APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Aesthetics									
Impact AES-1: Temporary visual impacts caused by construction activities (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-3–4 3.1-8–10	3.1-12–13	Would construction or heavy equipment be visible from residences or recreation areas and trails?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-1: Limit construction to daylight hours** ■ Do not allow construction between sunset and sunrise or on weekends ■ Do not use high-wattage lighting sources	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping or photo simulations to show areas visible from recreation areas or trails.* Construction would be completed with 2 to 3 days for each of the 60-meter masts, and within 6 days for the 80-meter mast, and the distance between any met mast and the nearest residence is approximately 1.1 miles. Effects from visual impacts will therefore be minimal. However, implementation of MM AES-1 to limit construction to daylight hours would prevent any significant impact
Impact AES-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6–7 3.1-8–10	3.1-15–16	Would new turbines be placed in areas where no turbines currently exist? (See Policies 105 and 106 for list of sensitive ridgelines, pg 3.1-6)	☐	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ■ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways** ■ Clean all derelict equipment, debris, and litter ■ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ■ Maintain site in such a manner ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ■ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ■ Screen sites from view	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show locations of existing turbines in relation to new proposed turbines.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers, and therefore no mapping is required. The distance from any public vantage point to any met tower would make the met tower almost impossible to distinguish, and therefore no impact would result.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact AES-3: Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway (significant and unavoidable – *findings of overriding considerations made at the program level*)	3.1-6 3.1-8–10	3.1-19–20	Would turbines be located along a state- or county-designated scenic highway? (See Attachment B for list)	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ■ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways** ■ Clean all derelict equipment , debris, and litter ■ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ■ Maintain site in such a manner ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ■ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ■ Screen sites from view	☒	☐	*Require the application to include locations of proposed turbines in relation to state- or county-designated scenic highways.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, but only met towers, which will be located over a mile distant from Patterson Pass Road, which is listed as a scenic route in the County's Scenic Route Element. The distance and extremely narrow outline of the met masts will be almost invisible, with the exception of any lights required by the FAA for aviation safety on the single 80-meter mast. The three-year duration of the installation will minimize substantial adverse effects of such lighting.
Impact AES-4: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (significant and unavoidable – *findings of overriding considerations made at the program level*)	3.1-6 3.1-8–10	3.1-23–24	Would new turbines be placed in the southern portion of the program area, starting approximately 2.5 miles south of Patterson Pass Road, or in other areas where no turbines currently exist?	☒	☐	**Same as Impact AES-3.**	☒	☐	The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers.
Impact AES-5: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-6 3.1-10–11	3.1-27–28	Would turbine be located in a setback area? Are there residents nearby - i.e., within 500 meters [1,640 feet] in a generally east or west direction to account for all seasons? Could blades cause shadow flicker that would disturb sensitive viewers, especially residents?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-5: Analyze shadow flicker distance and mitigate effects or incorporate changes into project design to address shadow flicker** ■ During project design, the project applicant will prepare a graphic model and study to evaluate shadow flicker impacts on nearby residences. (see mitigation measure for details on thresholds) ■ If it is determined that existing setback requirements as established by the County are not sufficient to prevent shadow flicker impacts on residences, Alameda County will require an increase in the required setback distances to ensure that residences are not affected. ■ If any residence is nonetheless affected implement measures to minimize impact, such as relocating the turbine; providing opaque window coverings, window awnings, landscape buffers, or a combination of these features to reduce flicker to acceptable limits; or shutting down the turbine during the period shadow flicker would occur ■ Relocate turbine if property owner is not amenable to other mitigation measures (window coverings, etc.)	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show the locations of residences in relation to proposed turbine locations.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact AES-6: Consistency with state and local policies (less than significant with mitigation)	3.1-3–7	3.1-30	Would the project comply with measures set forth to protect visual resources along scenic roadways and open space areas identified for protection (Alameda County 1966) and comply with measures set forth in the ECAP to protect visual resources such as sensitive viewsheds, streets and highways, scenic highways, and areas affected by windfarms (Alameda County 2000)?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2a: Require site development review prior to approval of site plans** ■ County to require, review, and approve Site Development Review prior to approval of site plans for new turbines along ridgelines that have not previously been developed with wind turbine strings a separate Site Development Review ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2b: Maintain site free of debris and restore abandoned roadways** ■ Clean all derelict equipment , debris, and litter ■ Restore and hydroseed abandoned roads (unless otherwise recommended by USFWS or CDFW) ■ Maintain site in such a manner ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-2c: Screen surplus parts and materials** ■ Maintain sites where surplus parts and materials are kept in a neat and orderly fashion ■ Screen sites from view ☐ **Mitigation Measure AES-5: Analyze shadow flicker distance and mitigate effects or incorporate changes into project design to address shadow flicker** ■ During project design, the project applicant will prepare a graphic model and study to evaluate shadow flicker impacts on nearby residences. (see mitigation measure for details on thresholds) ■ If it is determined that existing setback requirements as established by the County are not sufficient to prevent shadow flicker impacts on residences, Alameda County will require an increase in the required setback distances to ensure that residences are not affected. ■ If any residence is nonetheless affected implement measures to minimize impact, such as relocating the turbine; providing opaque window coverings, window awnings, landscape buffers, or a combination of these features to reduce flicker to acceptable limits; or shutting down the turbine during the period shadow flicker would occur ■ Relocate turbine if property owner is not amenable to other mitigation measures (window coverings, etc.)	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show the locations of residences in relation to proposed turbine locations.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers. *Require the application to include locations of proposed turbines in relation to state- or county-designated scenic highways.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers. *Require the application to include mapping to show locations of existing turbines in relation to new proposed turbines.* The proposed project does not involve the construction of turbines, only met towers. *Require the application to include mapping or photo simulations to show areas visible from recreation areas or trails.* The proposed project may be visible from Patterson Pass Road, which is a mapped Major Rural Road, however the use is temporary and visibility is expected to be minimal for most met towers.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Agricultural Resources									
Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use (less than significant with mitigation)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-7–8	Would project components be built on Prime Farmland?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AG-1: Avoid conversion of Prime Farmland** ■ Do not place wind turbines or other related facilities/infrastructure in locations that would result in the permanent conversion of land that is Prime Farmland or Farmland of State Importance	☒	☐	See Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR for the location of prime farmland in the program area. No prime farmland is withing the project area based on Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR.
Impact AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract (no impact)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-9	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☒	☐	**Note:** Wind turbines are a conditionally permitted use in the agricultural zone applied to the program area and are a compatible use, allowed under the Williamson Act contracts for grazing land covering the program area. Therefore, repowering projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	The proposed met towers would be a related use to wind turbines, which are a compatible use allowed under Williamson Act contract, as noted.
Impact AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (no impact)	3.2-3 3.2-6	3.2-10	Would project features be built in forest or timber land?	☒	☐	**Note:** There is no forest land in the program area. Therefore, repowering projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	
Impact AG-4: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (no impact)	Same as previous	Same as previous	Same as previous	☒	☐	**Note:** There is no forest land in the program area. Therefore, repowering projects would result in no impact.	☒	☐	
Impact AG-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use(less than significant with mitigation)	3.2-1–4 3.24–6	3.2-11	Would project features be built on Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or forest land?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AG-1: Avoid conversion of Prime Farmland** ■ Do not place wind turbines or other related facilities/infrastructure in locations that would result in the permanent conversion of land that is Prime Farmland or Farmland of State Importance	☒	☐	See Figure 3.2-1 of the PEIR for the location of prime farmland in the program area. No Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or forest land are within the proposed project area.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Air Quality									
Impact AQ-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan(less than significant)	3.3-1–7	3.3-19	Would the project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☒	☐	Repowering projects and other related activities that would not result in substantial increase in employment would fall within the impact assessed in the PEIR under Impact AQ-1.	☒	☐	The proposed project includes the construction of temporary met towers for the purposes of evaluating wind conditions for future repowering. This activity is covered in the PEIR.
Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (significant and unavoidable)	3.3-1–7	3.3-21	Would project construction create air quality conditions that violate air quality standards? Would project operation create air quality conditions that violate air quality standards? Would the project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures** ■ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP ☐ **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing measures based on BAAQMD's Additional Construction Mitigation Measures** ■ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP **Note:** Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a and AQ-2b would not reduce total construction-related ROG or NOX emissions of projects such as those assessed in the PEIR to a less-than-significant level. This impact of total ROG and NOX emissions would be significant and unavoidable as identified in the PEIR.	☒	☐	Because the analysis in the PEIR was based on a typical project, air quality modeling performed for a specific proposed project could show emissions levels below the standards. If air emissions modeling prepared for the proposed project and submitted with the application shows that the emissions levels for the specific project would not exceed the standards, the mitigation measures would not be required. Otherwise, the PEIR mitigation measures would be required and a project such as those assessed in the PEIR would be considered to have the significant and unavoidable impact as identified in the PEIR. The proposed project is minor involving a few small trucks and would not violate air quality standards.
Impact AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)(significant and unavoidable for construction and less than significant for operation)	3.3-1–7	3.3-37	Would the project create new permanent stationary sources of criteria pollutants or increase criteria pollutant emissions from any existing stationary sources? Would the project result in an increase in ROG, NOX, PM10, or PM2.5? Would the project include activities not covered in the PEIR?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure AQ-2a: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures** ■ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP ☐ **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b: Reduce construction-related air pollutant emissions by implementing measures based on BAAQMD's Additional Construction Mitigation Measures** ■ Implement mitigation measures shown in MMRP **Note:** Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2a and AQ-2b would not reduce total construction-related ROG or NOX emissions to a less-than-significant level. This impact of total ROG and NOX emissions would be significant and unavoidable.	☒	☐	Because the analysis in the PEIR was based on a typical project, air quality modeling performed for a specific proposed project could show emissions levels below the standards. If air emissions modeling prepared for the proposed project and submitted with the application shows that the emissions levels for the specific project would not exceed the standards, the mitigation measures would not be required. Otherwise, the PEIR mitigation measures would be required and a project such as those assessed in the PEIR would be considered to have the significant and unavoidable impact as identified in the PEIR. The proposed project is minor involving a few small trucks and would not violate air quality standards.
Impact AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations(less than significant with mitigation)	3.3-14	3.3-40	Would the project be located near sensitive receptors? The closest sensitive receptors to the program area are a community of single-family residences in the city of Livermore located approximately 4,500 feet to the west of the program area boundary and the Mountain House community located approximately 5,000 feet to the east of the program area boundary.	☒	☐	**Same as Impact AQ-3.**	☒	☐	The nearest residence to a proposed met mast location is approximately 1.1 miles away.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people(less than significant)	3.3-14	3.3-41	Would the project include activities not covered in the PEIR? Would the project cause objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	**Note:** It is anticipated that "The program would result in the development of new wind turbine generators that would not result in objectionable odors. Although program construction would involve the use of diesel equipment and a temporary batch plant that could result in the creation of odors, the construction activities would be temporary (approximately 5 years), spatially dispersed over the 49,202-acre program area, and would take place in areas that are not in the vicinity of sensitive receptors. Therefore, the program would not affect a substantial number of people." Potential odors from repowering projects and other related activities as described in the PEIR would fall within the impact assessed in the PEIR and be less than significant. If the project includes activities not covered in the PEIR the impact could be significant and will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	The proposed proejct would not create odors and would be located at least 1.1 miles from the nearest residence.
Biological Resources									
Impact BIO-1: Potential for ground-disturbing activities to result in adverse effects on special-status plants or habitat occupied by special-status plants (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–6 3.4-22–25	3.4-60	Would project construction affect special-status plants or habitat occupied by special-status plants?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Conduct surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status plant species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status plant species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices shown in MM BIO-1b and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Avoid and minimize impacts on special-status plant species by establishing activity exclusion zones** ■ Establish activity exclusion zones around special-status plant species if construction will occur within 250 feet of the occupied habitat ■ If exclusion zone is to be smaller, consult with qualified biologist and obtain concurrence from CDFW. **Note:** All impacts on large-flowered fiddleneck, diamond-petaled California poppy, and caper-fruited tropidocarpum must be avoided, impacts on other special-status plant species will be avoided to the extent feasible, and any impacts related to avoidance being infeasible will be addressed through compensatory mitigation.	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The biological resources study concludes that no significant effects on special-status plants are anticipated.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project				**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text					**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: Compensate for impacts on special-status plant species** ■ Where avoidance of impacts on a special-status plant species is infeasible, compensate for through the acquisition, protection, and subsequent management in perpetuity of other existing occurrences at a 2:1 ratio (occurrences impacted: occurrences preserved). ■ Provide detailed information to the County and CDFW on the location of the preserved occurrences, quality of the preserved habitat, feasibility of protecting and managing the areas in-perpetuity, responsibility parties, and other pertinent information. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring			
Impact BIO-2: Adverse effects on special-status plants and natural communities resulting from the introduction and spread of invasive plant species(less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-3–4 3.4-8–21	3.4-65	Would construction vehicles have the potential to introduce invasive plant species into the project area?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare a Grassland Restoration Plan in coordination with CDFW ■ Receive CDFW approval of Grassland Restoration Plan ☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ■ File NOI with the State Water Board ■ Prepare SWPPP ■ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board **Note:** Erosion control reduces impacts related to invasive plants through erosion of soils in which they grow.	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The project would involve the use of construction vehicles which could introduce invasive plant species.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-3: Potential mortality of or loss of habitat for vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-28–29	3.4-67	Would the project occur in or near vernal pool habitat or drainages? Would the project involve road construction or widening? Would the project alter the hydrology or sedimentation? Would herbicides be used during operation or maintenance near or upstream of suitable habitat for curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle? Would the project involve road or firebreak maintenance?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Implement measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle** ■ Implement measures ■ Where impacts cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the Program EIR). ■ If an incidental take permit is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the permit in consultation with USFWS.	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The biological resources study concludes that impacts to vernal pool species are not likely because those habitats are not near the proposed met tower sites. No new roads would be constructed, and herbicides would not be used.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-4: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle(less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-25–28	3.4-71	Would the project cause the removal of elderberry shrubs during construction or operation? Would the project cause the trimming of elderberry shrubs during construction or operation? Would the project cause disturbance of elderberry roots within the shrub dripline? Would the project cause changes in topography or compaction of soil from construction in the vicinity of elderberry shrubs?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ■ Avoid removal of elderberry shrubs. ■ Protect elderberry shrubs/clusters within 100 feet of the construction area. (A qualified biologist will mark the elderberry shrubs and clusters and orange construction barrier fencing will be placed at the edge of the buffer areas.) ■ Receive approval from USFWS for buffer areas. No construction activities will be permitted within the buffer zone. ■ Post signs every 50 feet (15.2 meters) along the perimeter of the buffer area fencing... ■ Inspect buffer area fences around elderberry shrubs weekly by a qualified biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities and monthly after ground-disturbing activities until project construction is complete or until the fences are removed ■ Submit biological inspection reports to USFWS. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-4b: Compensate for direct and indirect effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ■ If elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided and protected as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4a, the project proponent will obtain an incidental take permit from USFWS. ■ If elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided and protected as outlined in Mitigation Measure 4a, the project proponent will compensate for the loss of any elderberry shrubs.	