RECIRCULATION DRAFT

70–74 Liberty Ship Way Project
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
ADR17-285

Prepared for:

City of Sausalito
420 Litho Street
Sausalito, California 94965
Contact: Tricia Stevens
tstevens@migcom.com

Prepared by:

DUDEK
1630 San Pablo Avenue
Oakland, California 94612
Contact: Hannah Young

OCTOBER 2021

Printed on 30% post-consumer recycled material.

Table of Contents

APPENDICES

FIGURES

TABLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
AB	Assembly Bill
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BMP	best management practice
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalRecycle	California Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH_4	methane
City	City of Sausalito
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRPR	California Rare Plant Rank
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHCA	Galilee Harbor Community Association
GHG	greenhouse gas
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning
IS	Initial Study
L_{dn}	day-night noise level
L_{eq}	equivalent continuous sound level
MM	Mitigation Measure
MMWD	Marin Municipal Water District
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MT	metric ton
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO_x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
O_3	ozone
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
PM_{10}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
project	70–74 Liberty Ship Way Project
ROG	reactive organic gas
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
SB	Senate Bill
SFBCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
SMCSD	Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary District
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminant
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The proposed 70–74 Liberty Ship Way Project (project) would redevelop a 3.9-acre site and construct three two-story buildings within the Marinship Specific Plan area. These proposed uses would be consistent with the Industrial and Waterfront zoning districts and may include marine, industrial, storage, and other related uses. The project site is currently developed with dry boat storage and containerized storage. The project would add 108 parking spaces and include pedestrian access improvements to the San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail).

1.2 Background

In 2008, the City of Sausalito (City) prepared a draft Initial Study (IS) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for a project on this site that included construction of four industrial buildings totaling 57,075 square feet. The MND was not adopted and the project was not approved.

The currently proposed project has taken into account public comments and input from agencies received regarding the 2008 project. A Draft IS/MND for the current project was circulated in January 2021. During the public review period, detailed topographic maps showed that historic railroad tracks thought to be outside the project area were actually just inside the project boundary. This finding initiated additional review of potentially significant cultural resource impacts associated with these tracks. As this analysis was not included in the earlier IS/MND the City is recirculating the document to include the new analysis. Section 3.5 is the only section where new analysis is presented, and the City would ask that comments on this document be limited to that Section. A combined Response to Comments will be developed including public comments received regarding both IS/MND drafts.

1.3 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The City is the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency responsible for the review and approval of the proposed project. Based on the findings of the IS for the project, the City has determined that an MND is the appropriate environmental document to prepare in compliance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.). As stated in CEQA Section 21064.5, an MND may be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when an IS has identified no potentially significant effects on the environment.

This MND has been prepared for the City and complies with Section 15070(a) of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The purpose of the MND and the Initial Study Checklist (see Chapter 3 of this MND) is to determine any potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project and to incorporate mitigation measures, as necessary, to reduce or eliminate the significant or potentially significant effects of the project.

1.4 Public Review Process

In accordance with CEQA, a good-faith effort has been made during the preparation of this MND to contact affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project.

In reviewing the MND, public agencies and the interested public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the project's possible impacts on the environment. A copy of the draft MND and related documents are available to view or download from the City's website:

https://www.sausalito.gov/departments/community-development/planning-division/current-planning/public-notices.

Comments on the MND may be mailed, submitted in person or via email to the contact person below before the end of the public review period. A 30-day review and comment period from October 1, 2021 to November 1, 2021 has been established in accordance with Section 15072(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Following the close of the public comment period, the City will consider this MND and comments in determining whether to approve the proposed project.

Written comments on the MND may be mailed to the City at the address below or may be submitted by email to City representative Tricia Stevens at tstevens@migcom.com by November 1, 2021.

Tricia Stevens
City of Sausalito
420 Litho Street
Sausalito, California 94965

1.5 Entitlements and Required Approvals

The proposed project would require a number of discretionary actions and approvals, including the following:

- City of Sausalito
  - Design Review approval (ADR17-285)
  - Conditional use permit and building use permit
  - Grading and Building Permit
- Marin Municipal Water District
  - Landscape Review Permit
  - New Water Service Application
  - Potable, recycled, backflow, and fire service permits
- Marin County Environmental Health Services
  - Health Permit to Operate
- Southern Marin Fire Protection District
  - Fire Department Permit
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
  - Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
  - To be determined

2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location

The project site is an approximately 3.9-acre site located on the east side of the City, along the shore of Richardson Bay (Figure 1, Project Location). The project site is accessible from U.S. Highway 101, approximately 1.3 miles north and east of Bridgeway. The site consists of one parcel—Assessor's Parcel Number 063-080-06. As shown in Figure 1, the project site is accessed from the one-way Liberty Ship Way loop, leading to two-way circulation within the site. The site circulation interconnects with the existing Schoonmaker Point Marina parking area to allow ingress and egress to the site and the Marinship area.

2.2 Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the Industrial and Waterfront zoning districts in the southeastern portion of the Marinship Specific Plan area (City of Sausalito 1989).

The marsh restoration easement and the Napa Street Galilee Harbor lie along the eastern boundary of the project site (Figure 2, Project Vicinity). The Schoonmaker Marina is immediately north of the site, with Schoonmaker Beach bordering the parcel at its northernmost boundary. Industrial buildings containing industrial, manufacturing, warehousing, and marine uses are to the northwest and west. There are also limited commercial uses and harbors north, west, and southwest of the project site. Immediately south of the site is an industrial development with two office/industrial buildings buffering the site from Bridgeway, a main thoroughfare leading to U.S. Highway 101.

2.3 Existing Conditions

The 170,205-square-foot project site is predominantly flat and is approximately 12 feet above mean sea level. The project site currently contains dry boat storage for approximately 85 small vessels and containerized storage. An adjacent restaurant uses approximately 10,000 square feet of the site for parking. A two-story, 1,923-square-foot portion of the Harbormaster building also exists on site. There are no other permanent buildings located within the project boundary.

Both 30 Liberty Ship Way to the south and 80 Liberty Ship Way to the west contain existing commercial uses. An approximately 28,888-square-foot marsh restoration area is located along the southeastern boundary, and the City holds a restoration easement over this area. Adjacent to the marsh is an 8-foot-wide segment of the Bay Trail, a Class I waterfront pedestrian and bike path that extends along the San Francisco Bay. The Bay Trail, which extends 100 feet inland from the mean high tide line, is within the jurisdiction of San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (SFBCDC).

2.4 Planning Context

The project site is zoned Industrial (I) and Waterfront (W) with a Marinship Specific Plan Overlay. Approximately 105,200 square feet of the project site is located within Industrial zoning, and 65,005 square feet is located within Waterfront zoning (City of Sausalito 2003). The permitted uses within the Industrial (I) zone include general industrial, marine industrial, arts, commercial service, limited restaurant and food service, and dry boat storage.

The permitted uses within the Waterfront (W) zone include boat harbors, piers, wharves, and launching ramps; boat storage; boat sales, rental, repair, and service; commercial and sport fishing facilities; marine equipment sales, manufacture, service, and repair; and marine research laboratories (City of Sausalito 1989).

2.5 Proposed Project

The proposed project would involve construction of three two-story industrial buildings totaling approximately 50,000 square feet (Figure 3, Proposed Project Visual Simulation) and up to 32 feet in height. The building footprint of Building A is proposed as 9,376 square feet (18,752 gross square feet). Building B is proposed as 9,057 square feet (18,114 gross square feet), and Building C is proposed as 5,963 square feet (11,518 gross square feet) (Figure 4, Overall Site Plan). The potential uses for the project include manufacturing, warehousing, medical clinic, marine industrial, marine commercial, and restaurant uses. Specifically, Building A would include dry boat storage, manufacturing, and storage/warehouse; Building B would include manufacturing, repair and maintenance, and medical services; and Building C would include marine industrial, marine commercial, and restaurant uses. Figure 5, Section Site Plan, gives the cross-sections of Buildings A, B, and C. When buildout of the project is complete, approximately 84 full-time staff would be employed on site.

The proposed project would provide an approximately 48,979-square-foot surface parking lot with up to 108 parking spaces, including six handicap spaces; 12 bicycle parking spaces; and five motorcycle spaces. Nine of these spaces would be available for public use on weekdays from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m in the southwestern portion of the site. An additional eight spaces would be available for public use on weekends and extended evening hours. A truck loading space would be located adjacent to Building A.

The parking lot would be illuminated by light poles approximately 20 feet high, with the lights hanging at approximately 12 feet high. These lights would operate on motion sensors, thus reducing light levels in unused parking zones.

The project site would contain 2,530 square feet of solar energy panels on the roof of Building B. The panels would extend approximately 6 inches above the roof.

Access and Circulation

Access to the project site would be provided via Liberty Ship Way, which loops at the western edge of the project site and connects to Marinship Way. Although Liberty Ship Way is approximately 24-feet wide, it narrows to approximately 20-feet wide just west of the project site. For approximately 270-feet, the primary entrance to the site would be designated as one-way from the southern loop of Liberty Ship Way. Pending redevelopment of the 60D Liberty Ship Way building that causes the constraint, the one-way portion of the roadway may ultimately widen to accommodate the project's 24-feet wide drive aisle, thereby allowing for two-way traffic within the entirety of the site.

As part of the project, a curb and guardrail system would be added to the northern edge of the roadway to reduce potential hazards with the southernmost corner of the 60D Liberty Ship Way building. Additionally, the segment adjacent to this building, west of the driveway to 30 Liberty Ship Way and east to the proposed project parking lot, which are deteriorated and include old railroad tracks, would be repaved. After the one-way segment, the roadway would become two-way and would have 24-foot wide parking lot drive aisles, which are large enough to adequately accommodate delivery vehicles. Visitors may exit via the parking lot and drive aisles of the existing parking areas north of the site, before connecting back to the northern section of the Liberty Ship Way loop. The portion of Liberty Ship Way within the site boundary and internal driveways within the site would be owned and maintained by the

project applicant. Additionally, accessible pedestrian routes, consistent with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, would be provided throughout the project site.

Landscaping

The project would include 35,785 square feet of landscaped and vegetated areas, in addition to the existing marsh restoration area, which would remain as it currently exists. Two iron bark eucalyptus trees (*Eucalyptus sideroxylon*) would be removed from the southern point of the project site. The project would involve planting 24 Brisbane box trees (*Tristania conferta*) and six date palms (*Phoenix dactylifera*). Five bioretention areas are proposed to be located throughout the site to intercept and treat stormwater runoff prior to being discharged from the site.

Bay Trail Improvements

The project would provide enhanced access and connectivity to the Bay Trail by improving pedestrian access, adding lighting, and defining the edges of the path. Three pedestrian access points on the southeastern edge of the parking lot would connect an on-site sidewalk system to the Bay Trail. Each access point would be illuminated by a pair of lights. An existing 8-foot-high chain-link fence currently runs along the project boundary and would be replaced with chain bollards to improve visual character. The project would also provide nine public parking spaces, as described above.

Project Construction and Schedule

Construction activities would consist of excavation and shoring, construction of the foundation and below-grade areas, and construction of the building and finishing interiors. The project would not involve demolition, since there are no permanent structures on site. Project construction is expected to occur over approximately 42 months, with construction scheduled to commence in April 2021. Site preparation, grading, and construction of Building A would occur first and separately from Buildings B and C. Pile driving for Building A would begin in April 2021. Construction of Building A would be finished in November 2022, with occupants projected to move in that month. Construction of Buildings B and C would begin in December 2022 and pile driving would occur during December 2022 and January 2023. Buildings B and C would be finished in August 2024.

