm (detection) System Required</strong>&lt;br&gt;A Fire Alarm-Detection System shall be installed throughout the building so as to provide full property protection, including combustible concealed spaces, as required by NFPA 72. The system shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 72, CA Fire, Building, Electrical, and Mechanical Codes.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If the system is intended to serve as an evacuation system, compliance with the horn/strobe requirements for the entire building must also be met. All automatic fire extinguishing systems shall be interconnected to the fire alarm system so as to activate an alarm if activated and to monitor control valves. <strong>Delayed egress locks</strong> shall meet requirements of C.F.C.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;a) <strong>Fire Alarm Plans. (Deferred Submittal Item).</strong> Submit detailed drawings of the fire alarm system, including floor plan showing all rooms, device locations, ceiling height and construction, cut sheets, listing sheets and battery and voltage drop calculations to the Fire Department for review and permit prior to the installation. Where employee work area’s have audible alarm coverage, circuits shall be initially designed with a minimum 20% spare capacity for adding appliances to accommodate hearing impaired employee’s.&lt;br&gt;b) <strong>Central Station Monitored Account.</strong> Automatic fire alarm systems shall be monitored by an approved central alarm station. Zoning and annunciation of central station alarm signals shall be approved by the Fire Department.&lt;br&gt;c) <strong>Qualified Personnel.</strong> The system shall be installed, inspected, tested, and maintained in accordance with the provisions of NFPA 72. Only qualified and experienced persons shall perform this work. Examples of qualified individuals are those who have been factory trained and certified or are NICET Fire Alarm Certified.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Inspection &amp; Testing Documentation.</strong> Performance testing of all initiating &amp; notification devices in the presence of the Fire Inspector shall occur prior to final of the system. Upon this inspection, proof that the specific account is UL Certificated must be provided to the Fire Inspector.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td><strong>Fire Extinguishers.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Extinguishers shall be visible and unobstructed. Signage shall be provided to indicate fire extinguisher locations. The number and location of extinguishers shall be shown on the plans. Additional fire extinguishers maybe required by the fire inspector. Fire extinguisher shall meet a minimum classification of 2A 10BC. Extinguishers weighing 40 pounds or less shall be</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><strong>FD Building Key Box.</strong> Building Access. A Fire Department Key Box shall be installed at the main entrance to the Building. Note these locations on the plans. The key box should be installed approximately 5 1/2 feet above grade. The box shall be sized to hold the master key to the facility as well as keys for rooms not accessible by the master key. Specialty keys, such as the fire alarm control box key and elevator control keys shall also be installed in the box. The key box door and necessary keys are to be provided to the fire inspector upon the final inspection. The inspector will then lock the keys into the box.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><strong>Means of Egress.</strong> Exit signs shall be visible and illuminated with emergency lighting when building is occupied.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>Main Entrance Hardware Exception.</strong> It is recommended that all doors be provided with exit hardware that allows exiting from the egress side even when the door is in the locked condition. However, an exception for A-3, B, F, M, S occupancies and all churches does allow key-locking hardware (no thumb-turns) on the main exit when the main exit consists of a single door or pair of doors. When unlocked the single door or both leaves of a pair of doors must be free to swing without operation of any latching device. A readily visible, durable sign on or just above the door stating “This door to remain unlocked whenever the building shall be provided. The sign shall be in letters not less than 1 inch high on a contrasting background. This use of this exception may be revoked for cause.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td><strong>Maximum Occupant Load.</strong> Posting of room capacity is required for any occupant load of 50 or more persons. Submittal of a seating plan on 8.5” x 11” paper is required prior to final occupancy.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td><strong>Interior Finish.</strong> Wall and ceiling interior finish material shall meet the requirements of Chapter 8 of the California Fire Code. Interior finishes will be field verified upon final inspection. If the product is not field marked and the marking visible for inspection, maintain the products cut-sheets and packaging that show proof of the products flammability and flame-spread ratings. Decorative materials shall be fire retardant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>General Inspection.</strong> Upon inspection of the work for which this submittal was provided, a general inspection of the business and site will be conducted.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td><strong>Addressing.</strong> Addressing shall be illuminated or in an illuminated area. The address characters shall be contrasting to their background. If address is placed on glass, the numbers shall be on the exterior of the glass and a contrasting background placed behind the numbers.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Building Address. The building shall be provided with all addresses or the assigned address range so as to be clearly visible from either direction of travel on the street the address references. The address characters shall not be less than 5 inches in height by 1-inch stroke. Larger sizes may be necessary depending on the setbacks and visibility. Multi-Tenants. Where a building has multiple tenants, address shall also be provided near the main entrance door of each tenant space. The address shall be high enough on the building to be clearly visible from the driveway, street or parking area it faces even when vehicles are parked in front of the tenant space. The address shall not be less than 5-inches in height with a ½-inch stroke.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 62  | **FIRE SAFETY DURING CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION**  
A. Clearance to combustibles from temporary heating devices shall be maintained. Devices shall be fixed in place and protected from damage, dislodgement or overturning in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.  
B. Smoking shall be prohibited except in approved areas. Signs shall be posted “NO SMOKING” in a conspicuous location in each structure or location in which smoking is prohibited.  
C. Combustible debris, rubbish and waste material shall be removed from buildings at the end of each shift of work. Flammable and combustible liquid storage areas shall be maintained clear of combustible vegetation and waste materials. | F              | Ongoing during construction and demolition |

---

**DUBLIN SAN RAMON SERVICES DISTRICT**

<p>| 63  | Complete improvement plans shall be submitted to DSRSD that conform to the requirements of the Dublin San Ramon Services District Code, the DSRSD “Standard Procedures, Specifications and Drawings for Design and Installation of Water and Wastewater Facilities”, all applicable DSRSD Master Plans and all DSRSD policies. | DSRSD          | Issuance of any building permit |
| 64  | Planning and review fees, inspection fees, and fees associated with a wastewater discharge permit shall be paid to DSRSD in accordance with the rates and schedules and at time of payment as established in the DSRSD Code. Planning and review fees are due after the 1st submittal of plans. Construction Permit and Inspection Fees are due prior to the issuance of a Construction Permit. Capacity Reserve Fees are due before the water meter can be set or the connection to the sewer system. | DSRSD          | Issuance of any grading permit or a site development permit |
| 65  | All improvement plans for DSRSD facilities shall be signed by the District Engineer. Each drawing of improvement plans for DSRSD facilities shall contain a signature block for the District Engineer indicating approval of the sanitary sewer and/or water facilities shown. Prior to approval by the District Engineer, the applicant shall pay all required DSRSD fees, and provide an engineer’s estimate of construction costs for the sewer and water systems, a faithful performance bond, and a comprehensive general | DSRSD          | Issuance of any grading permit or a site development permit |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CONDITION TEXT</th>
<th>RESPON. AGENCY</th>
<th>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>All easement dedications for DSRSD shall be by separate instrument irrevocably offered to DSRSD or by offer of dedication on the Final Map. Prior to approval by City for Recordation, the Final Map shall be submitted to and approved by DSRSD for easement locations, widths and restrictions.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Final Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>All mains shall be sized to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate future flow demands in addition to each development project’s demand. Layout and sizing of mains shall be in conformance with DSRSD utility master planning.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>The locations and widths of all proposed easement dedications for water and sewer lines shall be submitted to and approved by DSRSD.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Water and sewer mains shall be located in public streets rather than in off-street locations to the fullest extent possible. If unavoidable, then sewer or water easements must be established over the alignment of each sewer or water main in an off-street or private street location to provide access for future maintenance and/or replacement.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Issuance of any building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Domestic and fire protection waterline systems for Tracts or Commercial Developments shall be designed to be looped or interconnected to avoid dead end sections in accordance with requirements of the DSRSD Standard Specifications and sound engineering practice.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sewers shall be designed to operate by gravity flow to DSRSD’s existing sanitary sewer system. Pumping of sewage is discouraged and may only be allowed under extreme circumstances following a case by case review with DSRSD staff. Any pumping station will require specific review and approval by DSRSD of preliminary design reports, design criteria, and final plans and specifications. The DSRSD reserves the right to require payment of present worth 30 year operations and maintenance costs as well as other conditions within a separate agreement with the applicant for any project that requires a pumping station.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>The District employs Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), a fixed water meter reading system. The system uses radio communication between the individual water meter boxes or vaults and Tower Gateway Base Stations (TGBs) to transmit data on water consumption and meter readings. Due to the high density and tall profile of the buildings in this project, the buildings themselves may hinder effective communication between the individual meter boxes and the TGBs. Applicant shall fund an AMI Propagation Study provided by the District to determine if supplementary AMI communication equipment is required. If findings show that additional communication equipment is</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>CONDITION TEXT</td>
<td>RESPON. AGENCY</td>
<td>WHEN REQ’D Prior to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>This project will be analyzed by DSRSD to determine if it represents additional water and/or sewer capacity demands on the District. Applicant will be required to pay all incremental capacity reserve fees for water and sewer services as required by the project demands. All capacity reserve fees must be paid prior to installation of a water meter for water. If a water meter is not provided, the developer shall be responsible for providing site and installation of supplementary equipment specific to the District's AMI system, as approved by both the City of Dublin and the District.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>No sewer line or waterline construction shall be permitted unless the proper utility construction permit has been issued by DSRSD. A construction permit will only be issued after all of the items in Condition No. 56 has been satisfied.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Above ground backflow prevention devices/double detector check valves shall be installed on fire protection systems connected to the DSRSD water main. The applicant shall collaborate with the Fire Department and with DSRSD to size and configure its fire system.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Recycled water is proposed for use on this project and shall be used if available. However, if available recycled water supplies are insufficient to meet the irrigation demands for the Proposed Project, the irrigation demands for the Proposed Project may be met with potable water. Upon the District’s determination that sufficient supply of recycled water is available at the time of planned connection and the connection is technologically and financially reasonable, the project shall use recycled water for irrigation of large landscape areas.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Development plans will not be approved until landscape plans are submitted and approved.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Improvement plans shall include recycled water improvements as required by DSRSD. Services for landscape irrigation shall connect to recycled water mains. Applicant must obtain a copy of the DSRSD Recycled Water Use Guidelines and conform to the requirements therein. Availability of Recycled Water to be determined by District.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Fire service line with hydrants are not allowed to be private fire service line. In addition, this fire service line shall also be looped and tied in to the existing water main to the west of the project site to provide service reliability during fire event.</td>
<td>DSRSD</td>
<td>Approval by the City of a grading permit or a site development permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC WORKS GENERAL CONDITIONS**

80. **Conditions of Approval.** Developer shall comply with the City of Dublin Public Works Standard Conditions of Approval contained below (“Standard Condition”) unless specifically modified by Project Specific Conditions of Approval below.PW On-going

81. **Compliance.** Developer shall comply with the City of PW On-going
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Dublin Zoning Ordinances, City of Dublin Title 7 Public Works Ordinance, which includes the Grading Ordinance, the City of Dublin Public Works Standards and Policies, the most current requirements of the State Code Title 24 and the Americans with Disabilities Act with regard to accessibility, and all building and fire codes and ordinances in effect at the time of building permit.

### 82. Clarifications and Changes to the Conditions

In the event that there needs to be clarification to these Conditions of Approval, the City Engineer has the authority to clarify the intent of these Conditions of Approval to the Developer without going to a public hearing. The City Engineer also has the authority to make minor modifications to these conditions without going to a public hearing in order for the Developer to fulfill needed improvements or mitigations resulting from impacts of this project.

| PW | On-going |

### 83. Zone 7 Impervious Surface Fees

The Applicant shall complete a “Zone 7 Impervious Surface Fee Application” and submit an accompanying exhibit for review by the Public Works Department. Fees generated by this application will be due at issuance of Building Permit.

| PW | Grading Permit or Building Permit Issuance |

### PUBLIC WORKS – AGREEMENTS AND BONDS

#### 84. Storm Water Treatment Measures Maintenance Agreement

Applicant/Developer shall enter into an Agreement with the City of Dublin that guarantees the property owner’s perpetual maintenance obligation for all stormwater treatment measures installed as part of the project, including those on-site and within the public Rights of Way along Martinelli Way, Altamirano Avenue, Campus Drive, and Arnold Road. Said Agreement is required pursuant to Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit, Order No. R2-2009-0074. Said permit requires the City to provide verification and assurance that all treatment devices will be properly operated and maintained. The Agreement shall be recorded against the property and shall run with the land.

| PW | Approval of Parcel Map |

#### 85. Improvement Agreement

Applicant/Developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the City for all public improvements including any required offsite storm drainage or roadway improvements that are needed to serve the development, as determined by the City Engineer.

| PW | Approval of Parcel Map |

### PUBLIC WORKS – PERMITS AND BONDS

#### 86. Encroachment Permit

Applicant/Developer shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from the Public Works Department for all construction activity within the public right-of-way. The encroachment permit may require surety for slurry seal and restriping. At the discretion of the City Engineer an encroachment permit for work specifically included in an Improvement Agreement may not be required.

| PW | Permit Issuance |

#### 87. Grading Permit

Applicant/Developer shall obtain a Grading Permit from the Public Works Department for all grading.

| PW | Permit Issuance |

#### 88. Security

Applicant/Developer shall provide faithful performance security to guarantee the improvements, as
| 89. | **Permits from Other Agencies.** Applicant/Developer shall obtain all permits and/or approvals required by other agencies including, but not limited to:  
- Army Corps of Engineers  
- US Fish and Wildlife  
- Regional Water Quality Control Board  
- Federal Emergency Management Agency  
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
- California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans)  
- Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)  
- Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA)  
- Tri-Valley-San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority  
- Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD)  
- Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 7 (Zone 7) | PW | Permit Issuance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Plan Submittal Requirements.</strong> All submittals of plans shall comply with the requirements of the “City of Dublin Public Works Department Improvement Plan Submittal Requirements”, the “City of Dublin Improvement Plan Review Check List,” and current Public Works and industry standards. A complete submittal of improvement plans shall include all civil improvements, joint trench, street lighting and on-site safety lighting, landscape plans, and all associated documents as required. Applicant/Developer shall not piecemeal the submittal by submitting various components separately.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Plan Requirements from Other Agencies.</strong> Applicant/Developer will be responsible for submittals and reviews to obtain the approvals of all participating non-City agencies. The Alameda County Fire Department and the Dublin San Ramon Services District shall approve and sign the Improvement Plans.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td><strong>Composite Exhibit.</strong> Construction plan set shall include a Composite Exhibit showing all site improvements, utilities, landscaping improvements and trees, etc. to be constructed to ensure that there are no conflicts among the proposed and existing improvements.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td><strong>Geotechnical Report.</strong> Applicant/Developer shall submit a Design Level Geotechnical Report, which includes street pavement sections, grading and additional information and/or clarifications as recommended in the peer review letter by Cal Engineering and Geology dated September 10, 2019.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td><strong>Ownership and Maintenance of Improvements.</strong> Applicant/Developer shall submit an Ownership and Maintenance Exhibit for review and approval by Planning Division and Public Works Department. Terms of maintenance are subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.</td>
<td>PL, PW</td>
<td>Approval of Parcel Map or Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td><strong>Building Pads, Slopes and Walls.</strong> Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Acceptance of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shall provide the Public Works Department with a letter from a registered civil engineer or surveyor stating that the building pads have been graded to within 0.1 feet of the grades shown on the approved Grading Plans, and that the top & toe of banks and retaining walls are at the locations shown on the approved Grading Plans.