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine if mitigation measures are required.* A biologial resources survey and report was prepared which concludes no elderberry shrubs are present in the project area.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-5: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for California tiger salamander, western spadefoot, California red-legged frog, and foothill yellow-legged frog(less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-8–22 3.4-29–32	3.4-76	Would the project include any of the following activities? • Excavation, grading, or stockpiling of soil • Removal or disturbance of upland habitat • Installation of power collection and communication systems • Turbine construction • Road infrastructure construction/maintenance and upgrades • Meteorological tower installation and removal • Temporary staging area set-up • Reclamation • Operation and maintenance • Travel on maintenance roads	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** ■ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ■ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS (California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander) and from CDFW (California tiger salamander only) before construction begins. ■ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable project permits (e.g., ESA or CESA incidental take authorization). ■ Comply with the State of California State Water Resources Control Board NPDES construction general requirements for stormwater. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** ■ If impacts on aquatic and upland habitat for special-status amphibians cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the PEIR). ■ If take authorization is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the authorization in consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW. ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The proposed project involves a very small amount of disturbance to grassland habitat which can be mitigated through the use of best management practices described in MM BIO-1b, and through the restoration of any disturbed annual grasslands.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-6: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for western pond turtle (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-32–33	3.4-82	Would the project involve construction activities in or near ponds, reservoirs, drainages, or surrounding riparian and grassland areas? Would the project involve road construction or widening activities?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct preconstruction surveys for western pond turtle and monitor construction activities if turtles are observed** ■ Conduct surveys for western pond turtle one week before and within 24 hours of beginning work in suitable aquatic ■ Have a biological monitor present during construction activities in the aquatic habitat where the turtle was observed ■ Have a qualified biologist remove and relocate turtle to appropriate aquatic habitat outside and away from the construction area (relocation of western pond turtle requires a letter from CDFW authorizing this activity)	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine if mitigation measures are required.* The biologial resoruces survey and report indicates that habitat for western pond turtle is not present at the proposed met tower sites.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-7: Potential disturbance or mortality of and loss of suitable habitat for Blainville's horned lizard, Alameda whipsnake, and San Joaquin coachwhip (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-32–34	3.4-85	Would the project involve construction activities in grassland, chaparral, oak woodland, or scrub? Would the project involve road and firebreak maintenance activities in grassland, chaparral, oak woodland, or scrub?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles** ■ Implement best management practices shown in and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ■ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (Alameda whipsnake) before construction begins. ■ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable project permits (i.e., ESA incidental take permit). ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-7b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status reptiles** ■ If impacts on habitat for special-status reptiles cannot be avoided or minimized, compensatory mitigation will be undertaken in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the EIR). ■ If incidental take permits are required for Alameda whipsnake, compensatory mitigation will be undertaken in accordance with the terms of permits in consultation with USFWS and CDFW.	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A biologial resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that grassland habitats are present in the project area. Implementation of MM BIO-1b, best management practices, would ensure that effects are minimized.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-8: Potential construction-related disturbance or mortality of special-status and non–special-status migratory birds (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-34–42	3.4-89	Would construction occur during nesting season (generally February 1–August 31)?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non–special-status nesting birds** ■ Implement best management practices, including: – Preconstruction bird surveys – Coordination with USFW on golden eagles – Coordination with CDFW and USFWS on active nests ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** ■ Implement best management practices, including: – Preconstruction burrowing owl surveys – Coordination with CDFW on active burrowing owl nests – Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl buffer – Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl exclusion plan	☒	☐	The proposed project may be constructed between Feb 1-August 31. Implementation of MM BIO-1b, best management practices, MM BIO-8a, preconstruction surveys for birds, and MM BIO-8b, preconstruction surveys for burrowing owl, would ensure that effects are minimized .

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-9: Permanent and temporary loss of occupied habitat for western burrowing owl and foraging habitat for tricolored blackbird and other special-status and non–special-status birds (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-34–42	3.4-94	Would the project result in the temporary or permanent loss of grassland?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** ■ If impacts on aquatic and upland habitat for special-status amphibians cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C of the EIR). ■ If take authorization is required, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of the authorization in consultation with USFWS and/or CDFW. ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Compensate for the permanent loss of occupied habitat for western burrowing owl** ■ If construction activities would result in the removal of occupied burrowing owl habitat, permanently protect mitigation land through a conservation easement or implement alternative mitigation ■ Consult with CDFW, as described in its Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (California Department of Fish and Game 2012:11–13), to develop the compensation plan ■ Submit compensation plan for County review and approval	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The biologial survey and report indicates that the project would result in the temporary loss of grassland. Implementation of MM BIO-5c would reduce the potential impact. Compensation measures are not necessary to reduce the impact to less than significant considering the size of the project and amount of potential disturbance.
Impact BIO-10: Potential injury or mortality of and loss of habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-45–46	3.4-96	Would the project result in temporary or permanent impacts on grassland? Would the project use vehicles that could hit San Joaquin kit fox or American badger? Would the project have exposed pipes, large excavated holes, or trenches that could entrap San Joaquin kit foxes or American badgers? Would the project have operation or maintenance activities, such as road and firebreak maintenance?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The biologial survey and report indicates that the project would result in the temporary loss of grassland which could be habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and other species. Implementation of MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-5c, and MM BIO-10a would reduce the potential impact. Compensation measures are not necessary to reduce the impact to less than significant considering the size of the project and amount of potential disturbance.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project					**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
						☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ■ Implement BMPs, including: – Preconstruction San Joaquin kit fox and American badger surveys – Conducting preconstruction surveys no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of ground disturbance, or any activity likely to affect San Joaquin kit fox – Submission of results of the preconstruction survey including the locations of any potential or known San Joaquin kit fox dens to USFWS ■ If implementation of some of these BMPs requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (San Joaquin kit fox) before construction begins. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-10b: Compensate for loss of suitable habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ■ If permanent impacts on habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger cannot be avoided or minimized, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with mitigation ratios and requirements developed under the EACCS (Appendix C in EIR). ■ If incidental take permits are required for San Joaquin kit fox, undertake compensatory mitigation in accordance with the terms of permits in consultation with USFWS and CDFW.			.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-11: Avian mortality resulting from interaction with wind energy facilities (significant and unavoidable)	3.4-1–8 3.4-46–49	3.4-102	Would the project include turbines or powerlines?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11a: Prepare a project-specific avian protection plan** ■ Prepare a project-specific avian protection plan (APP) ■ Submit a draft project-specific APP to the County for review by the TAC ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11b: Site turbines to minimize potential mortality of birds** ■ Conduct a siting process ■ Prepare a siting analysis to select turbine locations to minimize potential impacts on bird and bat species ■ Use model to identify dangerous locations for birds and bats based on site-specific risk factors ■ Include siting analysis and model results for each turbine in project-specific APP ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11c: Use turbine designs that reduce avian impacts** ■ Implement the following design-related measures: – Select designs that have been shown or that are suspected to reduce avian fatalities, based on the height, color, configuration, or other features of the turbines – Limit or eliminate perching opportunities – Limit or eliminate nesting or roosting opportunities – Install lighting on the fewest number of turbines allowed by FAA regulations, and all pilot warning lights will fire synchronously. Use only red or dual red-and-white strobe, strobe-like, or flashing lights and operate at the minimum allowable intensity, flashing frequency, and quantity allowed by FAA ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11d: Incorporate avian-safe practices into design of turbine-related infrastructure** ■ Implement avian-safe practices ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11e: Retrofit existing infrastructure to minimize risk to raptors** ■ Retrofit any existing power lines in a specific project area that are owned by the wind project operator and are associated with electrocution of an eagle or other raptor, within 30 days, to make them raptor-safe according to Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines. ■ Retrofit all other existing structures to remain in a project area during repowering, as feasible, according to specifications of Mitigation Measure BIO-11c prior to repowered turbine operation.	