The project site would be excavated approximately 24 to 30 inches below grade, and up to 5 feet in select places. Excavation would remove approximately 2,380 cubic yards of soil. Of the excavated soil, 430 cubic yards would be used as fill; a net 1,950 cubic yards of soil would be hauled off site. A total of 2,790 tons of material would be exported off site, which would include concrete slab and curbs, asphalt, and the chain-link fence.

No soils would be imported to the site. Groundwater on the site is likely to be encountered approximately 6 feet below ground surface and could fluctuate several feet depending on the season and rainfall. Dewatering would not be required. Pile driving would be required for Buildings A, B, and C and would occur over a total of 20 days. The concrete piles would be drilled into the underlying bedrock located at depths ranging from 50 feet to 90 feet. Approximately 42,500 square feet of the project site would be paved. The proposed project would result in approximately 132,786 square feet of impervious surfaces (approximately 78% of the site), which is an increase from the existing conditions of 36,011 square feet of impervious surface (21% of the site).

Construction hours on-site would be Monday through Friday (8 a.m.–6 p.m.), Saturday (9 a.m.–5 p.m.), no work on Sundays, and holidays (9 a.m.–7 p.m.). There would be an average of eight construction workers on site each day.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 1 Project Location

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 2 Project Vicinity

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 3 Proposed Project Visual Simulation

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 4 Overall Site Plan

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 5 Section Site Plan

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:**

   70-74 Liberty Ship Way Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

   City of Sausalito
   420 Litho Street
   Sausalito, California 94965

3. **Contact person and phone number:**

   Tricia Stevens, MIG Contract Planner
   916.698-4592
   tstevens@migcom.com

4. **Project location:**

   70-74 Liberty Ship Way, Sausalito, California 94965

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

   Michael Rainey
   85 Liberty Ship Way
   Sausalito, California 94965

6. **General plan designation:**

   Industrial and Waterfront

7. **Zoning:**

   Industrial and Waterfront

8. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

   - Marin Municipal Water District
   - Marin County Environmental Health Services
   - Southern Marin Fire Protection District
   - Bay Area Air Quality Management District
   - San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

9. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

   No, consultation was not requested. See Section 3.18 for further information.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

☒ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☒ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☒ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☒ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature Date

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project**:**				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. There are no officially designated scenic vistas located within the City of Sausalito. However, the Marinship Specific Plan identifies specific view corridors to be preserved and/or enhanced as a goal for development in the Marinship Specific Plan area. The Marinship Specific Plan notes that the intent of the inclusion of view corridors is to accommodate "review of the placement, height, and bulk of future structures in this area to evaluate their potential view impact of Richardson Bay, the shoreline, and industrial activity from Bridgeway" (City of Sausalito 1989). There are two view corridors from Bridgeway within the vicinity of the subject site with potential view impacts: View Corridor I and View Corridor J. These view corridors are depicted in Figure 6, Marinship Specific Plan View Corridors.

View Corridor I is a view of Richardson Bay from Bridgeway down Mono Street, an undeveloped, public right-of-way where an existing marsh restoration area is located. The project is laid out such that the buildings would be located toward the interior of the site and parking would be along the shoreline. This design seeks to diminish the massing of the buildings by setting them back from the shoreline. Buildings A and B would be largely blocked from view, since they would be located behind 30 Liberty Ship Way and at a lower elevation. As shown in Figure 3 and Figure 7, Building A would be perpendicular to 30 Liberty Ship Way to minimize potential obstruction of views from Bridgeway. The eastern boundary of the project site would be free of buildings to maintain View Corridor I. View impacts to this corridor are anticipated to be minimal and would be an enhancement of the existing view corridor by eliminating the view of outdoor storage in the distance.

The second view corridor, View Corridor J, offers sight lines of the Marinship industrial activity, and at points, views of the beach from Bridgeway between the Schoonmaker Building and 30 Liberty Ship Way. The intervening buildings located at 10 Liberty Ship Way, 28 Liberty Ship Way, and 30 Liberty Ship Way block views of the project site from Bridgeway. The project would not impact View Corridor J.

The project would leave the view corridor of Richardson Bay, the marsh restoration easement, and the harbor unobstructed. Impacts to a scenic vista would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. U.S. Highway 101 is located approximately 1.5 miles from the project site. The stretch of U.S. Highway 101 through Sausalito is an Eligible State Scenic Highway as designated by the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) Scenic Highway Program but is not an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway (Caltrans 2020). The project site is not visible from U.S. Highway 101. The project site currently houses a boat storage yard and contains two iron bark eucalyptus trees. These two trees would be removed with a Tree Removal Permit. As such, there are no scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway that would be substantially damaged. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project site currently houses an open boat storage and containerized storage. Adjacent properties contain industrial buildings of a similar architectural style with painted metal siding and rectangular massing. The visual character and zoning of the site is suitable for industrial uses and architecture, which is consistent with the proposed project and its industrial architectural design. In addition to conforming to the existing character of the area, the project would enhance the site and its surroundings by formalizing infrastructure, interconnecting and expanding the roadway network, improving the Bay Trail located along the marsh restoration area, constructing new industrial buildings of a similar architectural style to adjacent buildings, developing landscaped and plaza areas throughout the site with street trees, and diversifying the area's architecture by introducing triangular- and gazebo-shaped structures with architectural treatments such as glass canopies and flexible industrial storefronts. The project would enhance the visual character of the Bay Trail by replacing existing chain link fence with chain bollards and limited nighttime illumination.

The City's Design Review requirements ensure a process by which the aesthetic character of the site and vicinity would be assessed, thus preventing degradation to surrounding properties, and potentially enhancing the property. The proposed project would require Design Review approval prior to the issuance of a building permit, which would require the Planning Commission to consider the visual quality of the project in relationship to the existing neighborhood. The project would not be approved without the Planning Commission's determination that the required Design Review findings can be made for the project, which include determining that the proposed architecture and site design complement the surrounding neighborhood, and that the scale of the proposed structure is consistent with the general scale of structures in the surrounding district (Zoning Ordinance Section 10.54.050.D). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Proposed lighting on the project site would include sixty-seven 8-foot 26-watt wall-mounted lights, twelve 2.62-foot 35-watt parking lot lights, and fourteen 12 foot 50-watt pole lights. Six of the 2.62-foot lights would be located at the three pedestrian entrances to the Bay Trail. The light poles throughout the parking areas would be equipped with bi-level controls, or "motion sensors," that set lights at higher luminance levels when motion is detected and then reset to lower levels. Along the project boundaries, lights would be directed into the site and would reduce light spill-over to adjacent properties.

In addition, under Section 10.54.050 of the Municipal Code, for the Planning Commission to approve a Design Review Permit, the Planning Commission must find that exterior lighting and mechanical equipment is appropriately designed and located to minimize visual impacts to adjacent properties and the general public. To ensure that impacts on nighttime views would be less than significant, Design Review applications are subject to the City's standard condition that all exterior lighting be downward-facing and shielded, and subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-1, impacts regarding light and glare would be less than significant.

MM-AES-1: Parking lot lighting shall be designed and constructed with full cut-off luminaries and shall be fully shielded so that light is directed inward and downward toward the interior of the property, with a maximum illuminance level of 2.5 foot-candles. All lighting placed on the exterior of the building, including security lighting, shall also have fully shielded lighting fixtures to direct the light inward and downward, with a maximum illuminance level of 2.5 foot-candles.

Figure 6 Marinship Specific Plan View Corridors

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 7 Proposed Project Visual Simulation from Galilee Harbor

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a,b) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The project site is currently zoned Waterfront (W) and Industrial (I) within the Marinship Specific Plan area (City of Sausalito 1989), suitable for marine and industrial development. The project is located within Urban and Built-Up Land, and is not designated by the Farmland Mapping Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (DLRP 2016). Furthermore, the proposed project is not under a Williamson Act contract (GeoData Analytics 2003). Therefore, the project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The project site is zoned Waterfront (W) and Industrial (I) within the Marinship Specific Plan area (City of Sausalito 1989). No forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production zones exist on or adjacent to the project site (GeoData Analytics 2003). The project would not conflict with zoning of forestland or timberland. The project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The project site is zoned Waterfront (W) and Industrial (I) within the Marinship Specific Plan area (City of Sausalito 1989). No forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production zones exist on or adjacent to the project site (GeoData Analytics 2003). The project would not conflict with zoning of forestland or timberland. The project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The project is located in an urban environment surrounded by Waterfront, Commercial Waterfront, and Industrial zones. There is no Farmland or forestland in proximity to the project site (GeoData Analytics 2003); therefore, the project would not result in a conversion to non-agricultural or non-forest use, and there would be no impact.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted updated CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, including new thresholds of significance, in June 2010 (BAAQMD 2010), and revised them in May 2011. The CEQA Air Quality Guidelines advise lead agencies on how to evaluate potential air quality impacts, including establishing quantitative and qualitative thresholds of significance. The BAAQMD resolutions adopting and revising the significance thresholds in 2011 were set aside by a judicial writ of mandate on March 5, 2012. In May 2012, the BAAQMD updated its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to continue to provide direction on recommended analysis methodologies, but without recommended quantitative significance thresholds (BAAQMD 2012). On August 13, 2013, the First District Court of Appeal ordered the trial court to reverse the judgment and upheld the BAAQMD's CEQA thresholds. The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines were re-released in May 2017 and include the same thresholds as in the 2010 and 2011 Guidelines for criteria air pollutants, toxic air contaminants (TACs), and greenhouse gases (GHGs) (BAAQMD 2017a). The CEQA Air Quality Guidelines also address the December 2015 Supreme Court's opinion (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* [2015] 62 Cal. 4th 369). These BAAQMD significance thresholds are summarized in Table 3.3-1, Thresholds of Significance.

In general, the BAAQMD significance thresholds for reactive organic gases (ROGs), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less ($PM_{2.5}$), and carbon monoxide (CO) address the first three air quality significance criteria. The BAAQMD maintains that these thresholds are intended to maintain ambient air quality concentrations of these criteria air pollutants below state and federal standards, and to prevent a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional nonattainment with ambient air quality standards. The TAC thresholds (cancer and noncancer risks) and local CO thresholds address the fourth significance criterion, and the BAAQMD odors threshold addresses the fifth significance criterion.

Table 3.3-1. Thresholds of Significance for Air Quality

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (pounds per day)	*Average Daily Emissions (pounds per day)*	*Maximum Annual Emissions (tons per year)*
ROG	54	54	10
NO_x	54	54	10
PM_{10}	82 (exhaust)	82	15
$PM_{2.5}$	54 (exhaust)	54	10
$PM_{10}/PM_{2.5}$ (fugitive dust)	Best Management Practices	None	
Local CO	None	9.0 ppm (8-hour average), 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)	
Risks and Hazards (Individual Project)	Compliance with Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan or Increased cancer risk of >10.0 in 1 million Increased noncancer risk of >1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient $PM_{2.5}$ increase >0.3 µg/m^3 annual average Zone of Influence: 1,000-foot radius from property line of source or receptor		
Risks and Hazards (Cumulative)	Compliance with Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan or Cancer risk of >100 in 1 million (from all local sources) Noncancer risk of >10.0 Hazard Index (chronic, from all local sources) Ambient $PM_{2.5}$ >0.8 µg/m^3 annual average (from all local sources) Zone of Influence: 1,000-foot radius from property line of source or receptor		
Accidental Release of Acutely Hazardous Air Pollutants	None	Storage or use of acutely hazardous material located near receptors or new receptors located near stored or used acutely hazardous materials considered significant	
Odors	None	Five confirmed complaints to BAAQMD per year averaged over 3 years	

Source: BAAQMD 2017a

Notes: ppm = parts per million; µg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter; ROG = reactive organic gases; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less; CO = carbon monoxide

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. An area is designated as "in attainment" when it is in compliance with the federal and/or state standards. These standards are set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the maximum level of a given air pollutant that can exist in the outdoor air without unacceptable effects on human health or public welfare with a margin of safety. The project site is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is designated non-attainment for the federal 8-hour ozone (O_3) and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards. The area is in attainment or unclassified for all other federal standards. The area is designated non-attainment for state standards for 1-hour and 8-hour O_3, 24-hour PM_{10}, annual PM_{10}, and annual $PM_{2.5}$.