96. **Approved Plan Files.** Applicant/Developer shall provide the Public Works Department a PDF format file of approved site plans, including grading, improvement, landscaping & irrigation, joint trench and lighting.

97. **Master Files.** Applicant/Developer shall provide the Public Works Department a digital vectorized file of the “master” files for the project, in a format acceptable to the City Engineer. Digital raster copies are not acceptable. The digital vectorized files shall be in AutoCAD 14 or higher drawing format. All objects and entities in layers shall be colored by layer and named in English. All submitted drawings shall use the Global Coordinate System of USA, California, NAD 83 California State Plane, Zone III, and U.S. foot.

**PUBLIC WORKS - EASEMENTS AND ACCESS RIGHTS**

98. **Substantial Conformance.** The Parcel Map shall be substantially in conformance with the Approved Vesting Tentative Parcel Map 10949 unless otherwise modified by the conditions contained herein.

99. **Dedications.** All rights-of-way and easement dedications required by the Vesting Tentative Parcel Map or as otherwise required by these conditions or determined necessary by the City Engineer shall be shown on the Parcel Map.

100. **Public Service Easements.** A 5-foot wide Public Service Easement (PSE) shall be dedicated along the project’s frontage to allow for the proper placement of public utility vaults, boxes, appurtenances or similar items behind the back-of-sidewalk. Private improvements such as fences, gates or trellises shall not be located within the PSE.

101. **Emergency Vehicle Access Easements.** The Developer shall dedicate Emergency Vehicle Access Easements (EVAE) over the clear pavement width of all drive aisles as required by the Alameda County Fire Department and City Engineer.

102. **Abandonment of Easements.** Applicant/Developer shall obtain abandonment from all applicable public agencies of existing easements and rights-of-way within the project site that will no longer be used. Prior to completion of abandonment, the improvement plans may be approved if the Applicant/Developer can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the abandonment process has been initiated.

103. **Acquisition of Easements.** Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for obtaining all onsite and offsite easements, and/or obtain rights-of-entry from the adjacent property owners for any improvements not located on their property. The Applicant/Developer shall prepare all required documentation for dedication of all easements on-site and off-site. The easements and/or rights-of-entry shall be in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PUBLIC WORKS - GRADING</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>104. Approval by Others.</strong> The Developer will be responsible for submittals and reviews to obtain the approvals of all applicable non-City agencies.</td>
<td>PW  Approval of Parcel Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>105. Grading Plan.</strong> The Grading Plan shall be in conformance with the recommendation of the Geotechnical Report, the approved Tentative Map and Site Development Review, and the City design standards &amp; ordinances. In case of conflict between the soil engineer’s recommendation and the City ordinances, the City Engineer shall determine which shall apply.</td>
<td>PW  Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>106. Geotechnical Engineer Review and Approval.</strong> The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall be retained to review all final grading plans and specifications. The Project Geotechnical Engineer shall approve all grading plans prior to City approval.</td>
<td>PW  Grading Permit Issuance/ Sitework Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>107. Grading Off-Haul.</strong> The disposal site and haul truck route for any off-haul dirt materials shall be subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit. If the Developer does not own the parcel on which the proposed disposal site is located, the Developer shall provide the City with a Letter of Consent signed by the current owner, approving the placement of off-haul material on their parcel. A Grading Plan may be required for the placement of the off-haul material.</td>
<td>PW  Grading Permit Issuance/ Sitework Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108. Erosion Control Plan.</strong> A detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be included with the Grading Plan submittal. The plan shall include detailed design, location, and maintenance criteria of all erosion and sedimentation control measures.</td>
<td>PW  Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **109. Demolition Plan.** The Applicant/Developer’s Civil Engineer shall prepare a demolition plan for the project, which shall be submitted concurrent with the improvement plan package. The demolition plan shall address the following:  
  • Pavement demolition, including streetlights and landscaped median islands.  
  • Landscaping and irrigation  
  • Fencing to be removed and fencing to remain Any items to be saved in place and or protected, such as trees, water meters, sewer cleanouts, drainage inlets or backflow prevention devices. | PW  Grading Permit Issuance  |
<p>| <strong>PUBLIC WORKS - STORM DRAINAGE &amp; OTHER UTILITIES</strong> |  |
| <strong>110. On-site Storm Drain System.</strong> Storm drainage for the 10-year storm event shall be collected on-site and conveyed through storm drains to the public storm drain system. Show the size and location of existing and proposed storm drains and catch basins on the site plan. Show the size and location of public storm drain lines and the points of connection for the on-site storm drain system. | PW  Grading Permit Issuance  |
| <strong>111. Overland Release.</strong> Grading and drainage shall be designed so that surplus drainage (above and beyond that of the 10-year storm event) not collected in site catch basins, is directed overland so as not to cause flooding of  | PW  Grading Permit Issuance  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112. <strong>Storm Drain Easements.</strong> Private storm drain easements and maintenance roads shall be provided for all private storm drains or ditches that are located on private property. The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for the acquisition of all storm drain easements from offsite property owners which are required for the connection and maintenance of all offsite storm drainage improvements.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. <strong>Storm Drain Inlet Markers.</strong> All public and private storm drain inlets must be marked with storm drain markers that read: “No dumping, drains to creek,” and a note shall be shown on the improvement plans. The stencils may be purchased from the Public Work Department.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. <strong>Fire Hydrants.</strong> Fire hydrant locations shall be approved by the Alameda County Fire Department. A raised reflector blue traffic marker shall be installed in the street opposite each hydrant, and shown on the signing &amp; striping plan.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. <strong>Dry Utilities.</strong> Applicant/Developer shall construct gas, electric, telephone, cable TV, and communication improvements within the fronting streets and as necessary to serve the project and the future adjacent parcels as approved by the City Engineer and the various Public Utility agencies.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Certificate of Occupancy or Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. <strong>Dry Utility Locations.</strong> All electric, telephone, cable TV, and communications utilities, shall be placed underground in accordance with the City policies and ordinances. All utilities shall be located and provided within public utility easements or public services easements and sized to meet utility company standards.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Certificate of Occupancy or Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. <strong>Utility Vaults and Boxes.</strong> All utility vaults, boxes, and structures, unless specifically approved otherwise by the City Engineer, shall be underground and placed in landscaped areas and screened from public view. Landscape drawings shall be submitted to the City showing the location of all utility vaults, boxes, and structures and adjacent landscape features and plantings. The Joint Trench Plans shall be submitted along with the grading and/or improvement plans.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Certificate of Occupancy or Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC WORKS – STREET IMPROVEMENTS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118. <strong>Public Improvements.</strong> The public improvements shall be constructed generally as shown on the Site Development Review. However, the approval of the Tentative Map and Site Development Review is not an approval of the specific design of the drainage, traffic circulation, parking, stormwater treatment, sidewalks and street improvements.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. <strong>Public Improvement Conformance.</strong> All public improvements shall conform to the City of Dublin Standard Plans, current practices, and design requirements and as approved by the City Engineer.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. <strong>Public Street Slopes.</strong> Public streets shall be a minimum 1% slope with minimum gutter flow of 0.7% around bulb outs.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. <strong>Decorative Pavement.</strong> Any decorative pavers/paving installed within City right-of-way shall be done to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Where decorative paving is installed at signalized intersections, pre-formed traffic</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
signal loops shall be put under the decorative pavement. Decorative pavements shall not interfere with the placement of traffic control devices, including pavement markings. All turn lane stripes, stop bars and crosswalks shall be delineated with concrete bands or color pavers to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Maintenance costs of the decorative paving shall be the responsibility of the Applicant/Developer or future property owner.

122. **Curb, Gutter & Sidewalk.** Applicant/Developer shall remove and replace damaged, hazardous, or nonstandard curb, gutter and sidewalk along the project frontage. Contact the Public Works Department to mark the existing curb, gutter and sidewalk that will need to be removed and replaced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123. **Curb Ramps.** City standard curb ramps are required at all intersections. All curb ramps shall include truncated domes, and meet the most current City and ADA design standards. Show curb ramp locations on the plans. Please note that all curb returns on public streets shall have directional or dual ADA ramps – one for each crosswalk and oriented to align parallel with the crosswalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124. **Traffic Signing and Striping.** Applicant/Developer shall install all traffic signage, striping, and pavement markings as required by the City Engineer. Signing plans shall show street name and stop signs and any other regulatory signage appropriate for the project. Striping plans shall show stop bars, lane lines and channelization as necessary. Striping plans shall distinguish between existing striping to be removed and new striping to be installed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

125. **Street Lighting.** Street light standards and luminaries shall be designed and installed or relocated as determined by the City Engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC WORKS - CONSTRUCTION

126. **Erosion Control Implementation.** The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be implemented between October 1st and April 30th unless otherwise allowed in writing by the City Engineer. The Applicant/Developer will be responsible for maintaining erosion and sediment control measures for one year following the City’s acceptance of the improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Start of Construction and On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127. **Archaeological Finds.** If archaeological materials are encountered during construction, construction within 100 ft of these materials shall be halted until a professional Archaeologist certified by the Society of Calif. Archaeology (SCA) or the Society of Professional Archaeology (SOPA) has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permit Issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Start of Construction and On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128. **Construction Activities.** Construction activities, including the idling, maintenance, and warming up of equipment, shall be limited to Monday through Friday, and non-City holidays, between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. except as otherwise approved by the City Engineer. Extended hours or Saturday work will be considered by the City Engineer on a case-by-case basis. Note that the construction hours of operation within the public right-of-
| 129. **Temporary Fencing.** Temporary construction fencing shall be installed along the construction work perimeter to separate the construction area from the public. All construction activities shall be confined within the fenced area. Construction materials and/or equipment shall not be operated/stored outside of the fenced area or within the public right-of-way unless approved in advance by the City Engineer. | PW | Start of Construction and On-going |
| 130. **Construction Noise Management Plan.** Applicant/Developer shall prepare a construction noise management plan that identifies measures to minimize construction noise on surrounding developed properties. The plan shall include hours of construction operation, use of mufflers on construction equipment, speed limit for construction traffic, haul routes and identify a noise monitor. Specific noise management measures shall be provided prior to project construction. | PW | Start of Construction Implementation, and On-going as needed |
| 131. **Traffic Control Plan.** Closing of any existing pedestrian pathway and/or sidewalk during construction shall be implemented through a City approved Traffic Control Plan and shall be done with the goal of minimizing the impact on pedestrian circulation. | PW | Start of Construction and On-going as needed |
| 132. **Construction Traffic Interface Plan.** Applicant/Developer shall prepare a plan for construction traffic interface with public traffic on any existing public street. Construction traffic and parking may be subject to specific requirements by the City Engineer. | PW | Start of Construction; Implementation, and On-going as needed |
| 133. **Pest Control.** Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for controlling any rodent, mosquito, or other pest problem due to construction activities. | PW | On-going |
| 134. **Dust Control Measures.** Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for watering or other dust-palliative measures to control dust as conditions warrant or as directed by the City Engineer. | PW | Start of Construction; Implementation On-going as needed |
| 135. **Construction Traffic and Parking.** All construction related parking shall be off street in an area provided by the Applicant/Developer. Construction traffic and parking shall be provided in a manner approved by the City Engineer to minimize impact on BART patrons. | PW | Start of Construction and On-going |
| 136. **Dust Control/Street Sweeping.** The Developer shall provide adequate dust control measures at all times during the grading and hauling operations. All trucks hauling export and import materials shall be provided with tarp cover at all times. Spillage of haul materials and mud-tracking on the haul routes shall be prevented at all times. Developer shall be responsible for sweeping of streets within, surrounding and adjacent to the project if it is determined that the tracking or accumulation of material on the streets is due to its construction activities. | PW | During Grading and Site Work |