☒	☐	The proposed project would include the construction of guyed met towers which could interact with avian species. Implementation of MM BIO-11d would include the use of avian safe measures and practices which would reduce the potential impact. Other measures are applicable only to wind turbine projects and thus do not apply to this impact.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project					**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11f: Discourage prey for raptors** ■ Apply the following measures when designing and siting turbine-related infrastructure to minimize opportunities for fossorial mammals to become established – Do not use rodenticide on the project site to avoid the risk of raptors scavenging the remains of poisoned animals – Place boulders (rocks more than 12 inches in diameter) excavated during project construction in aboveground piles more than 500 meters (1,640 feet) from any turbine – Move existing rock piles created during construction of first- and second-generation turbines at least 500 meters (1,640 feet) from turbines – Place gravel around each tower foundation to discourage small mammals from burrowing near turbines ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11g: Implement postconstruction avian fatality monitoring for all repowering projects** ■ Implement the postconstruction monitoring program, including: – Conducting fatality monitoring for a minimum of 3 years – Forming a technical advisory committee (TAC) – Conducting carcass surveys – Providing for avian use surveys to be conducted within the project area boundaries for a minimum of 30 minutes duration – Submitting raw data and annual reports to the County ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11h: Compensate for the loss of raptors and other avian species, including golden eagles, by contributing to conservation efforts** ■ Implement the compensation measures, including submitting to the County for approval specific conservation effort to be pursued as part of the avian conservation strategy review process ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11i: Implement an avian adaptive management program** ■ Implement the adaptive management program in MM BIO-11i if fatality monitoring described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11g results in an estimate that exceeds the preconstruction baseline fatality estimates (i.e., estimates at the nonrepowered turbines as described in this PEIR) for any focal species or species group (i.e., individual focal species, all focal species, all raptors, all non-raptors, all birds combined). This includes: ■ Preparing a project-specific adaptive management plan within 2 months following the availability of the fatality monitoring results ■ Implementing the project-specific adaptive management plans within 2 months of approval by the County			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-12: Potential mortality or disturbance of bats from roost removal or disturbance (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-127	Would the project construction or decommissioning involve any of the following activities? • Increased traffic, noise, lighting, or human access • Removal or disturbance of trees, rock outcrops, debris piles, outbuildings, or other artificial structures • Removal of special-status species' roost structures	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-12a: Conduct bat roost surveys** ■ Prior to development of any repowering project, conduct a roost habitat assessment to identify potential colonial roost sites of special-status and common bat species within 750 feet of the construction area ■ If suitable roost sites are to be removed or otherwise affected by the proposed project, conduct targeted roost surveys of all identified sites that would be affected (several separate survey visits may be required) ■ At the completion of the roost surveys, submit a report documenting areas surveyed, methods, results, and mapping of high-quality habitat or confirmed roost locations ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-12b: Avoid removing or disturbing bat roosts** ■ Do not disturb active bat roosts and provide a minimum buffer of 500 feet where preexisting disturbance is moderate or 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal ■ Confirm buffer distances and determination of the need for a biological monitor for active maternity roosts or hibernacula in consultation with CDFW. ■ Wherever feasible, leave structures (natural or artificial) showing evidence of significant bat use within the past year in place as habitat ■ Consult with CDFW should such a structure need to be removed or disturbed ■ Provide environmental awareness training to construction personnel, establish buffers, and initiate consultation with CDFW if needed ■ Shield and angle artificial night lighting within 500 feet of any roost in such that bats may enter and exit the roost without artificial illumination and the roost does not receive artificial exposure to visual predators ■ Conduct tree and vegetation removal outside the maternity season (April 1–September 15) ■ If a maternity roost or hibernaculum is present within 500 feet of the construction site where preexisting disturbance is moderate or within 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal, have a qualified biological monitor onsite during groundbreaking activities	☒	☐	Impacts to bat species are unlikely but any potential impacts could be mitigated through implementation of BMP's outlined in MM BIO-1b.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-13: Potential for construction activities to temporarily remove or alter bat foraging habitat (less than significant)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-130	Would project construction degrade bat foraging habitat by replacing vegetation with nonvegetated land cover types?	☒	☐	Loss or degradation of bat foraging habitat by replacing vegetation with and by creating a temporary increase in traffic, noise, and artificial night lighting in the program area, reducing the extent of landscape available for foraging would fall within the impact assessed in the PEIR and be less than significant because the amount of landscape returned to foraging habitat in the process of decommissioning the first- and second-generation turbines would offset the amount of foraging habitat lost to repowering activities.	☒	☐	
Impact BIO-14: Turbine-related fatalities of special-status and other bats (significant and unavoidable – *findings of overriding considerations made with the program EIR*)	3.4-1–8 3.4-42–45	3.4-131	Would the project involve turbines?	☒	☐	**Note:** These mitigation measures will not reduce the impact to less than significant ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14a: Site and select turbines to minimize potential mortality of bats** ■ Use the best information available to site turbines and to select from turbine models in such a manner as to reduce bat collision risk; measures include siting turbines the greatest distance feasible up to 500 meters (1,640) feet from still or flowing bodies of water, riparian habitat, known roosts, and tree stands (California Bat Working Group 2006:6). ■ Conduct a bat habitat assessment and roost survey to identify and map habitat of potential significance to bats ■ Incorporate relevant bat use survey data and bat fatality records published by other projects in the APWRA into turbine siting decisions ■ Carry out roost surveys according to the methods described in Mitigation Measure-BIO-12a.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14b: Implement postconstruction bat fatality monitoring program for all repowering projects** ■ Implement a scientifically defensible, postconstruction bat fatality monitoring program ■ Include on the TAC at least one biologist with significant expertise in bat research and wind energy impacts on bats ■ Conduct bat acoustic surveys concurrently with fatality monitoring in the project area ■ Modify the fatality search protocol will be implemented to obtain better information on the number and timing of bat fatalities ■ Use bat carcasses in detection probability trials to develop bat-specific detection probabilities ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14c: Prepare and publish annual monitoring reports on the findings of bat use of the project area and fatality monitoring results** ■ Produce annual reports of bat use results and fatality monitoring within 3 months of the end of the last day of fatality monitoring ■ Report special-status bat species records to CNDDB ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14d: Develop and implement a bat adaptive management plan** ■ In concert with Mitigation Measure BIO-14b, develop adaptive management plans to ensure appropriate, feasible, and current incorporation of emerging information ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14e: Compensate for expenses incurred by rehabilitating injured bats** ■ Assume in full the cost of reasonable, licensed rehabilitation efforts for any injured bats taken to wildlife care facilities from the program area			
Impact BIO-15: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on alkali meadow (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-10–11	3.4-141	Would the project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in alkali meadow habitat? Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in alkali meadow habitat?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Compensate for the loss of alkali meadow habitat** ■ If alkali meadow habitat is filled or disturbed, compensate for the loss of this habitat ■ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ■ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine if mitigation measures are required.* A biological resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that alkali meadow habitat is not present in the project area.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-16: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on riparian habitat (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-14–15	3.4-142	Would the project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in riparian habitat? Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in riparian habitat?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Compensate for the loss of riparian habitat** ■ If riparian habitat is filled or removed as part of a project, compensate for the loss of riparian habitat ■ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ■ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A biologial resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that riparian habitats are not present in the project areat.