On April 19, 2017, the BAAQMD adopted the Spare the Air: Cool the Climate Final 2017 Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD 2017b). The 2017 Clean Air Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. To protect public health, the 2017 Clean Air Plan includes all feasible measures to reduce emissions of O_3 precursors (ROG and NO_x), and reduce O_3 transport to neighboring air basins. In addition,

the 2017 Clean Air Plan builds on the BAAQMD's efforts to reduce $PM_{2.5}$ and TACs. To protect the climate, the Clean Air Plan defines a vision for transitioning the region to a post-carbon economy needed to achieve ambitious GHG reduction targets for 2030 and 2050, and provides a regional climate protection strategy that will put the Bay Area on a pathway to achieve those GHG reduction targets (BAAQMD 2017b).

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines identify a three-step methodology for determining a project's consistency with the current Clean Air Plan. If the responses to these three questions can be concluded in the affirmative and those conclusions are supported by substantial evidence, then the BAAQMD considers the project to be consistent with air quality plans prepared for the Bay Area (BAAQMD 2017a).

The first question to be assessed in this methodology is "Does the project support the goals of the Air Quality Plan?" The BAAQMD-recommended measure for determining project support for these goals is consistency with BAAQMD thresholds of significance. If a project would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts after the application of all feasible mitigation measures, if necessary, the project would be consistent with the goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD 2017a).

As indicated in the following discussion with regard to air quality impact questions b) and c), the proposed project would result in less-than-significant construction and operational emissions impacts. Therefore, the project would be considered to support the primary goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan and is consistent with the current Clean Air Plan.

The second question to be assessed in this consistency methodology is "Does the project include applicable control measures from the Clean Air Plan?" The 2017 Clean Air Plan contains 85 control measures aimed at reducing air pollution in the Bay Area. Projects that incorporate all feasible air quality plan control measures are considered to be consistent with the Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD 2017a). The control strategies of the 2017 Clean Air Plan include measures in the categories of stationary sources, the transportation sector, the buildings sector, the energy sector, the agriculture sector, natural and working lands, the waste sector, the water sector, and super-GHG pollutant measures. Depending on the control measure, the tools for implementation include leveraging the BAAQMD rules and permitting authority, regional coordination and funding, working with local governments to facilitate best policies in building codes, outreach and education, and advocacy strategies.

The proposed project includes plans for constructing three buildings totaling approximately 50,300 square feet of light industrial uses and associated parking. Since the proposed project would comply with all applicable BAAQMD rules and would incorporate energy efficiency and green building measures in compliance with state standards and/or local building codes, the project would include applicable control measures from the 2017 Clean Air Plan.

The third question to be assessed in this consistency methodology is "Does the project disrupt or hinder implementation of any control measures from the Clean Air Plan?" Examples of how a project may cause the disruption or delay of control measures include a project that precludes an extension of a transit line or bike path, or proposes excessive parking beyond parking requirements (BAAQMD 2017a). The proposed project would not create any barriers or impediments to planned or future improvements to transit or bicycle facilities in the area, nor would it include excessive parking. Therefore, the project would not hinder implementation of 2017 Clean Air Plan control measures.

In summary, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.2 was used to estimate emissions from construction and operation of the project. CalEEMod is a statewide computer model developed in cooperation with air districts throughout the state to quantify criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions associated with construction and operational activities from a variety of land use projects, such as residential, commercial, and industrial. CalEEMod input parameters for the proposed project, including the project land use type and size and construction schedule, were based on information provided by the project applicant or on default model assumptions if project specifics were unavailable.

Construction. Construction of the project would involve construction and operation of approximately 50,300 square feet of light industrial uses and parking. Construction is anticipated to begin in April 2021 and would take approximately 42 months to complete by August 2024.[1]

The project site would be excavated approximately 24 to 30 inches below grade, but up to 5 feet in select places. Excavation would remove approximately 2,380 cubic yards of soil. Of the excavated soil, 430 cubic yards would be used as fill; a net 1,950 cubic yards of soil would be hauled off site. A total of 2,790 tons of material would be exported off site, which would include concrete slab and curbs, asphalt, and the chain-link fence. Sources of emissions would include off-road construction equipment exhaust, on-road-vehicle exhaust, entrained road dust (i.e., material delivery trucks and worker vehicles), fugitive dust associated with site preparation and grading activities, and paving and architectural coating. Detailed assumptions associated with project construction are included in Appendix A.

Average daily emissions were computed by dividing the total construction emissions by the number of active construction days, which were then compared to the BAAQMD construction thresholds of significance. Table 3.3-2 shows average daily construction emissions of O_3 precursors (ROG and NO_x), PM_{10} exhaust, and $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust during project construction.[2]

Table 3.3-2. Average Daily Unmitigated Construction Emissions

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10} Exhaust	$PM_{2.5}$ Exhaust
	Pounds per Day			
2021–2024 Project Emissions	4.0	20.5	0.9	0.9
BAAQMD Construction Thresholds	*54*	*54*	*82*	*54*
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Appendix A
Notes: The values shown are average daily emissions based on total overall tons of construction emissions, converted to pounds, and divided by 166 active work days.

1 The analysis and modeling used an earlier construction start date, previously assumed to be March 2020; however, the same 42-month construction duration was used in the analysis. This analysis provides a conservative estimate for construction emissions because increasingly stringent state and local regulations and growing market penetration of cleaner construction equipment are anticipated to further reduce emissions in the future. In other words, the project's emissions with a construction start date at a later time would result in emissions below those estimated with the earlier start.

2 Fuel combustion during construction and operations would also result in the generation of sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and CO. These values are included in Appendix A. However, since the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is in attainment for these pollutants, the BAAQMD has not established a quantitative mass-significance threshold for comparison, and these are not included in the project-generated emissions tables in this document. Notably, the BAAQMD does have screening criteria for operational localized CO, which are discussed in more detail below.

BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District; ROG = reactive organic gas; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter

As shown in Table 3.3-2, construction of the project would not exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction would be less than significant.

Although the BAAQMD does not have a quantitative significance threshold for fugitive dust, the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines recommend that projects determine the significance for fugitive dust through application of best management practices (BMPs). The project contractor would be required, as conditions of approval, to implement the following BMPs that are required of all projects (BAAQMD 2017a):

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Implementation of the required fugitive dust control measures would ensure that air quality and fugitive dust impacts associated with construction would remain less than significant.

Operations. Operation of the project would generate criteria pollutant emissions (ROG, NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$) from mobile sources (vehicular traffic), area sources (consumer products, architectural coatings, landscaping equipment), and energy sources (natural gas appliances, space and water heating). CalEEMod was used to estimate daily emissions from project-related operational sources. The CalEEMod default trip rate was adjusted to match the trip generation provided from the project's traffic and parking analysis. Table 3.3-3, Daily Unmitigated Operational Emissions, summarizes the daily mobile, energy, and area emissions of criteria pollutants that would be generated by project development, and compares the emissions to BAAQMD operational thresholds.

Table 3.3-3. Daily Unmitigated Operational Emissions

Source	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day			
Area	1.3	<0.1[a]	<0.1[a]	<0.1[a]
Energy	<0.1[a]	0.3	<0.1[a]	<0.1[a]
Mobile	1.0	3.1	4.4	1.2
Total	**2.3**	**3.3**	**4.4**	**1.2**
BAAQMD Operational Thresholds	*54*	*54*	*82*	*54*
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Appendix A
Notes: The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District; ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter
[a] <0.1 = value less than reported 0.1 pounds per day.

As indicated in Table 3.3-3, project-related operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds during operations, and thus, the project would have a less-than-significant impact in relation to regional operational emissions.

Regarding localized CO concentrations, according to the BAAQMD thresholds, a project would result in a less-than-significant impact if the following screening criteria are met (BAAQMD 2017a):

1. The project is consistent with an applicable congestion management program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, regional transportation plan, and local congestion management agency plans.
2. The project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour.
3. The project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, below-grade roadway).

The project would generate minimal traffic trips, approximately 706 daily trips as described in Section 3.17, Transportation and Circulation, and would comply with the BAAQMD's screening criteria. Accordingly, project-related traffic would not exceed BAAQMD CO screening criteria, and therefore, no further analysis is required for the formation of potential CO impacts. This CO emissions impact would be less than significant on a project level and cumulative basis.

Past, present, and future development projects may contribute to the region's adverse air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. Per BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, by its nature air pollution is largely a cumulative impact; no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. In developing thresholds of significance for air pollutants, BAAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be considered cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Therefore, if the project's emissions are below the BAAQMD thresholds or screening criteria, then the project's cumulative impact would be considered to be less than significant (BAAQMD 2017a).

As described for criterion "b" above, criteria pollutant emissions generated by short-term construction and long-term operations of the project would not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Thus, the project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact in relation to regional emissions. In addition, project-related traffic would not exceed the BAAQMD CO screening criteria and would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact in relation to localized CO.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The BAAQMD has adopted project and cumulative thresholds for three risk-related air quality indicators for sensitive receptors: cancer risks, noncancer health effects, and increases in ambient air concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$. These impacts are addressed on a localized rather than regional basis, and are specific to the sensitive receptors identified for the project. Sensitive receptors are groups of individuals, including children, older adults, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, who may be more susceptible to health risks due to chemical exposure. Sensitive-receptor population groups are likely to be located at hospitals, medical clinics, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, residences, and retirement homes (BAAQMD 2017a). The closest existing sensitive receptors are existing residences located approximately 412 feet south of the project site.

"Incremental cancer risk" is the net increased likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs resulting from a project over a 9-, 30-, and 70-year exposure period would contract cancer based on the use of standard Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment risk-assessment methodology (OEHHA 2015). In addition, some TACs have non-carcinogenic effects. TACs that would potentially be emitted during construction activities would be diesel particulate matter, emitted from heavy-duty construction equipment and heavy-duty trucks. Heavy-duty construction equipment and diesel trucks are subject to CARB air toxic control measures to reduce diesel particulate matter emissions. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions, should be based on a 30-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual resident; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with a project (OEHHA 2015). Thus, the duration of construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 42 months) would only constitute a small percentage of the total 30-year exposure period.

Regarding long-term operations, the project would include dry boat storage, manufacturing, and storage/warehouse in Building A; manufacturing, repair and maintenance, and medical services in Building B; and marine industrial and marine commercial space in Building C. The project would not result in non-permitted stationary sources that would emit air pollutants or TACs. In addition, the project would provide a distance buffer between the facility and proximate residences.

In summary, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial, long-term pollutant concentrations or health risks during construction or operations, and this impact would be less than significant on a project level and cumulative basis.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. BAAQMD has identified typical sources of odor in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines; some examples include manufacturing plants, rendering plants, coffee roasters, wastewater

treatment plants, sanitary landfills, and solid waste transfer stations (BAAQMD 2017a). Although sources that generate objectionable odors must comply with air quality regulations, the public's sensitivity to locally produced odors often exceeds regulatory thresholds. As previously discussed, the potential uses for Building A include dry boat storage, manufacturing, and storage/warehouse; Building B would include manufacturing, repair and maintenance, and medical services; and Building C would include marine industrial and marine commercial space. No significant odor impacts that would affect a substantial number of people are anticipated from the project. In addition, there would be a physical setback from potential receptors, and any such odors would be contained within the project's buildings. Therefore, potential odor impacts would be less than significant.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The following analysis relies on a biological resources assessment conducted by Dudek in February 2020. This assessment included a field reconnaissance and review of the latest available relevant literature; published research; and maps on soils, hydrology, wetlands, and special-status species distributions to determine those resources that have the potential to occur within the 3.95-acre property located at 70–74 Liberty Ship Way, Sausalito (Assessor's Parcel Number 063-080-06) (project site) and surrounding 100-foot buffer (the biological study area) (Figure 8, Biological Resources). The proposed project would include redevelopment of an existing dry boat and containerized storage area with three new two-story buildings, 108 parking spaces, and pedestrian access improvements, and may include marine, industrial, storage, and other related uses over an approximate 2.90-acre portion (the impact area) of the 3.9-acre project site.