**PUBLIC WORKS – EROSION CONTROL & STORMWATER QUALITY**

<p>| 137. <strong>Stormwater Treatment.</strong> Consistent with Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MRP) Order No. R2-2015-0049, the Applicant/Developer shall submit documentation including construction drawings demonstrating all stormwater treatment measures and | PW | Grading Permit Issuance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**138. **NOI and SWPPP. Prior to any clearing or grading, Applicant/Developer shall provide the City evidence that a Notice of Intent (NOI) has been sent to the California State Water Resources Control Board per the requirements of the NPDES. A copy of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be provided to the Public Works Department and be kept at the construction site.</td>
<td>139. <strong>SWPPP.</strong> The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall identify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate to the project construction activities. The SWPPP shall include the erosion and sediment control measures in accordance with the regulations outlined in the most current version of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook or State Construction Best Management Practices Handbook. The Applicant/Developer is responsible for ensuring that all contractors implement all storm water pollution prevention measures in the SWPPP.</td>
<td>PW Start of Any Construction Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>139. SWPPP.</strong> The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall identify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate to the project construction activities. The SWPPP shall include the erosion and sediment control measures in accordance with the regulations outlined in the most current version of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook or State Construction Best Management Practices Handbook. The Applicant/Developer is responsible for ensuring that all contractors implement all storm water pollution prevention measures in the SWPPP.</td>
<td>140. <strong>Stormwater Management Plan.</strong> A final Stormwater Management Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer. Approval is subject to the Applicant/Developer providing the necessary plans, details, and calculations that demonstrate the plan complies with the standards issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program.</td>
<td>PW Building Permit Issuance and Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>141. Trash Capture.</strong> Specific information is required on the construction plan set demonstrating how MRP Provision C.10 (trash capture) requirements are met. Trash capture devices to be used shall be listed and details shown on plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PW Building Permit Issuance and Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC WORKS - SPECIAL CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>142. Substantial Conformance.</strong> All future Improvement Plans for public and community-wide improvements shall be in substantial conformance with the City of Dublin General Plan, the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan, Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and any amendments thereof, Westin Hotel-Tentative Map, and the Stage 2 Development Plan approved for the Westin Hotel Project (PLPA-2019-00006).</td>
<td></td>
<td>PW Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143. Landscape Features within Public Right-of-Way.</strong> The Property Owner shall enter into an “Agreement for Long Term Encroachment for Landscape Features” with the City to require the Property Owner to maintain the landscape and decorative features within public right-of-way including frontage landscaping, decorative pavements and special features (i.e. walls, portals, benches, etc.). The Agreement shall identify the ownership of the special features and maintenance responsibilities. The Property Owner will be responsible for maintaining the surface of all decorative pavements including restoration required as the result of utility repairs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>144. Altamirano Avenue Improvements.</strong> Altamirano Avenue shall be improved to include the construction of two 12-foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>145.</strong> <strong>Future Valley Link Project along Altamirano Avenue.</strong> The Valley Link project approved by Tri-Valley-San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority (Rail Authority) show future right-of-way requirements may affect the site design for the portion adjacent to Altamirano Avenue. Applicant/Developer shall work with the Rail Authority in addressing this right-of-way impact while accommodating the required roadway cross section along Altamirano Avenue and the southerly portion of the parcel.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>146.</strong> <strong>Arnold Road improvements.</strong> Arnold Road shall be improved to include a 12-foot wide travel lane and 5-foot wide bike lane in the southbound direction, construction of concrete curb and gutter, a 6-foot wide sidewalk, and a landscape strip along the project frontage of Parcel 2. Curb ramps and crosswalks shall be constructed at the southeast corner of Arnold Road and Altamirano Avenue. A 5-foot minimum width ADA compliant asphalt path shall be constructed along the frontage of Parcel 1.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>147.</strong> <strong>Martinelli Way Improvements.</strong> Martinelli Way shall be improved by widening the existing pavement to provide for two lanes in the eastbound direction between Campus Drive and Arnold Road. A 5-foot minimum width ADA compliant asphalt path shall be constructed along the frontage of Parcel 1.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>148.</strong> <strong>Campus Drive Improvements.</strong> Campus Drive shall be improved by widening the existing pavement to provide for a 12-foot wide two-way left-turn lane, two 12-foot wide travel lanes, and 8-foot wide parking on both sides (52 feet total curb-to-curb width); curb and gutter; a 6- to 12-foot wide sidewalk; and landscaping along the project frontage of Parcel 2. Curb ramps and a crosswalk shall be constructed at the southwest corner of Parcel 2. Campus Drive shall be improved with a minimum 24-foot wide pavement and a 5-foot minimum width ADA compliant asphalt path along the frontage of Parcel 1.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Building Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>149.</strong> <strong>Pavement Structural Sections.</strong> Asphalt concrete pavement sections within the public right-of-way shall be designed using the Caltrans method for flexible pavement design (including the asphalt factor of safety), an assumed R-Value of 5 and the following traffic indices: Altamirano Avenue, Campus Drive, Arnold Road, and Martinelli Way TI=11. Final pavement sections shall be based on the actual R-Value obtained from pavement subgrade.</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>150.</strong> <strong>Street Restoration.</strong> A pavement treatment, such as slurry seal or grind and overlay, will be required within the public streets fronting the site as determined by the Public Works Department. The type and limits of the pavement treatment</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Certificate of Occupancy or Acceptance of Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shall be determined by the City Engineer based upon the number and proximity of trench cuts, extent of frontage and median improvements, extent of pavement striping and restriping, excessive wear and tear/damage due to construction traffic, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td><strong>Overhead Utilities.</strong> There are existing overhead utilities along the Arnold Road and Altamirano Avenue. All new and existing overhead utilities shall be placed underground.</td>
<td>PW Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td><strong>Curb Returns.</strong> Curb return radii for project driveways shall be reduced to meet the minimum needed to accommodate the delivery vehicles (50-ft. delivery truck) while maintaining Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) needs. This shall be confirmed with a turning template analysis or using Auto Turn in CADD for all curb returns and as approved by the Public Works Traffic Engineer. Curb ramp locations and design shall conform to the most current Title 24 and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and as approved by the Public Works Traffic Engineer.</td>
<td>PW Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td><strong>Entry Gates.</strong> Any proposed gates at the entry points on Arnold Road, Altamirano Avenue, and Campus Drive shall have adequate drive aisle depths to ensure any waiting vehicle (passenger and delivery) shall clear the sidewalk. The waiting space shall be adequate in both scenarios, with and without Valley Link Project Right Of Way adjustment.</td>
<td>PW Grading Permit or Encroachment Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td><strong>Drive Aisle Width.</strong> The parking lot aisles shall be a minimum of 24 feet wide to allow for adequate onsite vehicle circulation for cars, trucks, and emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>PW Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td><strong>Project signs.</strong> All proposed project monument signs shall be placed on private property. Signs should be located outside of any easement areas unless specifically approved by the City Engineer. Any signage allowed to be located in an easement is subject to removal and replacement at the expense of the Developer/property owner if required by the easement holder.</td>
<td>PW Grading Permit Issuance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 156.   | **Vehicle Parking.** All on-site vehicle parking spaces shall conform to the following:  
   a. All parking spaces shall be double striped using 4” white lines set 2 feet apart in accordance with City Standards and DMC 8.76.070.A.17.  
   b. 12”-wide concrete step-out curbs shall be constructed at each parking space where one or both sides abut a landscaped area or planter.  
   c. Where wheel stops are shown, individual 6’ long wheel stops shall be provided within each parking space in accordance with City Standards.  
   d. A minimum 2’ radius shall be provided at curb returns and curb intersections where applicable.  
   e. Parking stalls next to walls, fences and obstructions to vehicle door opening shall be an additional 4’ in width per DMC 8.76.070.A.16.  
   Landscapeed strips adjacent to parking stalls shall be unobstructed in order to allow for a minimum 2-foot vehicular overhang at front of vehicles. | PW Grading Permit Issuance |
| 157.   | **Bicycle Parking.** Developer shall install the bike lockers | PW Grading Permit Issuance |
| 158. **Striping Plan.** A Traffic Signing and Striping Plan showing all proposed signing and striping within public streets, including necessary off-site striping on Campus Drive north of Martinelli Way to allow for southbound through traffic, as well as on-site parking lots and drive aisles, shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer. | Issuance |
| 159. **Visibility Triangle.** All improvements within the sight visibility triangle at all intersections, including but not limited to walls and landscaping, shall be a maximum height of 30" from the roadway surface elevation at the nearest lane. | PW |
| 160. **Photometrics.** The Applicant/Developer shall provide a complete photometrics plan for both onsite and frontage roadways. Include the complete data on photometrics, including the High, Average and Minimum values for illuminance and uniformity ratio. The Class I Shared-Use Path along Altamirano Avenue shall have an average FC of 0.6-1.0. | PW |
| 161. **Storm Drain Analysis.** The storm drain analysis shall be consistent with the existing Storm Drainage Analyses for the Transit Center prepared by BKF Engineers dated January 29, 2002, updated October 27, 2005. | PW |
| 162. **Green Stormwater Infrastructure.** The Applicant/Developer shall incorporate Green Infrastructure facilities within the public rights-of-way of Martinelli Way, Campus Drive, Arnold Road, and Altamirano Avenue, subject to the review of the Public Works Department. Green Stormwater Infrastructure facilities include, but are not limited to: infiltration basins, bioretention facilities, pervious pavements, etc. | PW |
| 163. **Hydromodification Management Standards.** This project is subject to hydromodification management measures. Applicant/Developer shall review BAHM Review Worksheet for all projects that must meet Hydromodification Management Standards. The worksheet is available on the City’s website at the following webpage: [http://dublin.ca.gov/1656/Development-Permits---Stormwater-Require](http://dublin.ca.gov/1656/Development-Permits---Stormwater-Require) | PW |
| 164. **Waste Enclosure.** The waste enclosure shall meet all of the requirements set forth on DMC Section 7.98, including but not limited to providing sewer and water hook-ups. The improvement plans and Building Permit plans shall show additional information demonstrating these requirements are met. A pedestrian accessible path of travel shall be provided for employees from the building to the waste enclosure in conformance with current accessibility requirements. | PW |
PASSED AND ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of Dublin, on this ___ day of __________, by the following votes:

AYES: 

NOES: 

ABSENT: 

ABSTAIN: 

_____________________________ 
Mayor

ATTEST: 

_____________________________ 
City Clerk
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Project Description

The project (Westin Hotel) is for the construction of a six-story hotel on a 5.88-acre (net) site located at the southwest corner of Campus Drive and Altamirano Avenue, adjacent to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station in the City of Dublin (commonly referred to as Site D-2). The project site is located in the Dublin Transit Center area and would be constructed on the southern half of Site D-2, which totals 12.10 net acres. D-2 has a General Plan/Eastern Dublin Specific Plan land use designation of Campus Office allowing a maximum of 950,000 square feet (SF) of office space at a gross FAR of 1.26. Hotels are permitted use within the Campus Office land use designation; as are restaurants, as an Ancillary Retail and Service Use.

The proposed height for the hotel is 71 feet. At its tallest point, the building is 75 feet to the top of roof deck. The project proposes to provide 279 parking spaces on-site within a surface level parking lot.

The project site is located in the Dublin Transit Center, as well as the Transit Village Center subarea of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan (EDSP). The project is part of the existing entitlements defined in the 2002 Dublin Transit Center Stage 1 Planned Development (PD) Rezone and General Plan/Specific Plan amendment.

Permit approvals for the project include a Planned Development Rezone with a Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review Permit, and Tentative Parcel Map.

Prior CEQA Analysis

Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan EIR

On May 10, 1993, the Dublin City Council adopted Resolution No. 51-93, certifying an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan (SCH #91103064) (henceforth the EDSP EIR). The certified EDSP EIR consisted of a Draft EIR and Final EIR, as well as an Addendum to the EDSP EIR dated May 4, 1993, assessing a reduced development project alternative. The City Council adopted Resolution No. 53-93 approving a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan for the reduced area alternative on May 10, 1993. The EDSP EIR evaluated the potential environmental effects of urbanizing Eastern Dublin over a 20 to 30-year period. The EDSP EIR also identified numerous environmental impacts, and mitigations were adopted upon approval of the Eastern Dublin General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan. For identified impacts that could not be mitigated to insignificance, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations. On August 22, 1994, the City Council adopted a second Addendum updating wastewater disposal
plans for Eastern Dublin. Since certification of the EIR, many implementing projects have been proposed, relying to various degrees on the certified EIR.

**Dublin Transit Center EIR**

In 2002, an EIR was prepared to analyze the environmental effects of the Dublin Transit Center project, which included Site D-2, a portion of which is the subject of this CEQA document. The Dublin Transit Center EIR was certified by the City Council on November 19, 2002, by City Council Resolution No. 215-02. This EIR analyzed amendments to the Dublin General Plan and EDSP, a Stage 1 Planned Development Zoning, a Parcel Map and a Development Agreement. The Planned Development zoning for the D-2 site allocated 950,000 sf. of office use. Subsequent to the approval of the Dublin Transit Center project, it was incorporated into the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan area.

The EIR contains mitigation measures that will be applied to any development within the project area, including the project. Specific mitigation measures are noted in the Initial Study for the project. The EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to project exceedances of Bay Area Air Quality Management District air quality standards on a project and cumulative level, cumulative traffic impacts, and impacts to mainline freeway segments.

**Proposed CEQA Analysis in this Document**

The City of Dublin has determined that an Addendum to the Dublin Transit Center EIR is the appropriate CEQA review for the project. If approved, the project would reduce the amount of Campus Office space allowed on the D-2 site approximately half, from 950,000 sf. to approximately 450,000 sf.

This Addendum has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 for the project. The City prepared an Initial Study dated August 30, 2019, incorporated herein by reference, to assess whether any further environmental review is required for this Project. Through this Initial Study, the City has determined that no subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration is required per the following:

**No Subsequent Review is Required per CEOA Guidelines Section 15162**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 identifies the conditions requiring subsequent environmental review. After a review of these conditions, the City has determined that no subsequent EIR or negative declaration is required for this project. This is based on the following analysis:

a) **Are there substantial changes to the Project involving new or more severe significant impacts?** There are no substantial changes to the Project analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The project is similar to land uses for the project site analyzed in the 2002 EIR. As demonstrated in the Initial Study, the proposed land uses on the site is not a substantial change to the 2002 EIR analysis and will not result in additional significant impacts, and no additional or different mitigation measures are required.
b) Are there substantial changes in the conditions which the Project is undertaken involving new or more severe significant impacts? There are no substantial changes in the conditions assumed in the EDSP EIR or the 2002 EIR. This is documented in the attached Initial Study.

c) Is there new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of the previous EIR that shows the Project will have a significant effect not addressed in the previous EIR; or previous effects are more severe; or, previously infeasible mitigation measures are now feasible but the applicant declined to adopt them; or mitigation measures considerably different from those in the previous EIR would substantially reduce significant effects but the applicant declines to adopt them? As documented in the attached Initial Study, there is no new information showing a new or more severe significant effect beyond those identified in the prior CEQA documents. Similarly, the Initial Study documents that no new or different mitigation measures are required for the project. All previously adopted mitigations continue to apply to the Project. The CEQA documents adequately describe the impacts and mitigations associated with the proposed development on portions of the Dublin Transit Center property.

d) If no subsequent EIR-level review is required, should a subsequent negative declaration be prepared? No subsequent negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is required because there are no impacts, significant or otherwise, of the project beyond those identified in the EDSP EIR and the 2002 EIR for the site, as documented in the attached Initial Study.

Conclusion

This Addendum is prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 based on the attached Initial Study. The Addendum and Initial Study review the proposed amendments to the Planned Development Rezoning with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, a tentative parcel map and Site Development Review Permit as discussed above. Through the adoption of this Addendum and related Initial Study, the City determines that the above minor changes do not require a subsequent EIR or negative declaration under CEQA Section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163. The City further determines that the Dublin Transit Center EIR adequately address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development for a portion of Site D-2 of the Dublin Transit Center as documented in the attached Initial Study.

As provided in Section 15164 of the Guidelines, the Addendum need not be circulated for public review, but shall be considered with the prior environmental documents before making a decision on this project.

The Initial Study, the Dublin Transit Center EIR and all resolutions cited above are incorporated herein by reference and are available for public review during normal business hours in the Community Development Department, Dublin City Hall, 100 Civic Plaza, Dublin CA.
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Background & Project Description

Project Title
Westin Hotel

Lead Agency Name and Address
City of Dublin
Community Development Department
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568

Contact Person and Phone Number
Amy Million
Principal Planner
Phone: 925/833-6610
Amy.Million@dublin.ca.gov

Project Location
The project site (APN: 986-34-14) is located in the City of Dublin, bounded by Campus Drive to the west, Arnold Road to the east, and Altamirano Avenue to the south. Interstate 580 (I-580) is located just south of Altamirano Avenue. See Figure 1: Project Location.

Project Applicant’s/Sponsor’s Name and Address
LN Hospitality Dublin, LLC
3657 Old Santa Rita Road
Pleasanton, CA 94588

General Plan Designation
Campus Office

Zoning
PD Planned Development (Ordinance No. 21-02)

Project Site Background
As shown in Figure 2: Westin Hotel Site Plan, the project site is located within the 91-acre district known as the Dublin Transit Center. The Dublin Transit Center project includes high-
density mixed-use, transit and pedestrian-oriented development adjacent to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station.

**Dublin Town Center Constructed and Entitled Development**

As described in Table 1: Dublin Transit Center Constructed and Entitled Development, 1,336 residential units have been constructed and another 220 have been approved but not yet constructed, for a total for a total of 1,556 units. It is anticipated that 195 more units will be built, leaving a surplus of 49 units that will never be built as per the 1,800 total units analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. Other existing land uses include 15,389 sf of ancillary retail and a five-story BART parking garage containing 1,700 spaces adjacent to I-580. A second five-story freestanding BART parking garage with 570 spaces is planned northwest of the project site on the west side of Campus Drive. The EIR also analyzed two million square feet of office, none of which has been constructed. Hotels are a permitted use within the Campus Office land use designation as described in the Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan.

**Table 1: Dublin Transit Center Constructed and Entitled Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Residential Units Constructed</th>
<th>Residential Units Approved, not yet Constructed</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Ancillary Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Tribeca</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Camellia Place</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Ashton @ Dublin Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Elan</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Eclipse</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,389¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2</td>
<td>Westin/Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Removed from Plan Area as part of Dublin Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EIR Total**

| EIR Total | 1,800² | 2,000,000 | 70,000 |

Source: City of Dublin, 2019.
Project Site History

Previous aerial photographs (see Appendix A: Site D-2 Aerials – 1993 to 2018) show that the D-2 site has always been a relatively flat and undeveloped field. Following approval of the Dublin Transit Center project, the D-2 site has been disturbed almost continuously while used as a construction staging area for various other development projects in the Dublin Transit Center, including the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station and associated garage.