Impact BIO-17: Potential for ground-disturbing activities to result in direct adverse effects on common habitats (less than significant)	3.4-8–21	3.4-143	Would the project cause ground disturbance in common habitats? Would the project not include the following measures, which are part of the project, as described in Chapter 2, *Program Description*, of the EIR? • develop a reclamation plan in coordination with the County, USFWS, and CDFW • ensure the reclamation plan is completed and approved by the County 6 months in advance of project decommissioning	☒	☐	**Note**: No mitigation is required for projects as described in the PEIR because all lands disturbed by infrastructure installation or removal would be returned to preproject conditions per the County required reclamation plan. If the project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* The proposed project would include a reclamation plan and thus there would be no impact.
Impact BIO-18: Potential for road infrastructure upgrades to result in adverse effects on wetlands (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-1–8 3.4-15–17	3.4-145	Would the project involve grading, widening, or regravelling of existing roads or construction of new roads in wetlands? Would existing culverts be upgraded or new culverts installed in wetlands?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Compensate for the loss of wetlands** ■ If wetlands are filled or disturbed as part of a project, compensate for the loss of this habitat functions ■ Determine compensation ratios through coordination with state and federal agencies (CDFW, USFWS, USACE) ■ Develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan	☒	☐	*Use biological resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A biologial resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that wetlands are not present in the project area.
Impact BIO-19: Potential impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites (significant and unavoidable - *findings of overriding considerations made with the program EIR*))	3.4-1–8 3.4-25–49	3.4-146	Would the project involve construction activities or fencing of work areas?	☐	☒	**Note:** These mitigation measures will not reduce the impact to less than significant ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ■ Retain a qualified biologist to conduct monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct preconstruction surveys for habitat for special-status wildlife species** ■ Conduct surveys for the special-status wildlife species within and adjacent to all project sites no more than 3 years prior to construction	☒	☐	The proposed project may impact the movement of migratory species, however implementation of MM BIO-1b, BMP's, BIO-5c, grassland restoration, and BIO-11d, use of avian safe measures, would ensure that effects are minimized.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ■ Avoid removal of elderberry shrubs. ■ Protect elderberry shrubs/clusters within 100 feet of the construction area. (A qualified biologist will mark the elderberry shrubs and clusters and orange construction barrier fencing will be placed at the edge of the buffer areas.) ■ Receive approval from USFWS for buffer areas. No construction activities will be permitted within the buffer zone. ■ Post signs every 50 feet (15.2 meters) along the perimeter of the buffer area fencing... ■ Inspect buffer area fences around elderberry shrubs weekly by a qualified biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities and monthly after ground-disturbing activities until project construction is complete or until the fences are removed ■ Submit biological inspection reports to USFWS. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ■ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS (California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander) and from CDFW (California tiger salamander only) before construction begins. ■ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable project permits (e.g., ESA or CESA incidental take authorization). ■ Comply with the State of California State Water Resources Control Board NPDES construction general requirements for stormwater. ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ■ Prepare and submit a Grasslands Restoration Plan within 30 days prior to any ground disturbance			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles** ■ Implement best management practices and incorporate them into individual project design and construction documents ■ If implementation of some of these measures requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (Alameda whipsnake) before construction begins. ■ Implement additional conservation measures or conditions of approval in applicable project permits (i.e., ESA incidental take permit). ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non–special-status nesting birds** ■ Implement best management practices, including: – Preconstruction bird surveys – Coordination with USFW on golden eagles ■ Coordination with CDFW and USFWS on active nests ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** ■ Implement best management practices, including: – Preconstruction burrowing owl surveys – Coordination with CDFW on active burrowing owl nests – Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl buffer – Coordination with CDFW on burrowing owl exclusion plan ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ■ Implement BMPs, including: – Preconstruction San Joaquin kit fox and American badger surveys – Conducting preconstruction surveys no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of ground disturbance, or any activity likely to affect San Joaquin kit fox – Submission of results of the preconstruction survey including the locations of any potential or known San Joaquin kit fox dens to USFWS ■ If implementation of some of these BMPs requires a take permit, obtain incidental take permits from USFWS and CDFW (San Joaquin kit fox) before construction begins.			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project					**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11b: Site turbines to minimize potential mortality of birds** ■ Conduct a siting process ■ Prepare a siting analysis to select turbine locations to minimize potential impacts on bird and bat species ■ Use model to identify dangerous locations for birds and bats based on site-specific risk factors ■ Include siting analysis and model results for each turbine in project-specific APP ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11c: Use turbine designs that reduce avian impacts** ■ Implement the following design-related measures: – Select designs that have been shown or that are suspected to reduce avian fatalities, based on the height, color, configuration, or other features of the turbines – Limit or eliminate perching opportunities – Limit or eliminate nesting or roosting opportunities – Install lighting on the fewest number of turbines allowed by FAA regulations, and all pilot warning lights will fire synchronously. Use only red or dual red-and-white strobe, strobe-like, or flashing lights and operate at the minimum allowable intensity, flashing frequency, and quantity allowed by FAA ☒ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11d: Incorporate avian-safe practices into design of turbine-related infrastructure** ■ Implement avian-safe practices ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11e: Retrofit existing infrastructure to minimize risk to raptors** ■ Retrofit any existing power lines in a specific project area that are owned by the wind project operator and are associated with electrocution of an eagle or other raptor, within 30 days, to make them raptor-safe according to Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines. ■ Retrofit all other existing structures to remain in a project area during repowering, as feasible, according to specifications of Mitigation Measure BIO-11c prior to repowered turbine operation.			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project					**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-11i: Implement an avian adaptive management program** ■ Implement the adaptive management program if fatality monitoring described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11g results in an estimate that exceeds the preconstruction baseline fatality estimates (i.e., estimates at the nonrepowered turbines as described in this PEIR) for any focal species or species group (i.e., individual focal species, all focal species, all raptors, all non-raptors, all birds combined). This includes: – Preparing a project-specific adaptive management plan within 2 months following the availability of the fatality monitoring results – Implementing the project-specific adaptive management plans within 2 months of approval by the County ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-12a: Conduct bat roost surveys** ■ Prior to development of any repowering project, conduct a roost habitat assessment to identify potential colonial roost sites of special-status and common bat species within 750 feet of the construction area ■ If suitable roost sites are to be removed or otherwise affected by the proposed project, conduct targeted roost surveys of all identified sites that would be affected (several separate survey visits may be required) ■ At the completion of the roost surveys, submit a report documenting areas surveyed, methods, results, and mapping of high-quality habitat or confirmed roost locations			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-12b: Avoid removing or disturbing bat roosts** ■ Do not disturb active bat roosts and provide a minimum buffer of 500 feet where preexisting disturbance is moderate or 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal ■ Confirm buffer distances and determination of the need for a biological monitor for active maternity roosts or hibernacula in consultation with CDFW. ■ Wherever feasible, leave structures (natural or artificial) showing evidence of significant bat use within the past year in place as habitat ■ Consult with CDFW should such a structure need to be removed or disturbed ■ Provide environmental awareness training to construction personnel, establish buffers, and initiate consultation with CDFW if needed ■ Shield and angle artificial night lighting within 500 feet of any roost in such that bats may enter and exit the roost without artificial illumination and the roost does not receive artificial exposure to visual predators ■ Conduct tree and vegetation removal outside the maternity season (April 1–September 15) ■ If a maternity roost or hibernaculum is present within 500 feet of the construction site where preexisting disturbance is moderate or within 750 feet where preexisting disturbance is minimal, have a qualified biological monitor onsite during groundbreaking activities ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14a: Site and select turbines to minimize potential mortality of bats** ■ Use the best information available to site turbines and to select from turbine models in such a manner as to reduce bat collision risk; measures include siting turbines the greatest distance feasible up to 500 meters (1,640) feet from still or flowing bodies of water, riparian habitat, known roosts, and tree stands (California Bat Working Group 2006:6). ■ Conduct a bat habitat assessment and roost survey to identify and map habitat of potential significance to bats ■ Incorporate relevant bat use survey data and bat fatality records published by other projects in the APWRA into turbine siting decisions ■ Carry out roost surveys according to the methods described in Mitigation Measure-BIO-12a. ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-14d: Develop and implement a bat adaptive management plan** ■ In concert with Mitigation Measure BIO-14b, develop adaptive management plans to ensure appropriate, feasible, and current incorporation of emerging information			