For the purposes of this analysis, special-status species include those that are (1) listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered; (2) listed or candidates for listing under the California Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered; (3) a state fully protected species; (4) a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern; or (5) a species listed on the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants with a California Rare Plant Rank of 1B or 2B. Sensitive vegetation communities are those communities identified as high priority for inventory in CDFW's List of Vegetation Alliances and Associations (or Natural Communities List) (CDFW 2019a), which is based on A Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition (Sawyer et al. 2009), by a state rarity ranking of S1, S2, or S3.

Literature Review

Prior to conducting field reconnaissance, Dudek searched the CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (CDFW 2019b, 2020a–c), the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS 2020), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation occurrence data (USFWS 2020a) to identify special-status biological resources that are known to occur in the region. The CNDDB and CNPS databases were searched based on the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map for San Francisco North, where the project site is located, as well as the surrounding seven U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute quadrangle maps (i.e., San Francisco South, Hunters Point, San Rafael, San Quentin, Richmond, Point Bonita, and Oakland West). Results of the CNDDB, CNPS, and Information for Planning and Conservation database searches are included as Appendix B of this document. In addition, potential and/or historic drainages and aquatic features were investigated based on a review of U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps (1:24,000 scale), aerial photographs, the National Wetland Inventory database (USFWS 2020b), and the Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey (USDA 2019). Dudek also conducted a thorough review of the results of the biological resources assessment (WRA 2007) and Visual Tree Analysis conducted in 2017 to support a tree removal/alteration permit (Kipping 2018).

Field Reconnaissance

Following the literature and data review, Dudek biologist Ryan Henry conducted a reconnaissance-level survey on February 4, 2020, to identify existing biological resources and potential biological constraints within the biological study area. During the survey, vegetation communities and land covers were catalogued and confirmed based on existing site conditions. Additionally, Dudek investigated the extent and distribution of waters of the United States and waters of the state that may be subject to regulation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), CDFW, and/or SFBCDC. The survey was conducted from 8:15 a.m. to 9:36 a.m., and weather conditions were favorable, with clear skies and 0% cloud cover, a temperature that ranged from 48°F to 52°F, and wind speeds from 2 to 5 miles per hour. Vegetation community and land cover mapping was conducted according to the CDFW's Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities (CDFW 2018) and the Natural Communities List (CDFW 2019a). Vegetation communities and land covers not included in the Natural Communities List followed Cowardin et al. (1979). During the survey, Dudek compiled a general inventory of plant and wildlife species detected by

sight, calls, tracks, scat, or other signs, and made a determination concerning the potential for special-status species to occur within the biological study area.

Vegetation Communities and Plants

The biological study area supports four vegetation communities and land covers: pickleweed mats alliance, fennel association, open water-marine intertidal, and urban/developed. Figure 8 illustrates the distribution, and Table 3.4-1 summarizes the extent of vegetation communities and land covers within the biological study area. Descriptions of these vegetation communities and land covers are summarized below.

Table 3.4-1. Vegetation Communities and Land Covers within the Project Site

Vegetation Community or Land Cover	Project Site (acres)	Proposed Impact Area (acres)
Herbaceous Alliances and Stands		
Pickleweed mats alliance	0.47	—
Fennel association	0.53	0.33
Non-Natural Land Covers/Unvegetated Communities		
Open water-marine intertidal	0.34	—
Urban/developed	2.61	2.57
Total*	**3.95**	**2.90**

* Acreages may not total due to rounding

The pickleweed mats (*Salicornia pacifica [Salicornia depressa]*) alliance is dominated or co-dominated by Virginia glasswort (*Salicornia depressa*) or Pacific swampfire (*Sarcocornia pacifica*). This alliance occurs in coastal salt marshes and alkaline flats and has an intermittent to continuous ground cover. This alliance stretches along the southeastern side of the biological study area, where it is dominated by Virginia glasswort (*Salicornia depressa*). It sits between a section of heavily mown fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*) to the northwest and open water to the southeast. Other plant species observed in this area include salt grass (*Distichlis spicata*), California cordgrass (*Spartina foliosa*), and sea fig (*Carpobrotus chilensis*). The landward side of this vegetation community is delineated by a wooden sand fence and has benefited from historic and ongoing wetland restoration activities implemented by the neighboring Galilee Harbor Community Association.

The fennel association (*Foeniculum vulgare* association) is dominated by fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*) and other non-native invasive plant of the Apiaceae family, with ground cover open to continuous.[3] Within the biological study area, this association lies southeast of a developed area used for boat storage and is dominated by fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*). Other species that occur within this community include Russian thistle (*Salsola soda*), buckhorn plantain (*Plantago coronopus*), seaside barley (*Hordeum marinum*), soft brome (*Bromus hordeaceus*), and non-native annual grasses. An 8-foot-wide segment of the Bay Trail passes through this association, which is delineated to the southeast by a wooden sand fence and the edge of the pickleweed mats alliance.

The open water–marine intertidal mapping unit is not recognized by the Natural Communities List (CDFW 2019a). Per Cowardin et al. (1979), marine habitats extend from the upper limit of the unvegetated shore to the ocean, and the intertidal zone includes the area exposed by low tide up to and including the spray zone. This land cover is often unvegetated, although algae and Scouler's surfgrass (*Phyllospadix scouleri*) can occur. Although open water is not

[3] Per the second edition of the Manual of California Vegetation, "open" refers to areas having less than 33% absolute vegetative cover, and "continuous" as having greater than 66% absolute vegetative cover.

considered a riparian habitat because it lacks hydrophytic vegetation, it is typically regulated by CDFW, pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251 et seq.). This mapping unit exists at the southeastern edge of the biological study area, northwest of the Galilee Harbor. No vegetation was observed within this mapping unit.

Urban or developed land covers refer to areas that have been constructed on or otherwise physically altered to the point where vegetation is no longer present. Urban or developed areas are characterized by permanent or semi-permanent structures, hardscapes, and landscaped areas that require irrigation. Developed land is not a listed vegetation community under the California Natural Community List (CDFW 2019a), but has been used in this report because it best describes what was observed in the field. As such, this community is not globally or state ranked, and is not considered a sensitive natural community. This land cover comprises a large portion of the biological study area, the majority of which consists of a non-vegetated dirt and gravel lot used for parking and dry boat storage. Some ornamental trees and shrubs are present around the perimeter of this land cover and in adjacent areas, including Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix canariensis*), olive (*Olea europaea*), Peruvian peppertree (*Schinus molle*), red ironbark (*Eucalyptus sideroxylon*), and silverleaf cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosa*). Additional developed areas are present to the immediate northwest, west, and southwest of the project site. The proposed area of impact is primarily within the boundaries of this land cover.

Wildlife

Several wildlife species were observed or detected during the reconnaissance-level survey of the biological study area, including 16 bird species. Bird species detected within the biological study area were American avocet (*Recurvirostra americana*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), belted kingfisher (*Megaceryle alcyon*), black-crowned night-heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), Brewer's blackbird (*Euphagus cyanocephalus*), bufflehead (*Bucephala albeola*), Caspian tern (*Hydroprogne caspia*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), lesser goldfinch (*Spinus psaltria*), rock pigeon (rock dove) (*Columba livia*), snowy egret (*Egretta thula*), western gull (*Larus occidentalis*), and white-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*). No active bird nests were detected within the biological study area.

Jurisdictional Waters

The eastern portion of the biological study area was investigated during the assessment for jurisdictional aquatic resources. Richardson Bay is a navigable waterbody that is subject to the ebb and flow of the tides. Federal jurisdiction within tidal areas is determined by the high tide line, which occurs at an elevation of 5.13 feet North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NOAA Station 9414819), which generally corresponds with the edge of the open water–marine tidal mapping unit. State jurisdiction corresponds with the edge of the pickleweed mats alliance. As a result, the open water–marine tidal mapping unit and pickleweed mats alliance would be considered jurisdictional waters of the Unite States and state, and regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, RWQCB, CDFW, and SFBCDC. The proposed project has been designed to avoid all jurisdictional waters. See Figure 9, Impacts to Biological Resources.

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less-Than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The biological study area includes the project site and a 100-foot buffer around the project site. The proposed impact area generally lacks suitable habitat for most special-status plant species known from the surrounding region due to a combination of unsuitable habitat conditions and the high level of human activity in the area. Several special-status plant and wildlife species have a low potential to occur within the biological study area, as discussed below.

Special-Status Plants

The project site does not occur within USFWS-designated critical habitat for any federally listed plant species. No plant species listed or proposed for listing as rare, threatened, or endangered by CDFW or USFWS were detected within the biological study area during the reconnaissance-level survey conducted by Dudek in February 2020, or during previous surveys conducted by WRA in October 2007. Additionally, no plant species considered sensitive by CNPS were detected during these surveys.

Dudek performed a review of the literature, existing documentation, and GIS data to evaluate the potential for special-status plant species to occur within the biological study area. Based on the results of the literature review and database searches, 87 special-status plant species were identified as occurring within the region. Due to the current conditions present on site, including soils, vegetation communities (habitat), elevation ranges, and current disturbance levels, none of these species is expected to occur in the proposed area of impact, which is entirely developed and subject to regular disturbance. Five special-status plant species—California seablite (*Suaeda californica*; federally endangered/California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR] 1B.1), marsh sandwort (*Arenaria paludicola*; federally endangered/state endangered/CRPR 1B.1), pappose tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *Parryi*; CRPR 1B.2), Point Reyes bird's-beak (*Chloropyron maritimum* ssp. *Palustre*; CRPR 1B.2), and Suisun Marsh aster (*Symphyotrichum lentum*; CRPR 1B.2)—have at least a moderate potential to occur in the biological survey area. Although the surrounding development makes it less likely, these species have the potential to occur east of the project site. No other special-status plant species are expected to occur within the biological study area based on the absence of suitable soils, lack of suitable vegetation communities (habitats) present, the location of biological study area being outside species elevation ranges, the proximity to previous known locations based on the CNDDB and CNPS records, and the results of previous surveys.

California seablite, marsh sandwort, pappose tarplant, Point Reyes bird's-beak, and Suisun Marsh aster could be adversely affected by the project, if present. However, because no development is proposed for the portion of the biological study area where these species have the potential to occur, there would be no direct impacts to these species. Potential indirect impacts to these species would be limited to short-term construction-related impacts due to erosion, runoff, and dust. Standard BMPs have been incorporated as part of the project and would be implemented during construction to address these potential indirect impacts. With implementation of BMPs, potential indirect impacts to special-status plants would be less than significant. As a result, impacts to special-status plant species would be less than significant.

Special-Status Wildlife

The project site does not occur within USFWS-designated critical habitat for any federally listed wildlife species. No wildlife species listed or proposed for listing as rare, sensitive, threatened, or endangered by CDFW or USFWS were detected within the biological study area during the reconnaissance-level survey conducted by Dudek in February 2020. However, one special-status wildlife species (San Pablo song sparrow [*Melospiza melodia samuelis*]) was observed in the biological study area during previous surveys conducted by WRA in October 2007 (discussed below).