By June of 2007 the perimeter roads around the D-2 site had been constructed. Because these roadways constricted the natural sheet flow of stormwater off the D-2 site, open-channel drainage ditches were created generally at the perimeter and parallel to Martinelli Way, Campus Drive, and Altamirano Avenue. Stormwater from these drainage ditches was then diverted into the City’s existing stormwater drainage system. These drainage ditches were periodically regraded as necessary, a practice that still currently exists.

Project Description

The project applicant has applied for a Planned Development Rezone with a Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review Permit, and a Tentative Map. Figures illustrating the project are shown at the end of this document and are referenced herein.

The project includes the construction of a six-story hotel on a 5.88-acre (net) site. The project site is bounded by Campus Drive to the west, Arnold Road to the east, and Altamirano Avenue to the south. I-580 is located south of Altamirano Avenue. The project site is unpaved with minimal topographical change. Adjacent land uses include the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station to the west, I-580 to the south, vacant land to the north and east and residential development to the northwest.

The project site plan has been designed to accommodate a potential future easement for the Valley Link rail project, which if constructed, would shift the Caltrans right of way north requiring Altamirano Avenue and the southern property line of the project site to also shift north.

Building Program and Design

As shown in Figure 3: Floor Plan – Level 1 and Figure 4: Floor Plan – Level 2, the project consists of 200 rooms, a 5,000+ sf. ballroom, a restaurant, four conference/meeting rooms, and a rooftop pool and fitness center. The proposed gross building area is 50,395 SF. Figure 5: Floor Plan – Levels 3 to 6 show the floor plans for the hotel rooms on levels 3 through 6.

The proposed height for the hotel is 71 feet. Figures 6a, b, c, d show the building elevations. Per the Campus Office zoning designation for the project site, building height limits are limited to 75 feet.

The parking lot has been designed to accommodate 279 cars, seven of which will be handicap accessible.
Façade treatments include stucco with window wall glazing, a wood timber drop off canopy located at hotel entrance, metal and stone wall panels, and a vegetated “green” wall.

Conceptual renderings, as prepared by the project architect are shown in Figures 7a, b, c.

Landscape Design
As shown in Figure 2: Site Plan, a 20-foot building setback is required at the project’s north property line, a 10-foot building setback is required at the project’s east property line along Campus Drive, and a 15-foot building setback is required at the east and south property lines along Arnold Drive and Altamirano Avenue.

Raised planters are located throughout the landscape public spaces. Bio-retention planters are located throughout the parking lot.

All exterior light fixtures are “dark sky-friendly” and will be oriented downwards to minimize spill-over of light into adjacent properties. There will be 14 free-standing light fixtures located throughout the proposed parking lot. Light intensity from these fixtures will be most intense at the pole with a maximum lumen of 11.8 and dissipate to near zero lumens along the perimeter of the project site.

Pedestrian and Vehicular Access
As shown in Figure 2: Westin Hotel Site Plan, sidewalks will be constructed at the perimeter of the project site along Arnold Road, Campus Drive, and Altamirano Avenue. The primary hotel entry is located to the south side of the building where there will be a covered drop-off area.

Vehicular access to the parking lot will be from Campus Drive, Altamirano Avenue, and Arnold Road.

Grading and Infrastructure

Grading
The project site is relatively flat with grades ranging between elevation 337 and 342 feet. Earthwork will include minimal grading and contouring to accommodate drainage and elevation requirements. Regrading will result in elevations contours changing from 337 feet (above mean sea level) along the southern boundary, to 342 feet along the northern boundary. The project will require the cut of 6,500 cubic yards of soil, and the fill of 6,500 cubic yards of soil; for a net import of 0 cubic yards.

The southern side of the project site is located within a 500-year flood hazard area, as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Water and Sewer
Existing domestic water mains available for connection adjacent to the project site include a 12-inch main on Altamirano Avenue, and a 12-inch main on Arnold Drive. As part of the project,
three new domestic water service laterals will connect to the 12-inch main on Arnold Drive at the south side of the project site.

The project will utilize an existing 8-inch recycled water main that extends along Altamirano Avenue, Arnold Drive, and Campus Drive. The project will use recycled water for landscape irrigation.

Stormwater
The project site is currently a vacant lot and therefore essentially all stormwater falling on to the project will ultimately flow into the City’s storm drain system. Pursuant to the RWQCB requirements, the project applicant has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan.

Stormwater from the landscape areas (70,348 sf.) and pavement areas (242,990 sf.) will be directed to several on-site bioretention planters located in the parking lot and along the north perimeter. These planters will contain plants, treatment soils and gravel, providing treatment and drainage to mimic existing runoff conditions. Two new storm drain laterals will flow into the existing 36-inch storm drain on Altamirano Avenue.

Erosion Control
During construction, straw wattle sediment filters will be installed around the entire perimeter of the project site. Drop inlet sediment filters and existing curb inlet filters will also be installed on the project site.

Project Approvals
Permit approvals for the project include a Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, Site Development Review Permit, and Tentative Parcel Map. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the approvals required for the project. City Council action will include adoption of the Addendum for CEQA review and approval of the Planned Development Rezone with a related Stage 2 Development Plan, the Tentative Parcel Map and Site Development Review Permit.
Environmental Checklist

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected by the Project

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agricultural and Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question (see Source List, attached). A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less-than-significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that any effect may
be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: applies where incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.

5. Earlier Analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:
   a. Earlier analysis used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
   b. Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c. Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   o the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   o the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

10. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 5.1.e.
21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.
## Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the project MAY have a potentially significant or a potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CITY OF DUBLIN

_______________________________  __________________________
Amy Million, Principal Planner       Date
Environmental Analysis

The discussion below analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the project per the criteria as described in Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. For convenience, this analysis uses the Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines as a framework for analysis. As such, the check-boxes in the column labeled “No Impact/No New Impact” in the tables below indicates that no new environmental review is required because none of the standards under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 are met. There are no project changes, new information or change circumstances that result in a new or substantially increase in severity of a significant impact from those identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. No standards for requiring supplemental environmental review under CEQA are met.

Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact / No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

Impact 4.1.1 to 4.1-4 analyzed the change in scale and character of development by permitting buildings up to 10 stories high. Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 reduced this impact to less-than-significant by encouraging as part of the Site Development Review process to include breaks in building designs and maintain view corridors to provide views of Mt. Diablo to the north,
considering the need for noise control and the intent of the Dublin Transit Center to provide a compact transit-oriented design. Impact 4.1-5 analyzed the generation of new sources of light and glare from new development. Mitigation 4.1-2 requires the submittal of lighting plans for all non-residential projects along Iron Horse Parkway to ensure that all exterior light fixtures will either be oriented downward or equipped with cut-off lenses to ensure that no spill-over of unwanted light onto adjacent residential areas shall occur.

Implementation of these mitigation measures on future projects would reduce all impacts to less-than-significant.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Scenic vistas, views

**No New Impact.** The Dublin Transit Center EIR determined that the greatest impact to scenic vistas and views would on existing background views to Mount Diablo and surrounding ridgelines. Existing views of the project site are surrounded by a surface parking lot and six-level parking structure to the west, I-580 to the south, a vacant open field to the east, and background views of Mount Diablo to the north.

The project is set in a portion of Dublin that is transitioning to urban uses under the auspices of the City of Dublin General Plan Amendment and EDSP EIR, adopted in 1993. The existing natural topography is relatively flat since the site was mass graded as part of the Dublin Transit Center development. Impact 4.1-1 concluded that the proposed scale and character of development is an integral part of the “transit village” concept, which has been promoted by several local and regional agencies to assist in resolving transportation, air quality and jobs-housing balance issues (less-than-significant).

Because obstruction of distant ridgeline views would be similar to the view obstructions caused by the surrounding developments as analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to scenic vistas and views beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Scenic resources

**No New Impact.** The project site is located north of the I-580 freeway, which is a local scenic highway, and is located on the northern portion of the Dublin Transit Center. No scenic resources exist on the site, including but not limited to significant stands of tree, rock outcroppings or bodies of water, so there would be no impact with respect to damage to scenic resources.

The project site would be visible from the freeway because it is adjacent to I-580. However, the Dublin Transit Center EIR previously analyzed office buildings with a maximum height of ten stories in Site D-2. The project would be a maximum of six stories, lower than previously analyzed.
A view corridor would be preserved along the western property line for views from I-580 freeway to the northwest, as required by Dublin Transit Center EIR Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.

No public parks, playgrounds or other public gathering places exist on the project site so that scenic vistas could be viewed.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to scenic resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c) Substantially degrade the visual character of public views of the site or surrounding area

No New Impact. Concept renderings of the project are shown in Figures 7a, b, c, d from the four corners surrounding the project site. The proposed building heights are consistent with those land uses in the surrounding area and are within the height limits as identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, which was identified as less-than-significant for a “transit village”.

Because the project is consistent in building height, massing, and scale as that analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to the visual character of the project site or surrounding area beyond what has been analyzed, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare

No New Impact. Implementation of the project result in an increase in daytime and nighttime light and glare from the existing condition but within the level of impacts as analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The main sources of daytime glare would be from sunlight reflecting from structures with reflective surfaces, such as windows. The main sources of nighttime light and glare would be from additional lighting, including, but not limited to, internal and external building lights from the proposed hotel, street lighting, site lighting, and lights associated with vehicular travel (i.e., vehicle headlights).

The Dublin Transit Center EIR found that there is a potential for lighting from non-residential uses to spill over into residential areas, creating a nuisance to Transit Center residents. Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 requires the submittal of lighting plans for all non-residential projects located along the Iron Horse Parkway as a condition of Site Development Review. However, the project is not located adjacent to the Iron Horse Parkway and would not be directly adjacent to residential uses. The closest residential uses are approximately 408 feet northwest of the project site.

The project includes downward-facing LED low intensity lighting that would largely be restricted to the project site. With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to light and glare beyond what has been analyzed the Dublin Transit Center EIR, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
Agricultural and Forestry Resources

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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? ☒

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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? ☒

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? ☒

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? ☒

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR
No significant impacts to agricultural or forestry resources were identified in this document.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a-e) Convert farmland or conflict with zoning

No New Impact. The City of Dublin has previously zoned the project site for planned development. No new conditions have been identified in this document with respect to
conversion of prime farmland to a non-agricultural use and conversion of forest land to non-forest land. No agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts presently exist on the project site nor are any agricultural operations on-going. Therefore, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to farmland beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)

Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified three significant air quality impacts: short term construction impacts, long term operational impacts and cumulative regional air quality impacts. To address these impacts, the following significant air quality impacts and mitigation measures were identified:

- Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 reduced impacts related to construction emission from construction equipment (see Impact 4.2-1) to a less-than-significant level. Specific items
listed in this measure required contractors to water construction area and stockpiled material and other items based on BAAQMD standards.

- Impact 4.2-3 noted that project air emissions of ozone would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance for regional impacts. No mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than significant level and this impact remained significant and unavoidable.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) Consistent with air quality plans

**No New Impact.** Approval and implementation of the project is consistent with the land uses assumed as the basis for the regional Clean Air Plan. The project would not conflict with the Clean Air Plan adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), since the proposed amount of development has been included in Dublin's planned growth as part of the City’s General Plan, which is the basis of the Clean Air Plan.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality plans beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Project emissions

**No New Impact.** The Dublin Transit Center EIR found that proposed development would result in a significant and unavoidable emission of air emissions exceeding the applicable BAAQMD standards. No additional review is required.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to air quality standards or cause cumulatively considerable air pollutants beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c, d) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations and create odors

**No New Impact.** The health risk of diesel exhaust from roadway traffic was known in 2002 although it was not analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The 1999 BAAQMD CBQA Guidelines (1999 Guidelines) identified diesel engine particulate matter as a toxic air contaminant based on California Air Resources Board (CARB) findings. There were several studies published prior to 2002 that demonstrated potential health impacts to residences living close to freeways. (See, studies cited in CARB's 2005 “Air Quality and Land Use Handbook”.) The 1999 Guidelines encourage Lead Agencies to address impacts to sensitive receptors (such as residences) to exposure of high levels of diesel exhaust from sources such as a high-volume freeway (1999 BAAQMD CBQA Guidelines, p. 47).

BAAQMD recommends that these impacts should be analyzed based on best available information. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines in effect in 2002 also listed exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants as a potentially significant
impact. This significance threshold was included in the Dublin Transit Center EIR (p. 48). Since potential health impacts due to exposure to diesel exhaust was known or could have been known in 2002, the risks of toxic air contaminants from diesel exhaust is not new information that requires additional analysis under CEQA.

Similarly, recently updated information from CARB and BAAQMD on health impacts of diesel exhaust and the BAAQMD CEQA significance standards do not trigger the requirement for supplemental environmental review under CEQA section 21166. These new standards do not identify Toxic Air Contaminants as a "new significant impact." This adverse health impact was already known, and recent new information only refined the type and level of analysis.

Furthermore, the project would implement a number of design features to improve air quality and energy efficiency and minimize noise. These include:

- Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems to be designed as energy efficient and fully automated.
- Equipment be easily accessible and in compliance with manufacturer’s minimum requirements to allow routine maintenance, removal and replacement of system compounds.
- Louvers and exterior equipment to be located away from public and guest view.
- Placement of access panels in public spaces to be avoided. When required, coordinate location and design with the hotel’s Interior Design.
- HVAC systems to be designed in compliance with ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2016 Energy Efficiency in Buildings at a minimum.
- HVAC systems to be designed to minimize transmission of sound and vibration and provide acoustical and vibration attenuation for mechanical equipment.

No CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)
### Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous CEQA Document

**Dublin Transit Center EIR**

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified the following significant biological impacts and mitigation measures:

- Impact 4.3-1 noted an impact with loss of Congdon’s spikeweed (now referred to as Congdon’s tarplant) and potentially four other special-status plants on the project site.
This impact was reduced to a less than-significant level by adherence to Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 that requires project applicants to avoid populations of spikeweed or, if not feasible, an off-site mitigation program is to be created. Measures to avoid, preserve or mitigate other special-status plants identified and required to be implemented.

- Impact 4.3-2 found a significant impact with respect to California red-legged frogs (CRLF) or their habitat. This impact was reduced to a less-than-significant level through adherence to Mitigation Measure 4.3-2. This mitigation measure required a CRLF preconstruction survey consultation with the USFWS. If populations of CRLF are identified appropriate protection plans were required to be prepared with necessary permits from appropriate regulatory agencies.

- Impact 4.3-3 noted an impact regarding burrowing owls. Adherence to Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 reduced this impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring a preconstruction survey on a development site no more than 30 days prior to grading. If owls are found, a biologist shall establish an exclusion zone around occupied burrow until it is confirmed that the burrow is unoccupied.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) Substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species

**No New Impact.** No changes have occurred to the project site since certification of the Dublin Transit Center in 2002. Mitigation measures contained in the Dublin Transit Center EIR will continue to apply to the project site.