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact BIO-20: Conflict with local plans or policies (less than significant with mitigation)	3.4-6–8	3.4-153	Would project construction or operation cause the loss of special-status species or their habitat, loss of alkali meadow, loss of riparian habitat, or loss of existing wetlands?	☒	☐	**Note:** The mitigation measures below are not repeated here because they are addressed above ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Conduct surveys to determine the presence or absence of special-status species** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize impacts on special-status species** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Avoid and minimize impacts on special-status plant species by establishing activity exclusion zones** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: Compensate for impacts on special-status plant species** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: Retain a biological monitor during ground-disturbing activities in environmentally sensitive areas** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Implement measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on vernal pool branchiopods and curved-footed hygrotus diving beetle** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-4a: Implement measures to avoid or protect habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-4b: Compensate for direct and indirect effects on valley elderberry longhorn beetle** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status amphibians** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status amphibians** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-5c: Restore disturbed annual grasslands** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-7a: Implement best management practices to avoid and minimize effects on special-status reptiles** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-7b: Compensate for loss of habitat for special-status reptiles** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on special-status and non-special-status nesting birds** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-8b: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on western burrowing owl** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Compensate for the permanent loss of foraging habitat for western burrowing owl** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-10a: Implement measures to avoid and minimize potential impacts on San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-10b: Compensate for loss of suitable habitat for San Joaquin kit fox and American badger** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Compensate for the loss of alkali meadow habitat**	☒	☒	The proposed project would not conflict with local plans or policies protecting biological resources.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Compensate for the loss of riparian habitat** ☐ **Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Compensate for the loss of wetlands**			
Impact BIO-21: Conflict with provisions of an adopted HCP/NCCP or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan (no impact)	NA	3.4-158	Would the project include activities that are not within the scope of the project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the program area. If the proposed project does not fall within the scope of activities described in the PEIR but the project would not conflict with the EACCS, there would be no impact.	☒	☐	
Cultural									
Impact CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (less than significant with mitigation)	3.5-1–3 3.5-6–12	3.5-15	Are any historic architectural resources located in the project area?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure CUL-1a: Avoid historic resources** ■ Where feasible, avoid historic resources in design and layout of a proposed project in the program area ☐ **Mitigation Measure CUL-1b: Appropriate recordation of historic resources** ■ If Mitigation Measure CUL-1a is determined to be infeasible, record the significantly affected historic resource following the guidelines of NPS, HABS, or HAER and provide the documentation to NPS, the SHPO, and local repositories as determined by Alameda County	☒	☐	*Use cultural resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A cultural resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that there are no historic architectural resources present in the project area.
Impact CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource(less than significant with mitigation)	3.5-1–12	3.5-17	Would the project involve ground-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: Conduct a preconstruction cultural field survey and cultural resources inventory and evaluation** ■ Conduct an archaeological field survey of the program area and include the documentation and result of these efforts, the evaluation of any cultural resources identified during the survey, and cultural resources monitoring ☐ **Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Develop a treatment plan for any identified significant cultural resources** ■ If any significant resources are identified through the preconstruction survey, develop and implement a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery ☒ **Mitigation Measure CUL-2c: Conduct worker awareness training for archaeological resources prior to construction** ■ Prior to the initiation of any site preparation and/or the start of construction, ensure that all construction workers receive training overseen by a qualified professional archaeologist who is experienced in teaching nonspecialists, to ensure that forepersons and field supervisors can recognize archaeological resources	☒	☐	*Use cultural resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A cultural resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that no cultural resources were observed In the project area. Buried cultural resources could be present in the project area and could be encountered during construction.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
						☒ **Mitigation Measure CUL-2d: Stop work if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities** ■ In the construction specifications, include a stop-work order if prehistoric or historic-era cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities ■ If such resources are encountered, immediately halt all activity within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. ■ If the find is determined to be potentially develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery			
Impact CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (less than significant with mitigation)	3.5-1–3	3.5-20	Would the project involve ground-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Stop work if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities** ■ In the construction specifications, include a stop-work order if human remains are discovered ■ Do not excavate or disturb the site within a 100-foot radius of the location of such discovery, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains ■ Notify the Alameda County Coroner	☒	☐	A cultural resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that no cultural resources were observed In the project area. Buried cultural resources could be present in the project area and could be encountered during construction.
Geology, Soils, Mineral Resources, and Paleontological Resources									
Impact GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of rupture of a known earthquake fault (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1–9 3.6-9–13	3.6-19	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ■ Prior to construction activities at any site, retain a geotechnical firm with local expertise in geotechnical investigation and design to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report ■ Submit site-specific geotechnical report to the County building department ■ Incorporate geotechnical recommendations into project design	☒	☐	
Impact GEO-2: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of strong seismic ground shaking (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1–9 3.6-9–13	3.6-21	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ■ See Impact Geo-1	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact GEO-3: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of seismic-related ground failure, including landsliding and liquefaction (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1–9 3.6-9–13	3.6-24	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ■ See Impact Geo-1	☒	☐	
Impact GEO-4: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, as a result of landsliding (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1–9 3.6-9–13	3.6-26	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ■ See Impact Geo-1	☒	☐	
Impact GEO-5: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (less than significant)	3.6-1–9 3.6-14–15	3.6-28	Would the project not include the following measures, which are part of the project, as described in Chapter 2, *Program Description*, of the EIR? • prepare a SWPPP • develop a reclamation plan in coordination with the County, USFWS, and CDFW • ensure the reclamation plan is completed and approved by the County 6 months in advance of project decommissioning	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact GEO-6: Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-1–9 3.6-14–15	3.6-31	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct site-specific geotechnical investigation and implement design recommendations in subsequent geotechnical report** ■ See Impact Geo-1	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact GEO-7: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (less than significant with mitigation)	3.6-4 3.6-15–17	3.6-32	Would the project involve ground-disturbing earthwork associated with construction?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure GEO-7a: Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to monitor significant ground-disturbing activities** ■ Retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined by the SVP's Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (2010) to monitor activities with the potential to disturb sensitive paleontological resources ■ Monitor ground-disturbing activities as determined by the professional paleontologist (in general, these activities include any ground-disturbing activities involving excavation deeper than 3 feet in areas with high potential to contain sensitive paleontological resources) ■ Prepare recovered fossils so that they can be properly documented and ensure they are curated at an appropriate facility ☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-7b: Educate construction personnel in recognizing fossil material** ■ Ensure that all construction personnel receive training provided by a qualified professional paleontologist experienced in teaching non-specialists to ensure that they can recognize fossil materials in the event any are discovered during construction. ☒ **Mitigation Measure GEO-7c: Stop work if substantial fossil remains are encountered during construction** ■ If substantial fossil remains (particularly vertebrate remains) are discovered during earth disturbing activities, stop activities within 100 feet of the find immediately until a state-registered professional geologist or qualified professional paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find and a qualified professional paleontologist can recommend appropriate treatment. ■ Ensure that recommendations regarding treatment and reporting are implemented	☒	☐	*Use cultural resources study submitted with project application to determine which mitigation measures are required.* A cultural resources survey and report was prepared which concludes that no cultural resources were observed In the project area. Buried fossil materials could be present in the project area and could be encountered during construction.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions									