Dudek performed a review of literature, existing documentation, and GIS data to evaluate the potential for special-status wildlife species to occur within the project site and biological study area. Based on the results of the literature review and database searches, 43 special-status wildlife species were identified as occurring within the region. Based on the vegetation communities (habitat) present, elevation ranges, previous known locations documented within the CNDDB, and USFWS occurrence data, two of these species have at least a moderate potential to occur within the biological study area: San Pablo song sparrow and saltmarsh common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*).

San Pablo song sparrows, a California Species of Special Concern and a USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern, are found in tidal salt marshes throughout San Pablo Bay, where they are primarily associated with high marsh, particularly pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*) (Shuford and Gardali 2008). This species was observed within the biological study area during site assessments performed by WRA on October 23, 2007 (WRA 2007), and may nest in the pickleweed mats land cover within the biological study area. Saltmarsh common yellowthroat, a California Species of Special Concern and a USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern, nests and forages in emergent wetlands, including woody swamp, brackish marsh, and freshwater marsh. Saltmarsh common yellowthroat nests near the ground in grasses, herbaceous vegetation, cattails, tules, and some shrubs (Shuford and Gardali 2008). Within the biological study area, this species has a moderate potential to occur, and may nest in the pickleweed mats vegetation community.

The remaining special-status wildlife species identified during the literature review and database searches are not expected to occur within the biological study area based on the current disturbance levels, lack of suitable vegetation communities (habitats) present, the biological study area being outside species elevation ranges, the proximity to previous known locations based on the CNDDB and CNPS records, and the results of previous surveys.

San Pablo song sparrow and saltmarsh common yellowthroat both nest and forage in tidal marsh habitats, which are present within the biological study area. However, these species are not expected to occur within the proposed area of impact, and no development is proposed within the portion of the biological study area where suitable nesting and foraging habitat for these species is present. Therefore, direct impacts to these species are not expected to occur. Potential indirect impacts to San Pablo song sparrow and saltmarsh common yellowthroat would be limited to short-term construction-related impacts due to noise, erosion, runoff, and dust. Standard BMPs would be implemented during construction to reduce these potential indirect impacts to less than significant. As a result, impacts to special-status wildlife species would be less than significant.

Nesting Birds

Direct impacts to migratory nesting birds must be avoided to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (50 CFR Section 10.13). Additionally, Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests, including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as designated under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act).

Direct Impacts

The project site contains suitable foraging and nesting habitat for several common raptor and passerine species. It also provides potential nesting habitat for ground-nesting species such as killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*). Therefore, project construction could result in direct impacts to nesting birds, including the loss of nests, eggs, and fledglings, if vegetation clearing and ground-disturbing activities occur during the nesting season (generally February 15 through August 31). This impact would be significant absent mitigation. Implementation of MM-BIO-1 would reduce this direct impact to less than significant.

Indirect Impacts

Nesting birds can be significantly affected by indirect impacts from short-term construction-related noise, resulting in decreased reproductive success or abandonment of an area as nesting habitat. The biological study area and immediately adjacent areas support trees, shrubs, and structures that could provide potential nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of raptor and passerine species in the area. Indirect impacts from construction-related noise may occur to nesting birds if construction occurs during the breeding season (i.e., February 15 through August 31). Implementation of MM-BIO-1 would reduce this indirect impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

MM-BIO-1 Grading and earthwork activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures, and substrates) should take place outside of the bird breeding/nesting season, which generally occurs February 15 through August 31. If these activities cannot feasibly occur from September 1 through February 14, the applicant shall arrange for focused nesting bird surveys to be completed by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the area of impact or within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the area of impact. Surveys shall be conducted within the week prior to the initiation of construction. If nesting birds are detected, clearing and construction shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biologist until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting, as determined by the biologist. Based on the species present, surrounding habitat, and existing environmental setting/level of disturbance, the biologist may establish an avoidance buffer around occupied nests, within which no construction or ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted while the nest is still active. The extent of the buffer shall be established at the discretion of the biologist.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As described above, most of the biological study area is composed of urban and developed land covers. The eastern portion of the biological study area contains a narrow stretch of pickleweed flats and open water–marine intertidal, which are sensitive natural communities regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, RWQCB, CDFW, and SFBCDC. However, no development is proposed for these areas, and, as a result, there would be no direct impact to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Potential indirect impacts to these communities would be limited to short-term construction-related impacts due to erosion, runoff, and dust. Standard BMPs would be implemented during construction to address these potential indirect impacts. With implementation of these BMPs, impacts to sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As described above, most of the biological study area is composed of urban and developed land covers. The eastern portion of the biological study area, composed of pickleweed flats and open water–marine intertidal land covers, supports jurisdictional waters of the United States and state, including state- and federally protected wetlands. However, no development is proposed for these areas, and, as a result, there would be no direct impact to state or federally protected wetlands. Potential indirect impacts to these areas would be limited to short-term construction-related impacts due to erosion, runoff, and dust. Standard BMPs would be implemented during construction to address these potential indirect impacts. With implementation of these BMPs, impacts to state- or federally-protected wetlands would be less than significant.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

No Impact. As described above, most of the biological study area is composed of urban and developed land covers. The project site generally has limited value as a habitat linkage or wildlife corridor because of the developed character of the site itself and the surrounding existing development, including residential development to the south and commercial development to the west. With the possible exception of nesting or foraging birds, as discussed above, it is unlikely that the project site serves as an important corridor or resting place for any migratory or resident species. The natural land covers within the biological study area, situated east of the project site, could provide some value to native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species as a habitat linkage or wildlife corridor. However, no development is proposed for these areas and, as a result, there would be no direct impact to wildlife corridors or the movement of resident or migratory wildlife species within the biological study area. Neither would potential indirect impacts resulting from the proposed project diminish the value these areas provide as habitat linkages or wildlife corridors. Additionally, no native wildlife nurseries are located in the in the biological study area. Therefore, the project would have no impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, on established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or on native wildlife nursery sites.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Chapter 11.12 of the City's Municipal Code provides for the protection of certain trees on both City-owned and private property. On private, developed property, the City defines "protected trees" as including Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) measuring 4 inches diameter at breast height; heritage trees, defined as any tree measuring 10 inches diameter at breast height; and dedicated trees, which are trees provided special significance by resolution of the City council (City of Sausalito 2019). The City also identifies some species of trees as undesirable trees, negating any protection otherwise provided by the Municipal Code.

No coast live oak trees or City-dedicated trees are present in the biological study area. However, two red ironbark trees in the southern portion of the biological study area, measuring approximately 32- and 54-inches diameter at breast height, respectively, are heritage trees protected under the City's Municipal Code. The proposed project would remove both trees. In a tree report prepared in 2018 addressing the two trees proposed for removal, certified arborist Ted Kipping identified both trees as mechanically and biologically weakened with the potential to become hazardous. The report recommended removal of the trees (Kipping 2018). Furthermore, although not specifically identified as an undesirable tree in the City's Municipal Code, red ironbark tree is a non-native invasive species similar to Tasmanian bluegum (*Eucalyptus globulus*), which is listed as an undesirable tree in the Municipal Code. In addition to addressing a potential safety hazard, removal of the red ironbark trees would reduce the potential for colonization of other areas by this non-native invasive species. No other conflicts with local policies or ordinances would occur as a result of the proposed project.

In addition, the proposed project includes planting of 24 Brisbane box trees (*Tristania conferta*) and six date palms (*Phoenix dactylifera*). Therefore, impacts to biological resources protected by local policies or ordinances would be less than significant.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is not within an area covered by any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As a result, the proposed project would not conflict with any such plan, and no impact would occur.

Figure 8 Biological Resources

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 9 Impacts to Biological Resources

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Cultural Records Search Results

A records search was completed for the proposed project site and a 1/4-mile radius at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University on January 7, 2019 (Appendix C). This search included a review of their collection of mapped prehistoric, historical, and built-environment resources, Department of Parks and Recreation Site Records, technical reports, historical maps, and local inventories. Additional consulted sources included the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Inventory of Historical Resources/CRHR and listed Office of Historic Preservation Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, California Points of Historical Interest, and California Historical Landmarks. NWIC records indicate that 10 previous cultural resources technical investigations have been conducted within 1/4-mile of the proposed Project site. Of these studies, none have included any portion the proposed Project site.

Archival Building Development Research

Dudek consulted historic maps and aerial photographs to understand development of the proposed Project site and surrounding properties. Historic aerial photographs were available from 1946 to 2016; historic maps were available from 1895 to 2018 (NETR 2020). As indicated by both historical maps and aerial images, the Project site has only been used as a storage yard. In addition, the historical maps and aerial images indicate the Project site is completely composed of imported fill. Between 1947 and 1950, most of the Project site was created by imported fill placed in Richardson Bay. Between 1964 and 1968, more fill was added to create the current waterfront coastline.

Upon initial circulation of the MND, the City received information of additional historical uses and related railroad tracks which extend into the Project site. These tracks lie along the border of the Project site, and likely extend beneath the existing asphalt of Liberty Ship Way that is planned for improvement. No documentation of these tracks or the related historical context were on file with the NWIC at the time of the initial cultural resources technical study. The City commissioned an additional study (VerPlanck 2021; Appendix C to be conducted on these railroad tracks and their relationship to the WWII-era Marinship facilities that once occupied the area representing the present Project site. VerPlanck (2021) identified the 94 foot segment of street-level railroad tracks as being within Sausalito's Marinship

neighborhood. The track segment is mostly located on the private street, although a small portion encroaches on the adjoining property at 70 Liberty Ship Way, possibly extending for a short distance beneath the asphalt.

The tracks' geographical coordinates are 37.862753 -122.491306 and they are located in the southeasterly section of Sausalito's Marinship neighborhood near Schoonmaker Point. The track segment adjoins two World War II-era buildings, including Building 13 at 60-70 Liberty Ship Way, and the Annex next-door at 60D Liberty Ship Way (VerPlanck 2021). The shipyard was established by the U.S. Maritime Commission in March 1942 as part of its "emergency shipyard" program, which commissioned six shipyards across the country to build Liberty Ship freighters, tankers, and other non-military vessels needed for the war effort (VerPlanck 2021).

VerPlanck (2021) describes the track segment as consisting of grooved girder rails embedded in asphalt. They have surface corrosion but otherwise appear to be in good condition. As opposed to conventional ballasted tee track, this type of railroad track was typically set flush with the street so that vehicles could safely drive over them. The track segment appears to continue beneath the asphalt for some distance at either end, although how far is not presently known. A portion of the outer rail appears to retain elements of a switching apparatus.

The surviving aboveground segment of street-level railroad tracks on Liberty Ship Way does not appear individually eligible for the National Register or the California Register; however, the former Marinship outfitting zone does have potential to qualify as a California Register historic district (VerPlanck 2021). Therefore, as important remnants of Marinship's internal transportation infrastructure, any surviving track segments within this area would be contributing elements. No extant buildings or other known features associated with the Marinship are documented within the Project site.