In June of 2019, WRA Environmental Consultants conducted a field assessment of the project site and surrounding 250 feet to evaluate the potential presence of sensitive vegetation communities and aquatic features and evaluate on-site habitats to determine the potential for occurrence of special-status plant and wildlife species (see Appendix B: Dublin Westin Hotel – Biological Resources Assessment). WRA’s analysis identified seven special-status plant species that are known to occur in the vicinity of the Study Area (CDFW 2019, CNPS 2019). One of these species, Congdon’s tarplant, is likely present in the Study Area. The remaining species are unlikely or have no potential to occur in the Study Area.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b, c) Substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat, other natural community, or wetlands

**No New Impact.** As described in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, per a letter dated June 5, 2001, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers sent a letter to the Alameda County Surplus Property Authority...
(then property owners of the Dublin Transit Center) verifying that no jurisdictional waters of the U.S. were present within the Dublin Transit Center project area.

As described in the Project Site History section above, the D-2 site has been disturbed almost continuously while used as a construction staging area for various other development projects in the Dublin Transit Center. By June of 2007, the perimeter roads around the D-2 site had been constructed. Because these roadways constricted the natural sheet flow of stormwater off the D-2 site, open-channel drainage ditches were created generally at the perimeter and parallel to Martinelli Way, Campus Drive, and Altamirano Avenue. Stormwater from these drainage ditches is diverted into the City’s existing stormwater drainage system. These drainage ditches have been periodically regraded as necessary, a practice that still currently exists.

The results of WRA’s analysis concluded that the project site contains approximately 1.89 acres of unvegetated gravel area and 7.37 acres of ruderal vegetation. WRA also determined that the man-made ditch (as described above) which extends along the west and south edges of the property totals 0.12 acres does not qualify as “waters of the state”. As part of project construction, drainage will be revised consistent with surface water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Municipal Regional Permit Provision C.3.g requires that stormwater discharges not cause and increase in erosion potential of the receiving stream over the existing condition.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to riparian habitat, natural community or wetlands beyond what has been analyzed in the previous EIR, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**(d) Interfere or impede the movement of migratory fish or wildlife**

**No New Impact.** The project site is located in a substantially urbanized area and surrounded by paved roads or parcels of land that have been developed that would preclude significant wildlife migration. There are no creeks or streams on the project site that would allow for migration of fish species. The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified this impact as less-than-significant (Impact 4.3-4).

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to migratory fish or wildlife beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**(e) Conflict with local policies or ordinance include tree preservation or any adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans**

**No New Impact.** No trees are present on the project site, and there are no impacts regarding local tree preservation ordinances or policies.
The project site lies within the Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS) planning area. The City of Dublin utilizes the Conservation Strategy as guidance for environmental permitting for public projects, and private development projects are encouraged to use the EACCS as a resource as well. The Conservation Strategy embodies a regional approach to permitting and mitigation for wildlife habitat impacts associated with land development, infrastructure, and other activities. The Conservation Strategy is neither a Habitat Conservation Plan nor a Natural Community Conservation Plan but is intended to provide guidance during the project planning and permitting process to ensure that impacts are offset in a biologically effective manner.

Because no HCP or NCCP was identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and none applies at present, there would be no new or significantly more severe impacts to tree preservation or any adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)

### Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR
Impact 4.4-1 contained in the Dublin Transit Center EIR found a potentially significant impact with respect to historical, archeological and Native American resources on the project site. This
impact was reduced to less-than-significant by Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 that required, if archeological, archeological or Native American artifacts are encountered during construction, work on the project shall cease until compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 is demonstrated. Work on the project may commence under the guidance of an approved resource protection plan. The County Coroner is to be contacted if human remains are uncovered.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) **Historic resources**

**No New Impact.** The site is vacant and contains no built structures. As a result, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to historic resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) **Archaeological resources and Human Remains**

**No New Impact.** The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified a remote but potentially significant possibility that construction activities, including site grading, trenching and excavation, may uncover significant archeological and/or paleontological resources on development sites.

The Dublin Transit Center EIR did not identify any known cultural resources for the project site. However, Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 addresses conditions should the potential for currently unidentified resources be discovered during construction.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or more severe significant impacts to cultural impacts beyond those previously analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**


**Energy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporate</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. ENERGY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Energy was not analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Because the Dublin Transit Center EIR has been certified, the determination of whether energy resources need to be analyzed for this proposed project is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15163). Energy resources are not required to be analyzed under those standards unless it constitutes "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete" (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15162 (a) (3)).

Energy impacts were not analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR; however, these impacts are not new information that was not known or could not have been known at the time the Dublin Transit Center EIR was certified, and no new analysis is required.

(a-b) Wasteful consumption of energy resources and conflict with local plan for renewable energy

As discussed below in Greenhouse Gas Emissions, no additional environmental analysis is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162.

Source(s)

None.
## Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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? ☒

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☒

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? ☒

iv) Landslides? ☒

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☒

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) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? ☒

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? ☒

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☒
Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR
The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified potential impacts related to site grading and excavation, seismic risk, liquefaction and expansive soils. Impacts were determined to be significant for seismic hazard and potential significant for expansive soils. Two mitigation measures were identified to reduce all impacts to less-than-significant, namely:

- Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 reduced the impact related to seismic hazards (Impact 4.5-2) to a less-than-significant level. This measure required completion of a site-specific geotechnical investigation prior to development of individual projects. Future projects are required to be consistent with current building codes.
- Mitigation Measure 4.5-3 reduced the impact related to expansive soils to a less-than-significant level (Impact 4.5-3). This measure required site-specific geotechnical reports to address expansive soils and provide appropriate engineering and construction techniques to reduce damage from expansive soils.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures
The project applicant prepared a geotechnical investigation for the project (“Campus Drive Hotel Project”, prepared by Haley & Aldrich, March 2019) which is incorporated herein by reference.

(a) Seismic hazards

No New Impact. During a major earthquake on a segment of one of the nearby faults, moderate to strong ground shaking can be expected to occur at the project site. Strong shaking during an earthquake could result in ground failure such as that associated with soil liquefaction and differential compaction.

Dublin Transit Center Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 will require completion of a site-specific geotechnical investigation prior to development of individual projects.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to seismic hazards beyond what has been analyzed in both referenced EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Erosion/topsoil loss

No New Impact. Construction of the project improvements would slightly modify the existing ground surface and alter patterns of surface runoff and infiltration and could result in a short-term increase in erosion and sedimentation caused by grading activities. The project will be required implement the erosion controls as required by RWQCB measures, as implemented by the City of Dublin.
The project includes development of the type and in the location assumed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The project also includes the design-level geotechnical investigation required by the previously adopted mitigations and will implement their project-specific recommendations. With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to erosion/topsoil loss beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c-d) Soil stability

No New Impact. Consistent with Dublin Transit Center EIR Mitigations Measures 4.5-2 and 4.5-3, and standard City development procedures, the geotechnical investigation identifies methods to minimize impacts from liquefaction and other soil hazards for future site improvements on the project site.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or more severe significant impacts related to lateral spreading, liquefaction and other soil hazards beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(e) Soil capability to support waste water disposal, including septic

No New Impact. As assumed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, proposed development on the project site would be connected to existing sanitary sewers provided by Dublin San Ramon Services District on the adjacent roadways. Because the project site would be connected to existing sanitary sewers, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to soil capability to support waste water disposal, including septic beyond what has been analyzed previously. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(f) Paleontologic/unique geological resources

No New Impact. The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified a remote but potentially significant possibility that construction activities, including site grading, trenching and excavation, may uncover significant paleontological resources or unique geological resources on development sites. None of these pre-historic sites were identified by the Dublin Transit Center EIR within or near the project site. The Dublin Transit Center EIR noted a potentially significant cultural resource impact regarding unidentified historic resources and the project remains subject to Mitigation Measure 4.4-1.

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified no known cultural resources for the project site. However, mitigation for potential but currently unidentified resources should they be discovered during construction is provided in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The project remains subject to these prior adopted mitigations.

With adherence to previous mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to paleontological resources.
or unique geological resources beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**

Haley & Aldrich. Geotechnical Investigation for the Campus Drive Hotel Project, 2019.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since certification of the Dublin Transit Center EIR in 2002, the issue of the contribution of greenhouse gases to climate change has become a more prominent issue of concern as evidenced by passage of AB 32 in 2006.

Because these Dublin Transit Center EIR has been certified, the determination of whether greenhouse gasses and climate change need to be analyzed for this proposed project is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15163). Greenhouse gas and climate change is not required to be analyzed under those standards unless it constitutes "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete" (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15162 (a) (3)).

Greenhouse gas and climate change impacts were not analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR; however, these impacts are not new information that was not known or could not have been known at the time these Dublin Transit Center was certified. The issue of climate change and greenhouse gasses was widely known prior to EIR certification. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was established in 1992. The regulation of greenhouse gas emissions to reduce climate change impacts was extensively debated and analyzed throughout...
the early 1990s. The studies and analyses of this issue resulted in the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997.

In the early and mid-2000s, GHGs and climate change were extensively discussed and analyzed in California. In 2000, SB 1771 established the California Climate Action Registry for the recordation of greenhouse gas emissions to provide information about potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the impact of greenhouse gases on climate change was known at the time of the certification of the Dublin Transit Center EIR in 2002. Under CEQA standards, it is not new information that requires analysis in a supplemental EIR or Negative Declaration. No supplemental environmental analysis of the project's impacts on this issue is required under CEQA.

Even if the impact of the project's greenhouse gas emissions was required to be considered under CEQA, it would be less-than-significant since the project is consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan. In October 2010, the City adopted a Climate Action Plan in accordance with CEQA requirements and BAAQMD's CEQA Guidance. The City's Climate Action Plan was subsequently updated in October 2013. The GHG emissions from the Dublin Transit Center project were included in the Climate Action Plan. The City adopted a Negative Declaration for the Climate Action Plan finding the impacts of the Climate Action Plan would be less-than-significant. The Climate Action Plan serves as the City's qualified GHG Reduction Plan and programmatic tiering document for the purposes of CEQA for analysis of impacts of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

The City has determined that the reduction target under the Climate Action Plan will reduce the impact from activities under the Climate Action Plan to less-than-significant under CEQA (i.e., the project will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact). Therefore, CEQA allows the Climate Action Plan to be used for the cumulative impact analysis for future projects and development in the City covered by the Climate Action Plan. As such, it satisfies CEQA review requirements for the project.

Since the project emissions were included in the Climate Action Plan and the project is consistent with the applicable emission reduction measures identified in the Specific Plan and included in the Climate Action Plan, the project would be considered to have a less-than-significant impact (i.e., less than cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impact) due to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change consistent with Public Resources Code 21083.3, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183.5, 15064 and 15130 and BAAQMD adopted CEQA Guidelines and GHG Significance Thresholds. In fact, the project is exactly the type of project which reduces greenhouse gas emissions- an infill hotel project as part of an overall mixed-use development located adjacent to a major regional transit station.

**Previous CEQA Documents**

Greenhouse gas emissions was not analyzed in the previous Dublin Transit Center EIR.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or conflict with GHG plans or regulations

As discussed above, no additional environmental analysis is required under CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines section 15162.

Source(s)

City of Dublin Climate Action Plan, 2012

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified one applicable potentially significant impact related to site-specific hazardous materials. A second significant impact, damage to an underground petroleum pipeline located along the Iron Horse Trail right-of-way only applies to Sites A and C. The following mitigation measure was identified to reduce the potentially site-specific hazardous materials impact to less-than-significant:

- Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 reduced the impact related to release of hazardous materials on the project site remaining from past military uses (Impact 4.1-1) to a less-than-significant level. This measure requires the completion of additional environmental analysis (Phase I and/or Phase II reports) and completion of any clean-up of recognized hazardous materials in the Specific Plan area.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials

No New Impact. There would be no impact to the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, since the project involves construction of a hotel on the project site. Proposed land uses on the project site would not use, store or transport significant quantities of hazardous materials. To the extent there are potentially hazardous materials used in construction, the impacts would be less-than-significant due to compliance with regulatory requirements.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Potential release of hazardous materials into the environment

No New Impact. The Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessment for Parcel D-2 (Harding ESE, 2001) report prepared for the project site pursuant to Dublin Transit Center EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 did not identify any significant hazards to the public or the environment as a
result of release of hazardous materials. Adherence to Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 contained in the Dublin Transit Center EIR will ensure that release of hazardous materials would be less-than-significant.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c) Emit hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school

No New Impact. Because no schools exist or are planned within one quarter mile of the project area, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emitting hazardous materials within an existing or proposed school beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(d) Listed as a hazardous materials site

No New Impact. The Dublin Transit Center EIR examined the potential for hazardous materials extensively and the project site is not listed on the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control as an identified hazardous site as of February 26, 2012 (last update).

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to listed hazardous materials sites beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(e) Proximity to a public airport

No New Impact. The project site lies northwest of the Airport Influence Area of Livermore Municipal Airport and is not included in the Airport Influence Area. Because the project site is not within proximity to a public airport, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to public airports beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(f) Impair implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

No New Impact. The project would include the construction of a hotel on private land. No emergency evacuation plan would be affected since no roadways would be blocked. Therefore, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
(g) Expose people or structures to wildland fires

**No New Impact.** The project site is in an urbanized area of Dublin and contains no flammable structures or vegetation, as identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. The project site is surrounded by development properties and there is no possible exposure from wildland fires. As a result, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to exposing people or structures to wildland fires beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**


Harding ESE. Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessment Dublin Transit Center Parcel D-2, 2001.


### Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i). Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii). Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iii). 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; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv). Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR
The Dublin Transit Center identified significant hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the following: soil erosion and potential degradation of water quality from non-point source pollution. These impacts were reduced to less-than-significant with the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 reduces the impact related to non-point source pollution (Impact 4.7-3) to a less-than-significant level. This measure requires future individual site developers to prepare and implement erosion control plans per the City of Dublin's NPDES general construction permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. If needed, additional provisions may be required for the proper handling and disposal of hazardous materials. Associated Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 required each developer to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to Regional Water Board standards.

- Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 reduced the impact related to water quality by requiring project applicants to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction conditions. The SWPPP shall be prepared according to Regional Water Quality Control Board standards in effect at the time SDR permits are requested.

- Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 reduces the construction impact related to short-term increases of soil erosion from wind and water (Impact 4.7-4) to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation requires individual project applicants to prepare and implement erosion control plans for the project construction period, consistent with Regional Water Board standards. Measures included but were not limited to revegetation of
graded areas, protection of stockpiled material, constructing sediment ponds and related items.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Violate water quality or waste discharge requirements or degrade surface or groundwater quality

No New Impact. Approval and construction of the proposed development project would alter impervious surfaces to the undeveloped site that would decrease the net amount of stormwater runoff and potentially degrade water quality. Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 requires project applicants to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction conditions. The City of Dublin also requires new development proposals to adhere to the most recent surface water quality standards adopted by the RWQCB. The Municipal Regional Permit Provision C.3.g requires that stormwater discharges not cause and increase in erosion potential of the receiving stream over the existing condition.

The project is proposing to install flow-through planter boxes in the parking lot that contain plants, treatment soil and gravel. Once treated, this stormwater will flow into the existing 36-inch storm drain on Altamirano Avenue. Self-treating areas will also run along the east and west side of the project site. These stormwater systems, as required by the RWQCB, will help to ensure that water quality and waste discharge standards are met.