Impact GHG-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (less than significant)	3.7-1–7 3.7-7–11	3.7-16	Would the project include activities that are not within the scope of the project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project would include activities unrelated to wind power generation, the GHG impacts generated by the project would not be offset by the wind power generation related reduction in GHGs described in Impact GHG-1. However, if the project itself would result in a net reduction of CO_{2e} per year, the impact is less than significant.	☒	☐	The project would involve the use of vehicles that emit greenhouse gases (trucks and other equipment), however the use of these vehicles is unlikely to conflict with applicable plans for reducing greenhouse gases. Implementation of MM GHG-2a and GHG-2d would ensure that effects are minimzed

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (less than significant with mitigation)	3.7-1–7 3.7-7–11	3.7-24	Would the project use vehicles that emit greenhouse gases?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure GHG-2a: Implement best available control technology for heavy-duty vehicles** ■ Document that the vehicles used for project construction meet the specified requirements ☐ **Mitigation Measure GHG-2b: Install low SF6 leak rate circuit breakers and monitoring** ■ Ensure that any new circuit breaker installed at a substation has a guaranteed SF6 leak rate of 0.5% by volume or less ■ Provide Alameda County with documentation of compliance, such as specification sheets, prior to installation of the circuit breaker ■ Monitor the SF6-containing circuit breakers at the substation consistent with Scoping Plan Measure H-6 for the detection and repair of leaks ☐ **Mitigation Measure GHG-2c: Require new construction to use building materials containing recycled content** ■ In the construction of all new substation and other permanent buildings, incorporate materials for which the sum of post-consumer recycled content plus one-half of the post-industrial content constitutes at least 10% of the total value of the materials in the project ☒ **Mitigation Measure GHG-2d: Comply with construction and demolition debris management ordinance** ■ Comply with the County's revised Green Building Ordinance regarding construction and demolition debris as follows: (1) 100% of inert waste and 50% wood/vegetative/scrap metal not including Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) and unsalvageable material will be put to other beneficial uses at landfills, and (2) 100% of inert materials (concrete and asphalt) will be recycled or put to beneficial reuse.	☒	☐	The project would involve the use of vehicles that emit greenhouse gases (trucks and other equipment), however the use of these vehicles is unlikely to conflict with applicable plans for reducing greenhouse gases. Implementation of MM GHG-2a and GHG-2d would ensure that effects are minimzed.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials									
Impact HAZ-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (less than significant)	3.8-1–6 3.8-6–9	3.8-10	Would the project <u>NOT</u> implement the following BMPs and procedures? • Standard construction BMPs to reduce pollutant emissions during construction • BMPs to reduce the potential for or exposure to accidental spills involving the use of hazardous materials • Procedures to carefully disassemble and remove wind turbines in a manner consistent with recycling and/or reselling the units	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact HAZ-2a-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (less than significant)	3.8-1–6 3.8-6–9	3.8-13	Would the project involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project includes activities not covered in the PEIR the impact could be significant and will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
Impact HAZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school (no impact)	3.8-1–6 3.8-7	3.8-15	Is a public or private K–12 school located within 0.25 mile of the project area?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no public or private K–12 schools within 0.25 mile of the program area. The nearest school is approximately 0.48 mile east of proposed wind facilities and it is unlikely that hazardous materials would be emitted or released within 0.25 mile of any schools. Also, implementation of the SWPPP by contractors would reduce the potential of a hazardous spill incident. Should the project be located within 0.25 mile of a public or private K–12 school, it would not fall within the impacts assessed in the PEIR and the impact will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	No public or private schools are located within at least 5 miles of the project area.
Impact HAZ-4: Location on a hazardous materials site, creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1–6 3.8-6–9	3.8-16	Would the project involve soil disturbance?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prior to construction activities and remediate if necessary** ■ Conduct a Phase I environmental site assessment prior to construction and in conformance with the American Society for Testing and Materials Standard Practice E1527-05 ■ Conduct all environmental investigation, sampling, and remediation activities associated with properties in the project area under a work plan approved by the regulatory oversight agency ■ Include results of any investigation and/or remediation activities conducted in the project area in the project-level EIR	☒	☐	A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was completed for the project area and hazardous materials are not known to occur at the met tower sites.
Impact HAZ-5: Location within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1–6 3.8-7	3.8-19	Would the project be located in the Byron Airport influence area	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure HAZ-5: Coordinate with the Contra Costa ALUC prior to final design** ■ If wind turbines are proposed to be constructed within the Byron Airport influence area zones, coordinate and consult with the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Commission and request review and obtain approval of the final design and placement of wind turbines ■ Incorporate any ALUC recommendations in to the final design	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show locations of proposed turbines in relation to the Byron Airport influence areas or any private airstrips, including distances.*
Impact HAZ-6: Location within the vicinity of a private airstrip, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (less than significant)	3.8-1–6 3.8-7	3.8-21	Would the project be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip?	☒	☐	**Note:** Should the project be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip, it would not fall within the impacts assessed in the PEIR and the impact will need to be evaluated.	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show locations of proposed turbines in relation to the Byron Airport influence areas or any private airstrips, including distances.* No private airstrips are located within 2 miles of the proposed project.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact HAZ-7: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (less than significant with mitigation)	3.8-1–6	3.8-22	Would the project increase vehicular traffic?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (*see Traffic*)**	☒	☐	
Impact HAZ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands (less than significant)	3.8-1–6 3.8-7–9	3.8-24	Would the project alter the Altamont Pass Wind Farms Fire Requirements as described in Exhibit C of the 2005 CUPs?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project does not include these measures, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact HAZ-9: During normal operation, the effects of bending and stress on rotor blades over time could lead to blade failure and become a potential blade throw hazard (less than significant)	3.8-1–6	3.8-26	Is there potential for blade throw to occur outside windfarm boundaries? Would overall site access NOT be limited to persons approved for entry by the windfarm operators or landowners?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project does not include such restriction, a standard County requirement, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The proposed project does not involve the construction of wind turbines, only met towers.
Hydrology and Water Quality									
Impact WQ-1a-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements—program Alternative 1: 417 MW (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-7	Would the project involve earth-disturbing activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements** ■ File NOI with the State Water Board ■ Prepare SWPPP ■ Receive approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted) (less than significant)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-10	Would the project involve very large areas of disturbance or involve a substantial use of water beyond that described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project has a larger footprint, or a larger water use than that described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact WQ-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-11	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)**	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-4: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-12	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)**	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-5: Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-14	Would the project be constructed in an area with stormwater drainage facilities? Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)** **Note:** The program area does not currently have existing or planned stormwater drainage facilities.	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-6a-1: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality—program Alternative 1: 417 MW (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-15	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☐ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)**	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-7: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact WQ-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (no impact)	3.9-1–5 3.9-6	3.9-17	Would the project involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project would involve construction of housing or be constructed within the 100-year floodplain, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact WQ-10: Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (less than significant with mitigation)	3.9-1–5 3.9-5–6	3.9-18	Would the project involve construction activities?	☐	☒	☒ **Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Comply with NPDES requirements (see Impact WQ-1)**	☒	☐	
Land Use and Planning									
Impact LU-1: Physically divide an established community (no impact)	3.10-1–2 3.10-3	3.10-4	Would the project divide an established community?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no established communities in the program area that could be divided by any development associated with a wind project. If the project involves locations or activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (no impact)	3.10-1–2 3.10-3		Would the project involve activities or materials beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves locations beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The project falls within the program area identified in the PEIR.
Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (no impact)	3.10-1–2 3.10-3	3.10-6	Would the project include activities that are not within the scope of the project described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** There are no adopted HCP/NCCPs for the program area. If the proposed project does not fall within the scope of activities described in the PEIR but the project would not conflict with the EACCS, there would be no impact.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project					**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128			
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**		
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
Noise									
Impact NOI-1: Exposure of residences to noise from new wind turbines—program Alternative 1 (less than significant with mitigation)	3.11-5–8 3.11-8–9	3.11-11	Would the project be located with approximately 2,000 feet of residences?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Perform project-specific noise studies and implement measures to comply with County noise standards** ■ Retain a qualified acoustic consultant to prepare a report that evaluates noise impacts associated with operation of the proposed wind turbines ■ Include a noise monitoring survey to quantify existing noise conditions at noise sensitive receptors located within 2,000 feet of any proposed turbine location ■ Include measurement of the daily A-weighted L_{dn} values over a 1-week period and concurrent logging of wind speeds at the nearest meteorological station ■ Include a site-specific evaluation of predicted operational noise levels at nearby noise sensitive uses. ■ Modify project if operation of the project is predicted to result in noise in excess of 55 dBA (L_{dn}) where noise is currently less than 55 dBA (L_{dn}) or result in a 5 dB increase where noise is currently greater than 55 dBA(L_{dn}) ■ Submit a report to the County demonstrating how the project will comply with these performance standards ■ After review and approval of the report by County staff, incorporate measures as necessary into the project to ensure compliance with these performance standards	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show locations of proposed turbines in relation to residences, including distances.* Based on maps submitted by the applicant, the nearest residence is approximately 1.1 miles from a proposed met mast location.
Impact NOI-2: Exposure of residences to noise during decommissioning and new turbine construction (less than significant with mitigation)	3.11-5–8 3.11-8–9	3.11-15	Would construction equipment be used within 800 feet of residences?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Employ noise-reducing practices during decommissioning and new turbine construction** ■ Employ noise-reducing construction practices , which may include: – Prohibit noise-generating activities before 7 a.m. and after 7 p.m. on any day except Saturday or Sunday, and before 8 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday – Locate equipment as far as practical from noise sensitive uses – Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound-control devices – Use noise-reducing enclosures around noise-generating equipment where practicable – Do not use gasoline or diesel engines without muffled exhausts	☒	☐	*Require the application to include mapping to show locations of proposed turbines in relation to residences, including distances.* Based on maps submitted by the applicant, the nearest residence is approxiamtely 1.1 miles from a proposed met mast location.

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Population and Housing									
Impact POP-1: Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure) (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-5	Would the project create any housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project includes housing, the impact of the project would not be covered by the Program EIR.	☒	☐	
Impact POP-2: Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-9	Would the project result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project results in the demolition or displacement of housing, the impacts of the project would fall outside of those identified in the Program EIR, and additional impacts could occur.	☒	☐	
Impact POP-3: Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere (no impact)	3.12-1–2 3.12-2–4	3.12-9	Would the project result in the demolition or displacement of existing housing?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project results in the demolition or displacement of housing, the impacts of the project would fall outside of those identified in the Program EIR, and additional impacts could occur.	☒	☐	
Public Services									
Impact PS-1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; other public facilities (no impact)	3.13-1 3.13-1–2	3.13-3	Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Recreation									
Impact REC-1: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated (no impact)	3.14-1–2	3.14-3	Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment (no impact)	3.14-1–2	3.14-4	Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Transportation/Traffic									
Impact TRA-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit or conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-10	Would the project construction or operation increase traffic? Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan** ■ Prepare and implement a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) that adheres to Alameda County and Caltrans requirements ■ Submit the TCP for review and approval of the County Public Works Department prior to implementation ■ Include any additional elements required by the County or Caltrans during their review and approval of the TCP **Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project			**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128				
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**	
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
Impact TRA-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (less than significant)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-16	Would the project maintenance needs be substantially greater than currently required? Would post-construction traffic generated by the maintenance activities exceed the capacity of the CMP roadway system and differ materially from the current maintenance traffic level? Would the increase in construction traffic be substantial? Would the increase in construction traffic degrade the traffic operation of the CMP roadway segments that already exceed the LOS standard E or cause a CMP roadway segment to exceed the LOS standard?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact TRA-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks (less than significant)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-17	Would the project affect air traffic patterns of the public or private airports in the vicinity of the program area? Would the project result in substantial safety risks associated with airport operations?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities or locations beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact TRA-4: Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-18	Would the project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	
Impact TRA-5: Result in inadequate emergency access due to construction-generated traffic (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-20	Would the project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways? Would the project involve lane/road closures occurring during delivery of oversized loads?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist **Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project **Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128

Impact	Discussion in Text: Existing Conditions	Discussion in Text: Impacts	APWRA Issues to Consider	No	Yes	Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? No	Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR? Yes	Summary of Documentation
Impact TRA-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities (less than significant with mitigation)	3.15-1–5 3.15-5–7	3.15-21	Would the project involve large, slow-moving construction-related vehicles and equipment among the general-purpose traffic on roadways? Would the project involve lane/road closures occurring during delivery of oversized loads?	☒	☐	☐ **Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and implement a construction traffic control plan (see Impact TRA-1)**	☒	☐	
Utilities and Service Systems									
Impact UT-1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-3	Would the project generate a significant amount of wastewater?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The project would not generate any wastewater.
Impact UT-2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-4	Would the project generate a significant amount of wastewater? Would new water or wastewater treatment facilities be required?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The project would not generate any wastewater.
Impact UT-3: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-5	Would the project substantially modify the existing stormwater drainage patterns? Would the project increase impermeable surfaces onsite beyond the tower foundations? Would the project disturb less than 1 acre and therefore NOT be required to have coverage under the state's Construction General Permit?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	The project involves the construction of a single foundation which would not substantially modify any existing drainage patterns. It also would no increase permeable surfaces beyond the single foundation. Consequently, the project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilitites or the expansion of existing facilities. No stormwater drainage facilities would be required to facilitate the project.
Impact UT-4: Require new or expanded entitlements to water resources (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-6	Would the project require more than minimal water use? Would the project require new or expanded entitlements to supply the program during construction or operation?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

APWRA PEIR Implementation Checklist	**Project Title:** Brookfield-Mulqueeney Met Mast Project			**Project Identification:** PLN2015-00128				
	Discussion in Text						**Would the project, with mitigation, have impacts not identified in the PEIR?**	
Impact	**Existing Conditions**	**Impacts**	**APWRA Issues to Consider**	**No**	**Yes**	**Mitigation Measures (Details in MMRP) and Notes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Summary of Documentation**
Impact UT-5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the program's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-7	Would the project involve the construction or expansion of wastewater systems? Would the project require an offsite wastewater treatment provider?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☐	☐	
Impact UT-6: Generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of landfills to accommodate the program's solid waste disposal needs—program Alternative 1: 417 MW (less than significant)	3.16-1–3	3.16-8	Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	
Impact UT-7: Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (no impact)	3.16-1–3	3.16-9	Would the project involve activities beyond those described in the PEIR?	☒	☐	**Note:** If the project involves activities beyond those described in the PEIR, it would not fall within the impacts identified in the PEIR and could result in additional impacts.	☒	☐	

References Cited

Aesthetics

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

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

Biological Resources

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

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