In summary, the track segment on Liberty Ship Way appears to be a contributing feature to a potential historic district encompassing Marinship's outfitting zone, which appears eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1, with a period of significance of 1942 to 1946 (VerPlanck 2021). As the tracks were identified as potentially eligible for the CRHR, the project as currently designed may present impacts to a significant historical resource. Preconstruction identification of the resource's below asphalt location using metal detectors and subsequent construction monitoring, as detailed in MM-CUL-1, would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The NWIC records search, archival and building development research, and pedestrian survey completed for the project site did not identify any extant structures within the project boundaries (Appendix C). The record search noted there is a historic-era pier located at the end of Napa Street approximately 450 east of the project site but it would not be affected by the project. Therefore, no impact to historical resources would occur. The project site is entirely developed and is used for boat storage. There are no buildings on site and historical imagery indicates that the area has been subject to grading and excavation. WWII-era railroad tracks that are associated with the Marinship were identified within the project site. These railroad tracks were identified as potentially eligible for the CRHR (VerPlanck 2021) and the project as currently designed may present impacts to this significant historical resource. Compliance with MM-CUL-1, including pre-construction documentation and monitoring, would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

MM-CUL-1: Pre-Construction Historic Documentation. No modification of extant Marinship buildings, all of which are located outside the analyzed project parcel, shall be permitted. If the exposed Marinship railroad tracks intersecting the project site must be covered with

asphalt they shall be first documented according to Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards, including black and white archival photography, a concise HAER report, and measured drawings. This report would then be submitted to local archives, including the Sausalito Historical Society and the NWIC at Sonoma State University.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is entirely developed and historically has been use for marine industrial purposes. It is composed of fill imported in several stages between 1947 and 1968. A NWIC records search did not identify the presence of cultural resources. An NAHC Sacred Lands File search did identify Native American resources within the search area, which included the proposed Project site and the surrounding 1/4-mile buffer. Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria was identified as the tribe with additional information relating to this resource. Dudek contacted this tribe with a request for additional information, however no response was received. Archaeological sites were not identified during the initial cultural resources inventory, however, subsequent review by VerPlanck Historic Preservation Consulting provided additional information pertaining to a WWII-era neighborhood known as the Marinship shipyard that once occupied the area representing the present project site (Appendix C). VerPlanck further identified a segment of railroad track that extends to within the project site. A portion of this track is exposed at street level, and will be subject to HAER-style documentation, per MM-CUL-1. The track may additionally extend beneath the asphalt road further into the project site. MM-CUL-2 requires that, prior to construction, this area be investigated with a metal detector to assess if this track is present, and its likely maximum extent. It is anticipated that any track segment that remains beneath the present asphalt road surface will be left in place. In addition to this known historic-era feature, it should be assumed that the potential exists to encounter previously undiscovered significant archaeological resources during project construction activities. To ensure that impacts to cultural resources remain less than significant, including documentation of the obscured railroad segment and/or should any unanticipated cultural resources be encountered during project grading and construction, the project would be required to implement MM-CUL-2. With implementation of MM-CUL-2, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

MM-CUL-2: Preconstruction Identification and Construction Monitoring. Prior to ground disturbing activities, a qualified archaeologist will use a metal detector to identify the location and extent of the tracks encased beneath the asphalt and record these findings in the post-construction monitoring report. In addition, the results of these findings shall be provided to the technical specialist preparing the HAER documentation.

An archaeological monitor shall be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities within 50 ft of the identified track locations. Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing work, construction crews should be made aware of the requirements to preserve the tracks in place and the potential to encounter cultural resources and the requirement for cultural monitors to be present during these activities. The archaeological monitor should be provided a copy of the cultural resources technical reports and pertinent appendices to inform their monitoring efforts. The archaeological monitor should have the authority to temporarily halt work to inspect areas as needed for potential cultural material or deposits. The qualified archaeologist will record the tracks to appropriate standards (thereby addressing any data potential) and allow work to continue.

Daily monitoring logs should be completed by on-site archaeological. Within 60 days following completion of restoration, the qualified archaeological principal investigator should provide an archaeological monitoring report to the lead agency for review. This report should include the results of the cultural monitoring program, including a summary of any findings or evaluation/data recovery efforts, and supporting documentation that demonstrates all mitigation measures defined in the environmental document were appropriately met. Appendices should include monitoring logs and documentation relating to any newly identified or updated cultural resources.

Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources. In the event archaeological resources are unearthed during sediment-disturbing activities, all sediment-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted so that the find can be evaluated. Sediment-disturbing activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards. In anticipation of additional discoveries during construction, Archaeological Sensitivity Training shall then be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in sediment-disturbing activities on the site. All Native American artifacts (tribal finds) shall be considered as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to PRC 21074 until the lead agency has enough evidence to make a determination of significance. The City of Sausalito shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If appropriate, the archaeologist may introduce archaeological monitoring on all or part of the site. An archaeological report will be written detailing all archaeological finds and submitted to the Town and the Northwest Information Center.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The previous uses of the site are associated with marine industrial uses and storage and did not have any association with a cemetery or mausoleum. Furthermore, the site is entirely composed of imported fill and was not used historically for burial or internment purposes. No known human remains or burial sites were discovered through the NWIC records search, pedestrian survey of the project site, or NAHC Sacred Lands File search and subsequent tribal outreach. However, MM-CUL-3 has been incorporated into the project to ensure that potential impacts would be less-than-significant impact with mitigation by providing standard procedures in the event that human remains are encountered during project construction.

MMM-CUL-3: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within 2 working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall

notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the MLD from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project plans to comply with the most current Title 24 California Building Code/Code of Regulations (2019), CAL Green Code, California Green Building Standards Code, and 2019 energy standards at the time of building construction, as amended by the State of California and City of Sausalito. The project would include the construction of three buildings and would be responsible to comply with all current Title 24 energy requirements. During construction activities, heavy equipment powered by diesel and gasoline would clear and grade the site and be used to construct the buildings. Construction equipment would not result in the unnecessary or inefficient use of resources. In addition, during both construction and operation of the project, the project applicant or its contractor would comply with all state regulations related to solid waste generation, storage, and disposal, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act, as amended. During construction, all waste generated would be recycled to the maximum extent possible.

The project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project would follow applicable energy standards and regulations during the construction phase. In addition, the project would be built and operated in accordance with all existing, applicable regulations at the time of construction. As such, impacts related to the project's potential to conflict with plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency would be less than significant.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. As depicted in the Sausalito General Plan Update, Figure GEO-2, Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones, the closest active faults are the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 7 miles southwest of the project site, and the Hayward/Rodgers Creek Fault Zone, located approximately 11 miles northeast of the project site (CGS 2019a; City of Sausalito 2017; ENGEO 1993; Salem Howes 2006). Although varying in width, the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones are typically 0.25 miles in width (California Public Resources Code 2020). Therefore, the project site does not fall within an active fault zone. As surface faulting or ground rupture generally occur along fault lines, and no active fault lines are located within or near the project site, the potential for fault surface rupture in the development area is considered remote. In addition, project development would not directly or indirectly cause an active fault to rupture. As a result, no impacts would occur.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Although the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, Sausalito is located in a seismically active region, with four major active fault systems capable of causing strong ground-shaking earthquakes (ENGEO 1993; Salem Howes 2006). These fault systems affect a broad area, and ground shaking is the cause of most damage during earthquakes. The factors that affect the severity (intensity) of ground shaking and seismic risk to structures are the size (magnitude) of the earthquake, the duration of the earthquake, the distance of the structure from the quake epicenter, and the geological materials that underlie the site. The building materials used to strengthen or seismically reinforce a structure are also crucial (City of Sausalito 2017).

The geology of the project site consists of approximately 10 to 16 feet of artificial fill, underlain by Bay Mud, with bedrock at 50 to 90 feet below the surface. A geotechnical investigation completed at the site concluded that although the site is not subject to any unusual earthquake hazards, located near an active fault, or within a current Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, structures founded on fill and Bay Mud are subject to severe shaking during seismic events. The 30-year probability of one or more large earthquakes occurring in the San Francisco region is 70% (Salem Howes 2006).

However, completion of the project would not directly or indirectly cause strong seismically induced ground shaking. Project grading and construction would be completed in accordance with provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), which requires compliance with the recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report, including the two most-recent reports/memos completed (Salem Howes 2006, 2018). As is standard practice, a follow-up geotechnical report (or memorandum) would be completed based on the final project design and the most-recent version of the CBC. In addition, the project would incorporate the City's Health and Safety Code Earthquake Resistant Construction Standards (HS-1.1.1) and Building Code (HS-1.1.2) to minimize impacts caused by strong seismic ground shaking. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Liquefaction refers to the loosely packed, water-logged sediments at or near the ground surface that lose their strength due to strong ground shaking. Liquefaction occurring beneath buildings and other structures can cause major damage during earthquakes. Within the City, the low-lying coastal areas are most susceptible to liquefaction due to the underlying loose sand deposits. As depicted in City of Sausalito General Plan Update, Figure GEO-1, Landslide and Liquefaction Hazard, the potential for liquefaction at the project site is considered very high (City of Sausalito 2017).

However, as previously discussed, completion of the project would not directly or indirectly cause liquefaction to occur. Project grading and construction would be completed in accordance with provisions of the CBC and City municipal code requirements, which require compliance with the recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report, including the two most-recent reports/memos completed (Salem Howes 2006, 2018). As is standard practice, a follow-up geotechnical report (or memo) would be completed based on the final project design and the most recent version of the CBC. In addition, the project would incorporate the City's Health and Safety Code Earthquake Resistant Construction Standards (HS-1.1.1) and Building Code (HS-1.1.2) to minimize impacts caused by seismic-related ground failure. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The topography of the project site is flat, with a low elevation of 10 to 12 feet above sea level. There are no steep banks or hillsides in the immediate project area. The City of Sausalito General Plan Update, Figure GEO-1, Landslide and Liquefaction Hazard, does not place the site in a landslide hazard zone (City of Sausalito 2017). Although the project site would be excavated approximately 24 to 30 inches below grade, and up to 5 feet in select places, excavation side slopes would be completed in accordance with the CBC, City of Sausalito Building Code, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards and guidelines, thus preventing slope failures from occurring. As a result, the project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects regarding landslides, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Sandy soils on moderately steep slopes or clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated surface water flow. The project site includes a mild slope, varying from sea level to 12 feet above sea level. Construction activities would consist of excavation and shoring, foundation and below-grade construction, and construction of the building and finishing interiors. The project would involve excavation to approximately 24 to 30 inches below grade, and up to 5 feet in select places. Excavation would remove approximately 2,380 cubic yards of soil. Temporary staging areas would be provided for parking and maintenance of construction equipment.

Each of these activities would expose soils that could be susceptible to erosion as a result of rain, windy conditions, and/or construction vehicles traveling over exposed soils. However, because the proposed project would disturb more than 1 acre of soil, the applicant would be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land

Disturbance Activities (Order No 2009-009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002) (also known as the Construction General Permit), or the latest approved general permit requirements for stormwater discharge at construction sites. SWPPPs are required to include erosion control measures, such as covering exposed soil stockpiles, lining the perimeter of construction areas with sediment barriers, and protecting storm drain inlets and adjacent bay waters. In addition, project grading and construction would be completed in compliance with the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program, which requires completion of an Erosion Control Plan and implementation of BMPs to reduce erosion. These measures would control and reduce erosion and loss of topsoil during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A project-specific geotechnical investigation concluded that the fill on which the project site is located is considered more than adequate to spread the foundation load to an acceptable value at the fill/Bay Mud contact (Salem Howes 2006). The fill contains a wide range of non-soil material (glass, wood, wire, metal fragments), and the consistency ranges from medium to very dense. The fill is from 10 to 16 feet in thickness, with bedrock located 50 to 90 feet below the surface.

Settlement is considered the most significant geologic risk factor for the proposed project. Settlement refers to the vertical moment of the ground, often caused when increased vertical stresses are applied on or above non-dense soils. Differential settlement of the project site has resulted from the consolidation of varying thicknesses of Bay Mud under the weight of the overlying fill and former structures (Salem Howes 2006). The geotechnical investigation calculated that the existing fill has undergone approximately 4.5 feet of settlement since it was originally placed in 1941. An additional 0.5 to 1.0 feet of settlement is expected to occur in the next 50 years. The total settlement is predicted to be approximately 6.5 feet, occurring in the next 200 to 1,000 years (Salem Howes 2006).