With adherence to the Dublin Transit Center EIR and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to water quality or waste discharge requirements beyond what has been analyzed previously. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Substantially decrease or interfere with groundwater supplies

No New Impact. The existing project site provides minimal groundwater recharge. The project would rely on surface water supplies from the Dublin San Ramon Services District and not local groundwater supplies. The project is required to support Zone 7’s groundwater recharge policy to only pump groundwater it artificially recharges using its imported surface water or locally-stored runoff from Arroyo del Valley; which helps to maintain groundwater at a no net loss for the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin. As a result, the project would not result in a net increase in groundwater extraction from Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin.

With adherence to the previous EIR and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to groundwater supplies beyond what has been analyzed previously and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
(c) Substantially alter existing drainage patterns re: erosion/siltation, re: flooding, or degrade water quality

No New Impact. New impervious surfaces would be constructed on the project site to accommodate the hotel, roadways, driveways and similar surfaces, consistent with the development assumptions in the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

The project is subject to Mitigation Measure 4.7-3, which requires project applicants to implement an erosion control plan to minimize polluted runoff reduced impacts related to changed drainage patterns to a less-than-significant level. The project remains subject to these adopted mitigations and has submitted the necessary studies and documentation to the City of Dublin.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to erosion/siltation beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(d) Flood hazard, seiche, or tsunami

No New Impact. The southern side of the project site, which is proposed for surface parking, is located within a 500-year flood hazard area, as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). No permanent habitable buildings are proposed within the 500-year flood hazard area.

The project site is not located near a major body of water that could result in a seiche. The risk of potential mudflow is considered low since no historic landslides or mudflows have been identified on the project site. Since the project site and surrounding properties are relatively flat (less than two percent cross slope), no impacts are anticipated with respect to landslide hazard.

Compliance with the City of Dublin's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan will ensure that hazards to visitors and residents on the project site as a result of flood hazard, seiche, or tsunami will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by providing an emergency evacuation plan in the event of a flood hazard, seiche, or tsunami.

(e) Water Quality

No New Impact. As discussed above, the proposed water source for this project would rely on surface water supplies from the Dublin San Ramon Services District and not local groundwater supplies. As a result, the project would not conflict with a water quality control or sustainable groundwater management plan.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to water quality beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
Source(s)

Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document
There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Physically divide an established community

No New Impact. The project reflects the type and location of development assumed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. As noted in the land use discussion in the Dublin Transit Center EIR (see, e.g., Impact 4.8-2), the project is consistent with existing land uses and would not divide an established community.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to an established community beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Conflict with land use plan, policy, or regulation

No New Impact. As documented in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, the project would be consistent with goals and policies contained in the City’s General Plan. There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts due to conflict with environmental protection policies in the General Plan beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
Source(s)

Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a-b) Loss of known or identified mineral resource

**No New Impact.** The Dublin Transit Center EIR indicated that significant deposits of minerals do not exist on the project site, so there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to mineral resources that would occur beyond what has been previously analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)
Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

The Dublin Transit Center EIR stated that future noise level within the Transit Center project area will range from a DNL (average day/night sound level) of 68 to 76 dB and that noise levels are expected to be 3 dB higher at third and fourth floor elevations due to increased noise exposure from freeway traffic. Significant impacts were identified for construction noise and permanent noise impacts for residential uses. The following mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant:

- Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 reduced short-term construction noise (Impact 4.9-1) to a less-than-significant level by requiring individual project applicants to prepare Construction Noise Management Plans and to have these approved by the Dublin Community Development and Public Works Departments prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Each plan shall identify specific noise reduction measures, including listing of construction hours, use of mufflers on construction equipment, on-site speed limits for construction equipment and similar measures.

- Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 reduced impacts related to permanent noise on residential uses (Impact 4.9-2) to a less-than-significant level by requiring individual residential developers to prepare acoustic reports that lists specific measures to be taken to reduce noise to City exposure limits, including but not limited to window glazing, ventilation systems and noise barriers.
Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 reduced impacts related to helicopter overflights from Camp Parks RFTA (Impact 4.9-3) to a less-than-significant level by requiring notification of such overflights to future residents.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Generate noise exceeding standards

No New Impact. As analyzed in previous EIR, project applicants will be required to prepare a Construction Noise Management Plan and to have it approved by the Dublin Community Development and Public Works Departments prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

Adherence to this previous noise mitigation measure, noise standards in the Dublin General Plan, and the City of Dublin Noise Ordinance will reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. No new or more significant noise impacts have been identified beyond what has been previously analyzed. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise

No New Impact. The project would not include construction or operational elements that would result in significant groundborne vibration levels to nearby residents.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to ground borne vibration or ground borne noise beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c) Excessive noise level near a public or private airport

No New Impact. Based on Exhibit 3-2 in the Livermore Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2012), the project lies west of the noise compatibility zone for this airport. The project site would therefore not be subjected to substantial aircraft noise from this airport.

Source(s)


## Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous CEQA Document

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Dublin Transit Center EIR or the EDSP EIR.

### Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Population growth

**No New Impact.** Approval of the project would not induce substantial additional population growth in the greater Dublin area, since development on the project site has long been envisioned in the Dublin General Plan and the Dublin Transit Center project.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to population growth beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Housing and resident displacement

**No New Impact.** Since the project site is vacant, no housing units or people would be displaced.

Because the project site is vacant, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to housing displacement beyond what has been previously analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

### Source(s)

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Documents

Dublin Transit Center EIR
The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified potentially significant impacts to fire protection, police services and schools. The following mitigation measures were identified to reduce these impacts to less than significant:

- Mitigation Measure 4.12-1 reduced impacts related to fire protection service (Impact 4.12-1) by requiring future high-rise buildings more than six stores tall to incorporate augmented fire protection features including but not limited to caching fire equipment on upper floors and other measures as identified by the Alameda County Fire Marshal.
- Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 reduced impacts to police services (Impact 4.12-2) by requiring individual developments within the Transit Center to a less-than-significant level by requiring individual project developers to submit a safety and security plan to the Dublin Police Services Department.
- Mitigation Measure 4.12-3 reduced impacts to schools (Impact 4.12-3) to a less-than-significant level by requiring the project proponent to enter into school mitigation program with the Dublin Unified School District to pay fees necessary to off-set costs for new schools.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Fire

No New Impact. As reflected in the Dublin Transit Center EIR, approval and implementation of the project would increase the number of fire and emergency medical calls for service that would need to be responded to by the Alameda County Fire Department, the City of Dublin’s contract fire department. As a condition of the project, the applicant will be required to pay public facility impact fees to assist in funding new fire stations. The project will be conditioned to meet Fire Department requirements including but not limited to maintaining minimum water pressure and fire flow, providing adequate site access, using fire retardant building materials and similar features.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to fire services beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Police

No New Impact. Similar to fire protection, there would be no new impact with regard to police protection, based on mitigation measures included in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. This includes paying City of Dublin public facility impact fees to assist in funding new police facilities, incorporating Dublin Police Services safety and security requirements into the project, including but not limited to adequate locking devices, security lighting and ensuring adequate surveillance for structures and parking areas. The Dublin Transit Center EIR also requires submittal of a safety and security plan (MM 4.12-2).

With adherence to applicable mitigation measures and regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to police services beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c) Schools

No New Impact. The project is a hotel and would not include permanent housing that would include school-aged children. Furthermore, the project would be required to pay the mandated statutory impact fees for commercial development at the time of issuance of building permits which would provide mitigation of educational impacts of the project pursuant to State law.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to schools beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
(d, e) Other public facilities

**No New Impact.** Approval and construction of the project would incrementally increase the long-term maintenance demand for roads and other public facilities. However, such additional maintenance demands will be off-set by additional City fees and property tax revenues accruing to the City of Dublin and therefore impacts would be less-than-significant.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, including payment of fees, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to other public facilities beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**


---

**Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. RECREATION. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous CEQA Document**

Dublin Transit Center EIR

Impacts to parks and recreational facilities were found to be less-than-significant and no mitigation measures were contained in this EIR.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a, b) Increase the use of existing recreation facilities causing deterioration or require new recreation facilities

**No New Impact.** The project is a hotel that would accommodate temporary guests whose use of recreational facilities would be negligible.
City of Dublin

Source(s)


Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
   ☒

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
   ☒

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
   ☒

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?
   ☒

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified significant and unavoidable level of service impacts at the Dougherty Road/Dublin Boulevard (AM and PM) and Hacienda Drive/1-580 westbound off-ramp (AM) intersections. It identified a significant impact regarding insufficient parking by BART patrons on private residential, retail and office parking. It identified significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts at the Dougherty Road/Dublin Boulevard intersection. And finally, it identified significant roadway segment impacts to the I-580 mainline freeway.

To address the impacts, the following mitigation measures were identified:

- Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 required roadway improvements for the Scarlett Drive extension, the Dublin Boulevard/Dougherty Road intersection and the Hacienda Drive/I-580 westbound off-ramp to reduce impacts related to project traffic on external roadway intersections to a less-than-significant level (Impact 4.11-1).

- Mitigation Measure 4.11-2 reduced the impact of parking in the Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan area with respect to future BART parking (Impact 4.11-4). This measure required the City to post all on-street parking within the Transit Center for limited
parking hours (2-4 hours). Individual development projects are to be designed to limit BART parking.

- Mitigation Measure 4.11-3 partially but not fully reduced impacts related to cumulative traffic (Impact 4.11-5). This mitigation measure required additional roadway improvements to the Dougherty Road/Dublin Boulevard intersection which was found to be infeasible.

- Mitigation Measure 4.11-4 reduced local roadway segments impacts (Impact 4.11-6) to a less-than-significant level be requiring the widening of Hacienda Drive between Central Parkway and Gleason Drive from three to four lanes and the Scarlett Drive extension should be constructed between Dublin Boulevard and Dougherty Road.

- No feasible mitigation was found to reduce impacts to mainline freeway operations in the year 2025 (Impact 4.11-7) and this impact was found to be significant and unavoidable.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

(a) Conflict with applicable transportation plans standards, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities

**No New impact.** The Dublin Transit Center EIR considered traffic impacts associated with development of the project site with commercial land uses on the local and regional roadway and freeway networks.

The proposed land use differs from the Campus Office land use that was analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. A trip generation analysis was conducted to determine if the proposed hotel would result in additional traffic impacts than were previously analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR (see Appendix C: Dublin Westin Hotel – Trip Generation Analysis).

Site D-2 in the Dublin Transit Center was allocated a maximum of 950,000 square feet of office. The project would replace 6.11 acres (or 480,000 square feet of office) of the total 12.10-acre D-2 site with a 200-room hotel. The number of trips generated by the land use assumptions from the Dublin Transit Center EIR were compared to the new land use assumptions. The analysis used the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates using both the 6th Edition (which was the current edition at the time the Dublin Transit Center EIR was prepared), and the current 10th Edition.

- Using the 6th Edition, the project would generate a net reduction of 1,751 daily trips, 505 AM peak hour trips, and 463 PM peak hour trips.
- Using the 10th Edition, the project would generate a net reduction of 842 daily trips, 501 AM peak hour trips, and 352 PM peak hour trips.

Based on the analysis, the proposed hotel would generate fewer trips than the approximate 480,000 sf. of office that was assumed and would not result in any new traffic impacts than those identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR.
Furthermore, the Alameda County Transportation Commission requires that a roadway segment analysis be conducted for developments that generate more than 100 PM peak hour trips. Based on the above, this analysis is not required for this project.

The City of Dublin has adopted a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program which requires developers to contribute their “fair-share” of sub-regional traffic improvements required for new development within the Eastern Dublin area, which includes the Dublin Transit Center project area. The project is within the scope and level of development and impacts and is required to participate in the Eastern Dublin Traffic Impact Fee Program.

However, if approved and constructed, the project would continue to contribute to significant and unavoidable cumulative project impacts as identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

The project would be required to construct bicycle improvements along adjacent streets that connect to existing the existing bicycle and pedestrian network, consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The project would also be required to post all on-street parking for short-term (two or four hour) use.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, including payment of fees, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to applicable transportation plans standards, including congestion management plans, beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Conflict with CEQA Section 15064.3 (b)

No New Impact. The City is not required to conduct an analysis of vehicle miles travel (VMT) at this time since it is not required under State or local law. Nonetheless, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact. The project is within the Dublin Transit Center and adjacent to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station. Therefore, impact of VMT from the project is presumed to be less-than-significant.

(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature

No New Impact. Approval of the project would add sidewalks and other vehicular and pedestrian travel ways where none currently exist to connect to existing bicycle and pedestrian network along public streets in the area. The project would be required to comply with current City engineering design standards and other safety standards to ensure that no safety hazards would be created or exacerbated.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to mobility design features beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.
(d) Result in inadequate emergency access

**No New Impact.** Fire access to the building will be from the easterly property boundary (Arnold Road) and from the westerly property boundary (Campus Drive). No impacts would result with respect to emergency access.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emergency access beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**


---

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous CEQA Document**

Tribal cultural resources as a separate CEQA topic was not analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. However, mitigation measures related to potential impacts to historic and archeological resources on the site are described in the Cultural Resources section, above.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Since certification of the Dublin Transit Center EIR, the topic Tribal Cultural Resources is a new category in the CEQA checklist. However, mitigation measures related to potential impacts to historic and archeological resources on the site are described in the Cultural Resources section, above.

Because Dublin Transit Center EIR has been certified, the determination of whether tribal cultural resources need to be analyzed for this proposed project is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15163). Tribal cultural resources are not required to be analyzed under those standards unless it constitutes "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete" (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15162 (a) (3)).

(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources

No New Impact. The site is vacant and contains no historically significant resources. There would therefore be no impacts to historical resources. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1

No New Impact. The project is subject to existing cultural resource mitigation measures contained in the Dublin Transit Center EIR.

There are no known significant Tribal Cultural Resources on the project site. Impact 4.4-1 contained in the Dublin Transit Center EIR found a potentially significant impact with respect to unknown Native American resources on the project site. This impact was reduced by Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 that required, if archeological, archeological or Native American artifacts are encountered during construction, work on the project shall cease until compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 is demonstrated. Work on the project may commence under the guidance of an approved resource protection plan. The County Coroner is to be contacted if human remains are uncovered.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or more severe significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources beyond those previously analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)

Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous CEQA Document

Dublin Transit Center EIR

The Dublin Transit Center EIR identified one significant impact associated with electric power. The following mitigation measure reduced this impact to less-than-significant:

- Mitigation Measure 4.12-4 reduced impacts to provision of electrical service to the Transit Center site (Impact 4.12-8) to a less-than-significant level by requiring future project applicants to submit a “will-serve” letter from the utility provider indicating that there is sufficient electric power and transmission capacity to serve the proposed project prior to issuing the first building permit.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a and c) Require relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities and sufficient wastewater capacity

No New Impact. As part of the project, three new domestic water service laterals would connect to the 12-inch main on Arnold Drive to the south side of the project site.

The project will utilize an existing 8-inch recycled water main that runs in Altamirano Avenue, Arnold Drive, and Campus Drive. The project would use recycled water for landscape irrigation. The parking lot will be designed with on-site bioretention planters, which will provide sufficient treatment and drainage to mimic existing runoff conditions. Two new storm drain laterals will flow into the existing 36-inch storm drain on Altamirano Avenue. Self-treating areas will also run along the east and west side of the project site.

Consistent with City requirements, the project would be required to construct new or upgraded on and off-site (if required) storm drain systems that comply with City of Dublin and Zone 7 standards. The project would include on-site storm pipes and a water quality pond to ensure consistency with regional C.3 hydromodification standards and vegetated bioswales along the western side of the site to filter storm water runoff.

Water, recycled water and wastewater collection, treatment and disposal facilities from the construction of the project would not result in a new or more severe significant impacts than were analyzed in Dublin Center EIR, which assumed commercial development and no additional analysis is required.

(b) Sufficient water supply

No New Impact. Approval of the project would result in an increased demand for water for domestic and irrigation purposes, similar to water use projections previously analyzed, as identified in the previous CEQA document. The increased water demand could be accommodated by DSRSD and Zone 7 facilities and long-term supplies. Recycled water would be supplied to the project site for landscape irrigation by DSRSD. The project would be required to provide any local extensions and connections to the existing recycled water lines.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to water supply beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(d-e) Adequate landfill and compliance

No New Impact. Approval of the project would incrementally increase the generation of solid waste. Over the long term, the amount of solid waste reaching the landfill would decrease as statewide regulations mandating increased recycling take effect. The Dublin Transit Center EIR found that there is adequate capacity within the local landfill to accommodate increases in the amount of solid waste envisioned for future development. Information contained in the Dublin
Transit Center EIR indicates that additional equipment and personnel would be needed to collect the increased amount of solid waste. However, increased fees and user charges would offset any increased capital and/or personnel costs.

There would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to solid waste disposal beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

**Source(s)**


### Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous CEQA Document**

There are no applicable mitigation measures from the Dublin Transit Center EIR.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(a) Impair an emergency response plan
No New Impact. The project site is located outside of a very high fire hazard severity (VHFHS) zone as identified by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). The nearest VHFHS zone is located approximately 2.5 miles south of the project site. No emergency evacuation plan would be affected since the project site is located outside of a VHFHS. Therefore, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(b) Exposure to wildfire
No New Impact. The project site is in an urbanized area of Dublin and contains no flammable structures or vegetation, as identified in the Dublin Transit Center EIR. Properties surrounding the project site are developed and there is no possible exposure from wildland fires. As a result, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to exposing people to wildland fires beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(c) Require installation or maintenance of infrastructure
No New Impact. As discussed above, the project site is located outside of a VHFHS zone as identified by CALFIRE. All proposed project components including infrastructure, roads, etc. would be located within the boundaries of the project site and impacts associated with the development of the project within this footprint area analyzed throughout this document. Additionally, the Alameda County Fire Department, as part of the City’s process, will review all plans for adequate fire suppression, fire access, and emergency evacuation. With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to installation or maintenance of infrastructure beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

(d) Exposure to flooding or landslides
No New Impact. As discussed above, the project site is located outside of a VHFHS zone as identified by CALFIRE. The nearest VHFHS zone is located approximately 2.5 miles south of the project site. There are also no natural drainage courses located onsite. The project site is relatively flat, and the proposed on-site detention/infiltration basins would limit the release of stormwater from the site; therefore, the project site would not expose people to flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes.

With adherence to required mitigation measures and applicable regulatory requirements, there would be no new or substantially more severe significant impacts to exposure of people or...
structures to flooding or landslides beyond what has been analyzed in the Dublin Transit Center EIR and no other CEQA standards for supplemental review are met. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Source(s)
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Source: Google Earth
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Source: Google Earth
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Source: Google Earth
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Source: Google Earth
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Source: Google Earth
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Appendix B

Biological Resources Assessment
June 14, 2019

Bill Wiseman
Kimley-Horn
100 West San Fernando Street, Suite 250
San Jose, CA

**Re: Westin Hotel Dublin Development on Arnold Road in Dublin, Alameda County, California**

Dear Mr. Wiseman

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the results of the biological resources assessment site visit for the subject property (APN 986-34-14) on the west side of Arnold Road (Study Area) in the City of Dublin, California (Figure 1, attached). The Study Area is a portion of the parcel that occurs within a developed area of Dublin and is bounded to the north and east by vacant land, to the west by development, and to the south by I-580. The Study Area contains ruderal vegetation, a ditch, and several unvegetated gravel areas. The proposed Project is construction of a hotel within the Study Area.

Based on the site visit and review of background literature and databases, the Study Area may support one sensitive biological community - Waters of the U.S. The Study Area also has potential to support one special-status plant, two special-status wildlife species, and native nesting birds.

**Methods**

Prior to the site visit, background literature was reviewed to determine the potential presence of sensitive vegetation types, aquatic communities, and special-status plant and wildlife species. Resources reviewed for sensitive vegetation communities and aquatic features include aerial photography, the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Database (2019), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB, CDFW 2019). For database queries, the Dublin U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle was included as the focal search area (USGS 1980).

On June 10, 2019, WRA biologist Ra’am Akiba-Hajim conducted a field assessment of the Study Area and surrounding 250 feet to evaluate the potential presence of sensitive vegetation communities and aquatic features and evaluate on-site habitats to determine the potential for occurrence of special-status plant and wildlife species. Observed plant communities, aquatic features, and plant and wildlife species were noted. Site conditions were noted as they relate to habitat requirements of special-status plant and wildlife species known to occur in the vicinity as determined by the background literature research.
The Study Area was assessed in terms of potential redevelopment constraints. This analysis is not exhaustive, and was performed to a level of detail necessary to understand what types of major biological constraints and opportunities are likely to be associated with the Study Area. This site survey does not constitute a jurisdictional wetland delineation or rare plant survey.

Results

Vegetation Communities

The Study Area contains approximately 1.89 acres of unvegetated gravel area and 7.37 acres of ruderal vegetation (Figure 2).

Unvegetated gravel areas cut across the Study Area in several places and are made up of medium sized gravel particles loosely packed down. On the margins of these areas, plants from the surrounding ruderal vegetation have begun to recruit in the gravel and some coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*) are beginning to establish. A review of historical aerial photographs show that the Study Area and the region surrounding it have been developed since at least 1993. These gravel areas are likely the result of previously existing urban development that has since been demolished.

Ruderal vegetation within the Study Area exists in large patches dominated by a handful of species, mostly non-native. Dominant species include stinkwort (*Dittrichia graveolens*), bristly ox tongue (*Helminthotheca echioides*), Harding’s grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*), prickly Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), wild oat (*Avena barbata*), perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), and Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*).

Wetlands and Waters of the US

The Study Area contains one potentially jurisdictional feature that may be categorized as Waters of the U.S. (Figure 2). Approximately 0.12 acre of drainage ditch runs on the west and south edges of the property, with various widths and levels of vegetation. Along the southern edge, the ditch narrows and contains dead vegetation with Harding’s grass along the banks. Along the western edge, the ditch is wider and contains vegetation such as rabbits foot grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*), stinkwort, and coyote bush scattered along the banks.

Special-Status Plant Species

Seven special-status plant species are known to occur in the vicinity of the Study Area (CDFW 2019, CNPS 2019). One of these species *Centromadia parryi* ssp. *congdonii* (Congdon’s tarplant) has a high potential to occur within the Study Area. The remaining species are unlikely or have no potential to occur in the Study Area due to one or more of the following reasons:

- Hydrologic conditions (e.g. vernal pool habitat, riverine) necessary to support the special-status plants do not exist in the Study Area;
- Edaphic (soil) conditions (e.g. serpentine, volcanics, clay textures) necessary to support the special-status plants do not exist in the Study Area;
- Topographic conditions (e.g. north-facing, mountainous) necessary to support the special-status plants do not exist in the Study Area;
- Associated vegetation communities (e.g. chaparral, oak woodland) necessary to support the special-status plants do not exist in the Study Area;
Additionally, the disturbed conditions in and around the Project Area make it unlikely that other special-status plant species are present in the Project Area. The graded fill soils, apparent lack of seed bed, history of disturbance throughout the Study Area, and surrounding development likely precludes the possibility of presence of special-status plant species apart from Congdon’s Tarplant.

**Congdon’s tarplant**

Congdon’s tarplant is a CNPS rank 1B.1 and is the only special status plant species documented to occur within one mile of the Study Area. The nearest recorded observation is on the southern border of the Study Area from 2017 (CDFW, 2019), though it is known to occur on other properties in the near vicinity. Congdon’s tarplant typically occurs on alkaline soils, sometimes described as heavy white clay, in valley and foothill grassland habitats ranging from 0 to 755 feet (0-230 meters). Observed associated species include hyssop loosestrife, coyote thistle (*Eryngium* sp.), annual beard grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*), and Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*). Congdon’s tarplant is often associated with areas of disturbance, so there is a high potential that this species is present within the Study Area due to the area being highly disturbed by human activity.

**Special-Status Wildlife Species**

Fifteen special-status species have been documented to occur within the vicinity of the Study Area. Two special-status wildlife species have potential to occur in the Study Area. The remaining species documented in the vicinity are unlikely or have no potential to occur within the Study Area due to lack of suitable habitat, previous and repeated site disturbance, adjacent urbanization, and barriers to wildlife movement.

*Western burrowing owl* (*Athene cunicularia*). CDFW Species of Special Concern, USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Moderate Potential.

This species has been documented to occur within 1 mile of the Study Area (CDFW 2019, eBird 2019). The nearest recorded observation of this species is 0.3 miles northeast of the Study Area from 2009 (CDFW 2019). Burrowing owl typically favors flat, open grassland with sparse or nonexistent tree or shrub canopies. This species is dependent on burrowing mammals to provide the burrows that are characteristically used for shelter and nesting, and in northern California is typically found in close association with California ground squirrels (*Spermophilus beecheyi*). Manmade substrates, such as pipes or debris piles, may also be occupied in place of burrows. Burrowing owls exhibit high site fidelity. No suitable burrows or indication of burrowing owl presence were observed within the Study Area on the June 10, 2019 site visit. However, due to open and flat nature of the site, multiple nearby documented occurrences, and the potential for ground squirrels to create burrows within the Study Area, this species has a moderate potential to occur, particularly in the winter when vegetation height is low.

*Loggerhead shrike* (*Lanius ludovicianus*). CDFW Species of Special Concern, USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Moderate Potential.

Loggerhead shrike is a year-round resident or winter visitor in lowlands and foothills throughout California. This species is associated with open country with short vegetation and scattered trees, shrubs, fences, utility lines, and/or other perches. Although they are songbirds, shrikes are predatory and forage on a variety of invertebrates and small vertebrates. Captured prey items...
are often impaled for storage purposes on suitable substrates, including thorns or spikes on vegetation and barbed wire fences. The Study Area provides potential open foraging habitat for this species.

*Nesting Birds*

Within the Study Area, native birds may nest in trees, shrubbery, and even on the ground. Most native birds have protections under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) as well as the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). Under these laws/codes, the intentional killing, collecting or trapping of covered species, including their active nests (those with eggs or young), is prohibited. Nesting birds have potential to occur within the Study Area during the nesting season, generally defined as February 1 to August 31 in this region.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kari Dupler
Senior Biologist

Enclosures:  Appendix A.  Figures
Appendix B.  Site Photographs
Appendix C.  CNDDDB and CNPS Database Searches
Appendix D.  Observed Plant Species
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Figure 1. Study Area Regional Location Map

Westin Hotel Dublin Development Dublin, Alameda County, California
Figure 2. Biological Communities
APPENDIX B - SITE PHOTOGRAPHS
Photograph 1. Representative photograph of unvegetated biological community and ruderal vegetation within the Study Area, facing west.

Photograph 2. Representative photograph of ditch within the Study Area with some ruderal vegetation on the banks, facing west.
Photograph 3. Representative photograph of ruderal vegetation within the Study Area, facing west.

Photograph 4. Representative photograph of ditch within the Study Area with some ruderal vegetation on the banks, facing southwest.
Photograph 5. Representative photograph of unvegetated biological community within the Study Area, facing northeast.

Photograph 6. Representative photograph of unvegetated biological community and ruderal vegetation within the Study Area, facing east.
APPENDIX C - CNDDDB AND CNPS DATABASE SEARCHES
### Appendix C. CNDDB and CNPS Database Searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>STATUS*</th>
<th>HABITAT</th>
<th>Microhabitat. Source: CNDDB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Congdon's tarplant  
*Centromadia parryi ssp. congdonii* | Rank 1B.1 | Valley and foothill grassland (alkaline). Elevation ranges from 0 to 755 feet (0 to 230 meters). Blooms May-Oct(Nov). | Alkaline soils, sometimes described as heavy white clay. 0-230 m. |
| Santa Clara red ribbons  
*Clarkia concinna ssp. automixa* | Rank 4.3 | Chaparral, cismontane woodland. Elevation ranges from 295 to 4920 feet (90 to 1500 meters). Blooms (Apr)May-Jun(Jul). | On slopes and near drainages. 90-1500 m. |
| Diablo helianthella  
| bristly leptosiphon  
*Leptosiphon acicularis* | Rank 4.2 | Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal prairie, valley and foothill grassland. Elevation ranges from 180 to 4920 feet (55 to 1500 meters). Blooms Apr-Jul. | Grassy areas, woodland, chaparral. 55-1500 m. |
| Oregon polemonium  
*Polemonium carneum* | Rank 2B.2 | Coastal prairie, coastal scrub, lower montane coniferous forest. Elevation ranges from 0 to 6005 feet (0 to 1830 meters). Blooms Apr-Jul. | 0-1830 m. |
| long-styled sand-spurrey  
*Spergularia macrotheca var. longistyla* | Rank 1B.2 | Meadows and seeps, marshes and swamps. Elevation ranges from 0 to 835 feet (0 to 255 meters). Blooms Feb-May(Jun). | |
| saline clover  
*Trifolium hydrophilum* | Rank 1B.2 | Marshes and swamps, valley and foothill grassland (mesic, alkaline), vernal pools. Elevation ranges from 0 to 985 feet (0 to 300 meters). Blooms Apr-Jun. | Mesic, alkaline sites. 0-300 m. |
APPENDIX D - OBSERVED PLANT SPECIES
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## Appendix D. Observed plant species on June 10, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Rarity Status¹</th>
<th>CAL-IPC Status²</th>
<th>Wetland Status (AW 2016)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias californica</td>
<td>California milkweed</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex prostrata</td>
<td>Fat-hen</td>
<td>non-native</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena barbata</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual grass, perennial grass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis pilularis</td>
<td>Coyote brush</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>shrub</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus diandrus</td>
<td>Ripgut brome</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual grass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromus hordeaceus</td>
<td>Soft chess</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual grass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carduus pycnocephalus ssp. pycnocephalus</td>
<td>Italian thistle</td>
<td>non-native</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
<td>Field bindweed</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial herb, vine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dittrichia graveolens</td>
<td>Stinkwort</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erodium botrys</td>
<td>Big heron bill</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festuca perennis</td>
<td>Italian rye grass</td>
<td>non-native</td>
<td>annual, perennial grass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helminthotheca echioides</td>
<td>Bristly ox-tongue</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual, perennial herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirschfeldia incana</td>
<td>Mustard</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum murinum</td>
<td>Foxtail barley</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual grass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactuca serriola</td>
<td>Prickly lettuce</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Life Form</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepidium latifolium</td>
<td>Perennial pepperweed</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicago polymorpha</td>
<td>California burclover</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalaris aquatica</td>
<td>Harding grass</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial grass</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantago lanceolata</td>
<td>Ribwort</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypogon monspeliensis</td>
<td>Annual beard grass</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual grass</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphanus sativus</td>
<td>Jointed charlock</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual, biennial herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumex crispus</td>
<td>Curly dock</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>perennial herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salsola tragus</td>
<td>Russian thistle</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silybum marianum</td>
<td>Milk thistle</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual, perennial herb</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia villosa</td>
<td>Hairy vetch</td>
<td>non-native (invasive)</td>
<td>annual herb, vine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All species identified using the Jepson Manual, 2nd Edition (Baldwin et al. 2012) and Jepson eFlora (2018); nomenclature follows Jepson eFlora. Sp.: “species”, intended to indicate that the observer was confident in the identity of the genus but uncertain which species. Cf: intended to indicate a species appeared to the observer to resemble a certain species, but was not confirmed.