As previously discussed, project grading and construction would be completed in accordance with provisions of the CBC, which require compliance with the recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report. The 2006 geotechnical report and follow-up 2018 memo recommend that proposed foundations consist either of a ribbed mat-type foundation on compacted fill, or pile support if differential settlement cannot be accommodated by the structure supported on the fill. Pile foundations have an advantage in that the floor elevation would remain constant as the surrounding ground settles (Salem Howes 2006, 2018). As is standard practice, a follow-up geotechnical report/memo would be completed based on the final project design and the most recent version of the CBC. In addition, the project would incorporate the City's Health and Safety Code Earthquake Resistant Construction Standards (HS-1.1.1) and Building Code (HS-1.1.2) to minimize impacts caused by seismic-related ground failure and long-term differential settlement. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Expansive soils can experience a significant volume change due to successive wetting and drying of soils, which can cause damage to improperly designed structures. In Sausalito, there is generally a low to moderate risk of damage from expansive soils throughout most of the City; however, the risk of damage is moderate to high in low-lying areas along Richardson Bay (City of

Sausalito 2017). The project site contains 10 to 15 feet of fill over 40 to 80 feet of soft clays, referred to as Bay Mud. The fill material is heterogeneous and may contain expansive soils. However, proposed structures would be constructed in accordance with recommendations in a standard, final design-level geotechnical report, as well as provisions of the CBC and City's Building Code, thus minimizing the potential for damage. Therefore, construction of the project would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property in association with potentially expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would connect to the existing sewer system and would not use a septic tank system or other alternative wastewater systems. Therefore, there would be no impact.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As the project is presently designed, no paleontological monitoring or additional management requirements would be required. The project site is located within the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province within California (CGS 2002; Norris and Webb 1990). Artificial fill underlays the project site; the project would not impact native soils with potential to support the presence of fossilized material. Recent (map units Qaf and Qm respectively; less than approximately 11,700 years old) Bay Mud and clay are mapped in areas adjacent to the project site. Modern shell fragments may be encountered within these geological units, but due to their young age, these shells would not be considered to be paleontologically significant. Older, Pleistocene-age deposits (2.58 million to 11,700 years old) are anticipated to underlie these Holocene-age deposits at an unknown depth (Schlocker 1958).

The graywacke and mélange (map unit KJss; Cretaceous and Jurassic; approximately 80 million to 200 years old) mapped south of the project site has low potential also, due to any potentially preserved fossilized remains being destroyed during the tectonic processes in this area, as they are part of the greater Franciscan complex geology exposed within the project area (Schlocker 1958). Although there are other bedrock units in this area that contain fossils, such as the Cretaceous–Jurassic radiolarian cherts (map unit KJc; Cretaceous and Jurassic; approximately 80 million to 200 years old), these fossils would be considered redundant (Schlocker 1958). These bedrock units are not anticipated to be impacted during construction.

The archival search of recorded paleontological localities found that no localities have been recorded within the project site; however, localities nearby have produced fossils specimens of extinct horse and tapir (Appendix C, Cultural Resources Report). Although no paleontological resources were observed during the pedestrian survey, the surrounding area is considered to have the potential to yield significant paleontological resources. Should the project site extend outside the current limits, Pleistocene-age sedimentary deposits may be encountered during grading activities. Therefore, if the project footprint changes to extend into the south or west outside of the current footprint, the following measure is recommended to reduce impacts to paleontological resources. With the incorporation of MM-GEO-1, impacts would be less than significant.

MM-GEO-1: Prior to the commencement of any grading activity, the applicant shall retain a paleontologist qualified by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP 2010), subject to the review and approval of the lead agency to ensure the implementation of a paleontological monitoring program.

The qualified paleontologist shall attend, or call in to, any pre-construction meetings, and manage the paleontological monitors if she/he is not doing the monitoring. A paleontological monitor shall be on site during all excavations below the depth of previously disturbed sediments. The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology defines a qualified paleontological monitor as having the following (SVP 2010):

The paleontological monitor shall monitor construction excavations below a depth of 5 feet in areas underlain by Quaternary alluvium and all excavations in areas underlain by elevated Quaternary alluvium as determined by the Qualified Paleontologist based on the construction plans. The paleontological monitor shall be equipped with necessary tools for the collection of fossils and associated geological and paleontological data. The monitor shall complete daily logs detailing the day's excavation activities and pertinent geological and paleontological data. In the event that paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are unearthed during grading, the paleontological monitor shall temporarily halt or divert grading activity to allow recovery of paleontological resources. The area of discovery shall be roped off with a 50-foot-radius buffer. Once documentation and collection of the find is completed, the monitor shall remove the rope and allow grading to recommence in the area of the find.

Following the paleontological monitoring program, a final monitoring report shall be submitted to the City for approval. The report shall summarize the monitoring program and include geological observations and any paleontological resources recovered during paleontological monitoring for the project.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate, such as temperature, precipitation, or wind, lasting for an extended period (decades or longer). Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHGs). The greenhouse effect traps heat in the troposphere through a threefold process: (1) short-wave radiation emitted by the Sun is absorbed by the Earth; (2) the Earth emits a portion of this energy in the form of long-wave radiation; and (3) GHGs in the upper atmosphere absorb this long-wave radiation and emit this long-wave radiation into space and back toward the Earth. This trapping of the long-wave (thermal) radiation emitted back toward the Earth is the underlying process of the greenhouse effect (CAT 2006).

Principal GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide, O_3, and water vapor. Some GHGs, such as CO_2, CH_4, and nitrous oxide, occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO_2 and CH_4 are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO_2 are largely byproducts of fossil-fuel combustion, whereas CH_4 results mostly from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Manufactured GHGs, which have a much greater heat-absorption potential than CO_2, include fluorinated gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride, which are associated with certain industrial products and processes (CAT 2006).

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change developed the global warming potential concept to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The global warming potential of a GHG is defined as the ratio of the time-integrated radiative forcing from the instantaneous release of 1 kilogram of a trace substance relative to that of 1 kilogram of a reference gas (IPCC 2014). The reference gas used is CO_2; therefore, emissions weighted by global warming potential are measured in metric tons (MTs) of CO_2 equivalent (CO_2e).

Regarding impacts from GHGs, both BAAQMD and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association consider GHG impacts to be exclusively cumulative impacts (BAAQMD 2017a; CAPCOA 2008); therefore, assessment of significance is based on a determination of whether the GHG emissions from a project represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the global atmosphere. This analysis uses both a quantitative and qualitative approach. The quantitative approach was used to address the first significance criterion: "Would the Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?" This analysis considers that, because the quantifiable thresholds developed by BAAQMD were formulated based on Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and California Climate Change Scoping Plan reduction targets for which its set of strategies were developed to reduce GHG emissions statewide, a project cannot exceed a numeric BAAQMD threshold without also conflicting with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Therefore, if a project exceeds a numeric threshold and results in a significant cumulative impact, it would also result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to plan, policy, or regulation consistency, even though the project may incorporate measures and have features that would reduce its contribution to cumulative GHG emissions.

Separate thresholds of significance are established by the BAAQMD for operational emissions from stationary sources (such as generators, furnaces, and boilers) and nonstationary sources (such as on-road vehicles) (BAAQMD 2017a). The threshold for stationary sources is 10,000 MT CO_2e per year (i.e., emissions above this level may be considered significant). For nonstationary sources, the following three separate thresholds have been established:

- Compliance with a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (i.e., if a project is found to be out of compliance with a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, its GHG emissions may be considered significant).
- 1,100 MT CO_2e per year (i.e., emissions above this level may be considered significant).
- 4.6 MT CO_2e per service population per year (i.e., emissions above this level may be considered significant). (Service population is the sum of residents plus employees expected for a development project.)

The quantitative threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e annually adopted by BAAQMD was applied to this analysis. If the project's GHG emissions would exceed this threshold then, consistent with BAAQMD Guidelines, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable contribution of GHG emissions and a cumulatively significant impact on climate change.

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would generate GHG emissions during both construction and operation, as evaluated below.

Construction. Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions primarily associated with the use of off-road construction equipment, on-road vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. Since the BAAQMD has not established construction-phase GHG thresholds, construction GHG emissions were amortized assuming a 30-year development life after completion of construction and added to operational emissions to compare to the BAAQMD operational GHG threshold. Amortized GHG emissions associated with project construction would result in an annualized generation of 40 MT CO_2e (Appendix A). A detailed depiction of the construction schedule—including information regarding phasing, equipment used during each phase, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles—is included in Appendix A.

Operations. Long-term operational emissions would occur over the life of the project. CalEEMod was used to estimate GHG emissions from motor vehicle trips, grid electricity usage, solid waste, and other sources (including area sources, natural gas combustion, and water/wastewater conveyance). CalEEMod default mobile-source data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emission factors, and trip distances, were used for the model inputs. Project-related traffic was assumed to be composed of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model defaults for industrial land use traffic. The CalEEMod default trip rate was adjusted to match project specifics as provided in the project's traffic and parking analysis. The first full year of project operation would be in 2025.

CalEEMod was also used to estimate emissions from the project's area sources, which includes operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment, which produce minimal GHG emissions.

The estimation of operational energy emissions was based on CalEEMod land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of the project. Annual natural gas (non-hearth) and electricity emissions were estimated in CalEEMod using the emissions factors for Pacific Gas & Electric as a conservative estimate and adjusted based on Pacific Gas & Electric's reported emissions rate of 206 pounds of CO_2 per megawatt-hour of delivered electricity (Pacific Gas & Electric Company 2020). The most recent amendments to Title 24, Part 6, referred to as the 2019 standards, became effective on January 1, 2020. These standards are incorporated in the latest version of CalEEMod by including a 30% reduction compared with the default values in CalEEMod (Appendix A).

Supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water for the project would require the use of electricity, which would result in associated indirect GHG emissions. Similarly, wastewater generated by the project would require the use of electricity for conveyance and treatment, along with GHG emissions generated during wastewater treatment. Water consumption estimates for both indoor and outdoor water use and associated electricity consumption from water use and wastewater generation were estimated using CalEEMod default values. In addition, compliance with CALGreen indoor and outdoor water reduction standards was assumed (Appendix A).

The project would generate solid waste and would therefore result in CO_2e emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. The project was assumed to comply with the 50% diversion rate consistent with AB 341 (Chesbro, Chapter 476, Statutes of 2011).

The estimated operational project-generated GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, motor vehicles, solid waste generation, water supply, and wastewater treatment are shown in Table 3.8-1.

Table 3.8-1. Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	CO2e (Metric Tons per Year)
Area	<0.1[a]
Energy	87.94
Mobile	519.2
Solid Waste	15.7
Water Supply and Wastewater	17.4
Total	**640.2**
Amortized Construction Emissions	39.8
Operation + Amortized Construction Total	**680.0**
BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Threshold	*1,100*
Significant (Yes or No)?	*No*

Source: Appendix A
Note: Total emissions may not sum due to rounding. Project greenhouse gas emissions are based on the "Mitigated" CalEEMod outputs in order to incorporate compliance with the 2019 Title 24 Standards, water reduction consistent with CALGreen, and solid waste diversion rates consistent with Assembly Bill 341, even though these would not be considered actual mitigation.
CO_2e = carbon dioxide-equivalent; BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District
[a] <0.1 = value less than reported 0.1 metric tons per year.