1 Rare Status: The CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS 2018)
   FE: Federal Endangered
   FT: Federal Threatened
   SE: State Endangered
   ST: State Threatened
   SR: State Rare
   Rank 1A: Plants presumed extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere
   Rank 1B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
   (*Rank 1B: Rare in native stands only)
   Rank 2A: Plants presumed extirpated in California, but more common elsewhere
   Rank 2B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
   Rank 3: Plants about which we need more information – a review list
   Rank 4: Plants of limited distribution – a watch list

2 Invasive Status: California Invasive Plant Inventory (Cal-IPC 2018)
High: Severe ecological impacts; high rates of dispersal and establishment; most are widely distributed ecologically.
Moderate: Substantial and apparent ecological impacts; moderate-high rates of dispersal, establishment dependent on disturbance; limited- moderate distribution ecologically
Limited: Minor or not well documented ecological impacts; low-moderate rate of invasiveness; limited distribution ecologically
Assessed: Assessed by Cal-IPC and determined to not be an existing current threat

3 Wetland Status: National List of Plant Species that Occur in Wetlands, Arid West Region (Lichvar et al. 2016)

OBL: Almost always a hydrophyte, rarely in uplands
FACW: Usually a hydrophyte, but occasionally found in uplands
FAC: Commonly either a hydrophyte or non-hydrophyte
FACU: Occasionally a hydrophyte, but usually found in uplands
UPL: Rarely a hydrophyte, almost always in uplands
NL: Rarely a hydrophyte, almost always in uplands
NI: No information; not factored during wetland delineation
Appendix C

Dublin Westin Hotel – Trip Generation Analysis
June 18, 2019

Mr. Obaid Khan
Transportation and Operations Manager
City of Dublin
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568
(transmitted via email)

RE: Dublin Westin Hotel & Resorts – Trip Generation Analysis

Dear Mr. Khan:

The Dublin Westin Hotel & Resort (Project) is a proposed hotel to be constructed on the vacant land in Dublin, California bounded by Martinelli Way, Interstate 580, Campus Drive, and Arnold Road. The project is located on Site D-2 of the Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan.

The proposed land use differs from the office land use that is anticipated to be constructed in the Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan. A trip generation analysis was conducted to determine if the proposed hotel would result in additional traffic impacts than were identified in the 2001 Dublin Transit Center Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Based on the analysis in this letter, the proposed hotel will generate fewer trips than the approximate 480,000 SF of office it is replacing and would not result in any new traffic impacts than identified in the DEIR. Specific details on the methodology and results of the trip generation analysis are described below.

TRIP GENERATION

Site D-2 in the Specific Plan was allocated a maximum of 950,000 square feet of office. The proposed project would replace approximately 6.11 acres (or 480,000 square feet of office) of the total 12.10 acres with a 200-room hotel. The number of trips generated by the land use assumptions from the DEIR were compared to the new land use assumptions.

TRIP GENERATION 6TH EDITION

The DEIR utilized average rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation 6th Edition for the corporate headquarters office (Land Use 714: Corporate Headquarters Office), residential apartments (Land Use 220: Apartments, retail (Land Use 814: Special Retail), and hotel (Land Use 310: Hotel). Trip rates for the BART parking structure were developed based on peak period counts collected at the East Dublin BART station. Due to the Project’s proximity to the East Dublin BART station, a 15 percent transit reduction was applied to office and hotel land uses and a 25 percent transit reduction was applied to residential land uses. By replacing the office uses with the proposed hotel use on Site D-2, the proposed trips will generate a net -1,751 daily trips, -505 AM peak trips, and -463 PM trips, as shown in Table 1. Since the proposed project will generate fewer trips than analyzed in the DEIR, it is anticipated that the project will not result in any new impacts than identified in the DEIR.
Table 1: Trip Generation Comparison - 6th Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Daily Rate</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Headquarters Office</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking Structure¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail²</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Transit Reduction (15%)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,316</td>
<td>-441</td>
<td>-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transit Reduction(25%)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,486</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Trips³</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Headquarters Office</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>11,734</td>
<td>2,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking Structure¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail²</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Transit Reduction (15%)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,760</td>
<td>-335</td>
<td>-335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transit Reduction(25%)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,486</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Transit Reduction (15%)³</td>
<td>-247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-247</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Trips³</td>
<td>27,509</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (Proposed - EIR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,751</td>
<td>-505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
Utilized average rates from Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation 6th Edition.

¹ DEIR utilized rates based on peak period counts conducted at East Dublin BART Station (Omni-Means, November 2000)
² For AM peak Retail trips, the DEIR utilized the average rate and directional distribution for Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic One Hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
³ Due to proximity to East Dublin BART station, DEIR assumed 15 percent and 25 percent transit reduction for office and residential land uses, respectively.
⁴ Rounding during trip generation calculation may result in total project trips differing than what is reported in the Dublin Transit Center Specific Plan DEIR.
⁵ Assumed 15 percent transit reduction, due to hotel’s proximity to East Dublin BART Station.
TRIP GENERATION 10TH EDITION

Trip Generation is updated periodically to incorporate new trip generation data. The Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition is the most current edition. A trip generation comparison was conducted using trip generation rates from Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition as an informational analysis. The same land uses from the Trip Generation 6th Edition trip generation analysis was used except for Land Use 220: Apartment and Land Use 814: Specialty Retail, which are no longer included in the Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. For the 10th edition analysis, data for Land Use 221: Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) and Land Use 820: Shopping Center were used. Due to the Project’s proximity to the East Dublin BART station, a 15 percent transit reduction was applied to office and hotel land uses and a 25 percent transit reduction was applied to residential land uses. As shown in Table 2, the proposed trips will generate a net -842 daily trips, -501 AM peak trips, and -352 PM trips. Since the proposed project will generate less trips than analyzed in the DEIR, it is anticipated that the project will not result in any new impacts than identified in the DEIR.
Table 2: Trip Generation Comparison - 10th Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Headquarters Office</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>12,783</td>
<td>2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking Structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Transit Reduction (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,917</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transit Reduction (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,043</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,543</td>
<td>3,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Headquarters Office</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>2,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking Structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Transit Reduction (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,474</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Transit Reduction (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,043</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Transit Reduction (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-251</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,701</td>
<td>2,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference (Proposed - EIR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-842</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

Utilized average rates and fitted equations from *Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation 10th Edition*.

1. Trip Generation 10th Edition does not have LU 220: Apartment, therefore LU 221: Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) was used.
2. DEIR utilized rates based on peak period counts conducted at East Dublin BART Station (Omni-Means, November 2000).
3. Trip Generation 10th Edition does not have LU 814: Special Retail, therefore LU 820: Shopping Center was used.
4. Due to proximity to East Dublin BART station, DEIR assumed 15 percent and 25 percent transit reduction for office and residential land uses, respectively.
5. Assumed 15 percent transit reduction, due to hotel’s proximity to East Dublin BART Station.
Sincerely,

Ben Huie, P.E.
California Professional Engineer #C76682
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Figure 2: Westin Hotel Site Plan
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Figure 3: Floor Plan - Level 1
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Figure 4: Floor Plan - Level 2
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Figure 5: Floor Plan - Levels 3 to 6
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Figure 6a: South Building Elevation
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Figure 6b: North Building Elevation
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Figure 6c: West Building Elevation
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Figure 6d: East Building Elevation
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Figure 7a: Concept Rendering - South View
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Figure 7c: Concept Rendering - Northwest View
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SITE PLAN KEYNOTES
1. GATE CONTROLLED VEHICULAR ENTRY/EXIT
2. MAIN HOTEL ENTRANCE & PORTE COCHERE
3. CONFERENCE CENTER COVERED WALKWAY & DROP-OFF
4. OUTDOOR PLAZA
5. LANDSCAPE FEATURE (SEE FLOOR PLAN)
6. CONNECTING PATHWAY TO B.A.R.T.
7. LOADING / SERVICE
8. RESTAURANT ENTRANCE
9. RESTAURANT TERRACE
10. HOTEL PEDESTAL SIGNAGE

NOTES
• REFER TO "PLAN DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2" DOCUMENTATION FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE SITE PLAN
• SITE PLAN SHOWS 279 TOTAL PARKING SPACES. FOR MIX OF PARKING TYPES REFER TO "PLAN DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2" DOCUMENTATION
• SITE PLAN SHOWS 279 TOTAL PARKING SPACES. FOR MIX OF PARKING TYPES REFER TO "PLAN DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2" DOCUMENTATION
• REFER TO LANDSCAPE DESIGN FOR ALL TREE LOCATIONS, COUNTS, AND PLANTING TYPES
• REFER TO "PLAN DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2" DOCUMENTATION FOR ADDITIONAL SITE PLAN DETAILS

PARKING COUNT

| Standard       | 165 (65%) |
| Compact        | 105 (39%) |
| Accessible     | 8 (3%)    |
| Motorcycle     | 4 (1%)    |
| Total          | 279 Stalls|

SITE AREA: 256,463 SF (5.8876 AC)
REDUCED AREA: 239,518 (5.4986 AC)

* REDUCED AREA IS THE AREA THAT WOULD REMAIN IF THE VALLEY LINK RIGHT-OF-WAY OCCURS

SCHEMATIC ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
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SCHEMATIC DESIGN

ARCHITECTS + INTERIORS LLC.
LEVEL 1
0' - 0"

LEVEL 2
18' - 0"

LEVEL 3
29' - 0"

LEVEL 4
39' - 0"

LEVEL 5
49' - 0"

LEVEL 6
59' - 0"

T.O. ROOF
71' - 0"

TOWER ELEVATION - SEE ABOVE

ELEVATION OF PODIUM (SOUTH)

*NOTE: COLORS AND HATCHING PATTERNS ON EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ARE DIAGRAMATIC IN NATURE. PLEASE REFER TO COLORED RENDERS STARTING ON SD-10 FOR MORE REALISTIC LOOKING COLORS AND MATERIALS.

MATERIALS KEYNOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEYNOTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC-1</td>
<td>ALUMINUM CAP FLASHING - PTD TO MATCH ADJACENT MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP-2</td>
<td>COMPOSITE PANEL - WOOD LIKE FINISH (VERTICAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-1</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-2A</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-2B</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-3</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR-1</td>
<td>GLASS RAILING SYSTEM @ POOL DECK LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-1</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL - MATCH S.F. FRAME COLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1</td>
<td>PRE-CAST STONE TRIM @ WINDOW AND STONE WALL OPENINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-1</td>
<td>STONE VENEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW-1</td>
<td>WINDOW WALL WINDOW SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD BUILDING ELEVATION - SOUTH TOWER

SD BUILDING ELEVATION - SOUTH

COMPRESSOR CENTER CANOPY

MAIN CANOPY SYSTEM (SEE A.D. 001)
SD BUILDING ELEVATION - NORTH

MATERIALS KEYNOTES

KEYNOTE # DESCRIPTIONS

CP-1 COMPOSITE PANEL - WOOD LIKE FINISH (HORIZONTAL)

EF-1 EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #1

EF-2A EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2A

EF-2B EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2B

EF-3 EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #3

ML-1 ARCHITECTURAL LOUVER - CONTINUOUS W/ BLOCK-OUTS WHERE NO FUNCTIONING LOUVER - MATCH S.F. FRAMING COLOR

WW-1 WINDOW WALL WINDOW SYSTEM

*NOTE: COLORS AND HATCHING PATTERNS ON EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ARE DIAGRAMATIC IN NATURE. PLEASE REFER TO COLORED RENDERINGS STARTING ON SD-10 FOR MORE REALISTIC LOOKING COLORS AND MATERIALS.
*NOTE: COLORS AND HATCHING PATTERNS ON EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ARE DIAGRAMATIC IN NATURE, PLEASE REFER TO COLORED RENDERS STARTING ON SD-16 FOR MORE REALISTIC LOOKING COLORS AND MATERIALS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEYNOTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-1</td>
<td>COMPOSITE PANEL - WOOD LIKE FINISH (HORIZONTAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-1</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-2A</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-3</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-1</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL - MATCH S.F. FRAME COLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-1</td>
<td>STONE VENEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW-1</td>
<td>WINDOW WALL WINDOW SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SD BUILDING ELEVATION - WEST**

**MATERIALS KEYNOTES**

© DESIGN COPYRIGHT 2018 #1814101

SD BUILDING ELEVATION - WEST
MATERIALS KEYNOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEYNOTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-2</td>
<td>COMPOSITE PANEL - WOOD LIKE FINISH (VERTICAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-1</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-2A</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-3</td>
<td>EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEMS (EIFS) COLOR #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR-1</td>
<td>GLASS RAILING SYSTEM @ POOL DECK LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1</td>
<td>PRE-CAST STONE TRIM @ WINDOW AND STONE WALL OPENINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-1</td>
<td>STONE VENEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW-1</td>
<td>WINDOW WALL WINDOW SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: COLORS AND HATCHING PATTERNS ON EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ARE DIAGRAMATIC IN NATURE. PLEASE REFER TO COLORED RENDERINGS STARTING ON SD-10 FOR MORE REALISTIC LOOKING COLORS AND MATERIALS.*
AERIAL VIEWS SHOWING THE BUILDING FROM ALL 4 SIDES. THE RENDERINGS SHOW THE BUILDING AS IT MAY LOOK DURING THE DAY OR NIGHT. EACH VIEW HAS EXISTING IMAGES SUPERIMPOSED TO GIVE CONTEXT OF THE DESIGN.
3D CONCEPT REDNERING - DROP-OFF & HOTEL ENTRANCE
Outdoor Plaza – The outdoor plaza design inspiration stems from the Westin core principle of Biophilia. This green space integrates natural materials and elements in their true form and provides guests an experience and opportunity to connect to nature and maintain their well-being while restoring a sense of control to have them feeling better when they leave than when they arrived.
**HOTEL – AMENITY DESCRIPTION**

**Podium Pool** - A roof top pool and pool deck are strategically located on the southern side of the "Tower" to take advantage of all-day sun exposure. The deck provides a variety of lounge spaces that create an inviting environment for guests to relax and rejuvenate.

**Wellness Center** – The architecture and design of the wellness center create a sensory experience through aesthetics that are nature inspired. The studio provides a generous space with equipment that brings balance and energy to everyday exercise.
WESTIN HOTEL – AMENITY DESCRIPTIONS

Restaurant and Bar – The restaurant, café and bar are designed around the Eat Well pillar of the Westin brand and provide a full dining experience during lunch and dinner. The restaurant will offer a very interactive and social scene with a large bar and bar seating area, an expo kitchen, and an outdoor seating area with a fire pit that all become a part of the restaurant experience.