Table 3.8-1 indicates that the GHG emissions associated with the project would be below BAAQMD's GHG threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and this would represent a cumulatively less-than-significant GHG impact.

b) Would the project generate conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The City of Sausalito has a Climate Action Plan that focused on reducing municipal and community GHG emissions through 2020. To reduce GHG emissions 9% below 2005 levels by 2020, the Climate Action Plan included recommended actions. The actions outlined in the Climate Action Plan, such as increasing energy efficiency in buildings; encouraging less dependence on the automobile; and using clean, renewable energy sources, would help to reduce community-wide GHG emissions (City of Sausalito 2015). The project would install solar energy panels and would comply with the current Title 24 California Building Code/Code of Regulations (2019), CALGreen Code, California Green Building Standards Code, and 2019 energy standards. The project would not conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan.

The Climate Change Scoping Plan, approved by CARB on December 12, 2008, and updated since, provides a framework for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions, and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects (CARB 2014, 2017). Relatedly, in the Final Statement of Reasons for the Amendments to the CEQA Guidelines, the California Natural Resources Agency observed that "[t]he [Scoping Plan] may not be appropriate for use in determining the significance of individual projects because it is conceptual at this stage and relies on the future development of regulations to implement the strategies identified in the Scoping Plan" (CNRA 2009). Under the Scoping Plan, however, there are several state regulatory measures aimed at the identification and reduction of GHG emissions. CARB and other state agencies have adopted many of the measures identified in the Scoping Plan. Most of these measures focus on area-source emissions (e.g., energy usage, high global-warming-potential GHGs in consumer products) and changes to the vehicle fleet (e.g., hybrid, electric, and more fuel-efficient vehicles) and associated fuels

(e.g., Low Carbon Fuel Standard), among others. To the extent that these regulations are applicable to the project, the project would comply will all regulations adopted in furtherance of the Scoping Plan to the extent required by law (CARB 2014, 2017).

Regarding consistency with Senate Bill (SB) 32 (goal of reducing GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030) and Executive Order S-3-05 (goal of reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050), there are no established protocols or thresholds of significance for a future-year analysis. However, CARB has expressed optimism with regard to both the 2030 and 2050 goals. It states in the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan that "California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 GHG emissions limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32" (CARB 2014). With regard to the 2050 target for reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels, the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan states the following (CARB 2014):

> This level of reduction is achievable in California. In fact, if California realizes the expected benefits of existing policy goals (such as 12,000 megawatts of renewable distributed generation by 2020, net zero energy homes after 2020, existing building retrofits under Assembly Bill 758, and others) it could reduce emissions by 2030 to levels squarely in line with those needed in the developed world and to stay on track to reduce emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Additional measures, including locally driven measures and those necessary to meet federal air quality standards in 2032, could lead to even greater emission reductions.

In other words, CARB believes that the state is on a trajectory to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction targets set forth in AB 32, SB 32, and Executive Order S-3-05. This is confirmed in California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan (2017 Scoping Plan), which states, "This Plan draws from the experiences in developing and implementing previous plans to present a path to reaching California's 2030 GHG reduction target. The Plan is a package of economically viable and technologically feasible actions to not just keep California on track to achieve its 2030 target, but stay on track for a low- to zero-carbon economy by involving every part of the state" (CARB 2017). The 2017 Scoping Plan also states that although "the Scoping Plan charts the path to achieving the 2030 GHG emissions reduction target, we also need momentum to propel us to the 2050 statewide GHG target (80% below 1990 levels). In developing this Scoping Plan, we considered what policies are needed to meet our mid-term and long-term goals" (CARB 2017).

The project would not interfere with implementation of any of the above-described GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050 because the project would not exceed the BAAQMD's GHG threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year, which was established based on the goal of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Because the project would not exceed the threshold, this analysis provides support for the conclusion that the project would not impede the state's trajectory toward the above-described statewide GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050.

In addition, as discussed previously, the project is consistent with the GHG emission reduction measures in the Scoping Plan and would not conflict with the state's trajectory toward future GHG reductions. Since the specific path to compliance for the state in regards to the long-term goals will likely require development of technology and other changes that are not currently known or available, specific additional mitigation measures for the project would be speculative and cannot be identified at this time. With respect to future GHG targets under SB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05, CARB has also made clear its legal interpretation that it has the requisite authority to adopt whatever regulations are necessary, beyond the AB 32 horizon

year of 2020, to meet SB 32's 40% reduction target by 2030 and Executive Order S-3-05's 80% reduction target by 2050; this legal interpretation by an expert agency provides evidence that future regulations will be adopted to continue the state on its trajectory toward meeting these future GHG targets.

Based on the above considerations, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and no mitigation is required. This impact would be less than significant.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in the development of three industrial buildings with an adjacent surface parking lot. The Marin County Department of Public Works is the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), which regulates and inspects Marin County businesses, including compliance with hazardous materials regulations and providing assistance and guidance in order to meet compliance requirements (County of Marin 2020a). Any facility in Marin County that handles or stores hazardous materials or hazardous waste materials in quantities that require a state Hazardous Materials Business Plan must report this use or storage to the County Certified Unified Program Agency prior to business operation. The general thresholds of hazardous waste materials are 55 gallons of a liquid, 200 cubic feet of a gas, and 500 pounds of a solid. In the event that project operations include hazardous materials use in excess of these quantities, the facility occupant would obtain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan prior to operations.

Although small quantities of commercially available hazardous materials may be used within the proposed buildings and in landscaped areas on the project site, quantities of these materials would not be above the federal or state-defined thresholds or pose a threat to human or environmental health. Hazardous materials may include products such as pesticides, petroleum products, solvents, and chemical intermediates. Toxic materials used during the construction period would be handled in compliance with hazardous materials regulations. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project 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 Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. An adjacent property to the south, located at 30 Liberty Ship Way, underwent a remediation effort under the supervision of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, in association with an underground storage tank release of petroleum products (AEI Consultants 2018). In 1997, one 500-gallon gasoline underground storage tank was removed from this adjacent site, and in 2000, one 3,000-gallon diesel underground storage tank was removed. In addition, approximately 600 tons of impacted soil and approximately 9,200 gallons of impacted groundwater were removed and disposed of off-site. Elevated levels of total petroleum hydrocarbons, total petroleum oil and grease, and lead were present in the soil. Quarterly monitoring events and remediation efforts were ongoing from 2002 through 2010 (AEI Consultants 2018). To a limited extent, the tank release also affected the southwest portion of the project site where Building A is proposed. Based on the results of initial site investigations and groundwater monitoring at 30 Liberty Ship Way (AEI Consultants 2018), additional site characterization/assessment was implemented in January 2007, including soil and groundwater sampling at 30 Liberty Ship Way and on the project site. Samples taken on the project site included 14 soil borings and the installation of 8 groundwater monitoring wells.

In 2011, the RWQCB concluded that the concentrations in soil vapor did not pose an unacceptable human health risk for commercial/industrial workers and recommended case closure. Although 30 Liberty Ship Way and the impacted portion of the project site were issued a Case Closed status by the RWQCB on August 25, 2011, deed restrictions are in place on both sites (AEI Consultants 2018). In response to direction by the RWQCB, AEI Consultants prepared the Risk Management Plan for Diesel-Impacted Portions of 30 Liberty Ship

Way and 76 Liberty Ship Way in 2011 (AEI Consultants 2011), The Risk Management Plan includes the proper handling of diesel-impacted soil and/or groundwater should it be encountered or brought to the ground surface during future excavations in the project site and other general requirements. Implementation of MM-HAZ-1 would require the project to comply with the post-closure deed restrictions found in the project's Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (AEI Consultants 2018) and Risk Management Plan (AEI Consultants 2011), thus reducing the impacts from hazardous materials to less than significant.

MM-HAZ-1: Adherence to the post-closure deed restrictions of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Covenant and Environmental Restriction on Property (Deed 2011-0039596), dated August 22, 2011 require the site land use restrictions include the following:

The restrictions on development and use are as follows: development and use of the property shall be restricted to industrial, commercial, containerized/dry boat storage, office space, water recreational, or maritime uses; no residence for human habitation shall be permitted on the property; no hospitals shall be permitted on the property; no schools for persons under 21 years of age shall be permitted on the property; no day care center for children or senior citizens shall be permitted on the property; no excavation work shall be conducted except in compliance with the Risk Management Plan and any contaminated soil brought to the surface shall be managed in accordance with local, state, and federal law; all uses and development shall preserve or restore a minimum depth of 2 feet of soil above the diesel/fuel oil-impacted areas; no drilling for the purpose of a well or extraction of water for any use; the RWQCB shall be notified of any planned grading/excavation/ trenching/backfilling that could create a direct contact exposure pathway above the diesel/fuel oil-impacted areas; and no act shall aggravate or contribute to the existing environmental conditions of the property.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The project site is 0.3 miles northeast of Montessori Sparrow Creek School and is approximately 0.6 miles east of Willow Creek Academy. Due to their distance from the project site, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 by the Department of Toxic Substances Control, provides information regarding the location of hazardous materials release sites. Although the project site itself is not included on the Cortese List, the following properties within 1,000 feet of the project site are included: the adjacent site located at 30 Liberty Ship Way, 25 Liberty Ship Way, and 300 Napa Street (AEI Consultants 2018).

As discussed for Threshold 3.9(b), contamination at the adjacent 30 Liberty Ship Way property associated with a former leaking underground storage tank migrated downgradient onto the project site. However, in 2011, the RWQCB concluded that although residual soil and groundwater contamination remains at 30 Liberty Ship Way and the project site, the concentrations of soil vapor did not pose an unacceptable human

health risk for commercial/industrial workers and recommended case closure. 30 Liberty Ship Way and the impacted portion of the project site were issued a Case Closed status by the RWQCB on August 25, 2011 but deed restrictions are in place on both sites (AEI Consultants 2018). Implementation of MM-HAZ-1 described above would require the project to comply with the post-closure deed restrictions, thus reducing the impacts from hazardous materials to less than significant.

The property located at 300 Napa Street, approximately 175 feet east of the project site, is a voluntary cleanup site due to a release of arsenic, lead, diesel, mercury, and motor oil from historic shipbuilding activities at the site. Impacted soil was excavated and removed from the site. Residual contaminated soil was covered by a geosynthetic liner followed by a geotextile fabric and 1 foot of clean soil over the fabric. Land use restrictions also apply to this site. Based on this information and the down-gradient location of this site relative to the project site, the property located at 300 Napa Street is not expected to represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment (AEI Consultants 2018).

The property located at 25 Liberty Ship Way, approximately 750 feet west of the project site, is a former shipyard and machine shop operated during World War II (DTSC 2020). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers acquired one building from the shipyard in 1948 and converted it into a geotechnical testing laboratory in 1950. This laboratory closed in 1997 and the site is currently owned by the Veterans Administration. Contaminants in the soil and groundwater on site included Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), petroleum hydrocarbon, solvents, metals, and arsenic. A soil removal action was completed in 2006 to remove PCB contamination detected above levels considered safe for commercial/industrial use. Land use restrictions are in effect to restrict the property from sensitive uses such as residential, hospital, or school. Due to the distance from the project site, this property would not represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Therefore, with the inclusion of MM-HAZ-1, the project site and nearby properties would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airports are San Rafael Airport in San Rafael Airport and San Francisco Airport, both of which are more than 10 miles away. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There would be no impact.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The project site would be served by the City of Sausalito Police Department and Southern Marin Fire Protection District, both of which are equipped to respond to an emergency on the site should the need occur. The City has limited routes of access to and from the City; however, the project would not obstruct evacuation routes during construction or operation. The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There would be no impact.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. The project site is located within an urbanized area, and is not adjacent to or close to wildlands. Figure HAZ-3, Wildfire Hazards, of the City of Sausalito General Plan Update does not show the area as having any wildfire hazards (City of Sausalito 2017). Therefore, the project does not have the potential to expose people to risk as a result of wildland fires. There would be no impact.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The San Francisco Bay RWQCB regulates water quality in surface waters and groundwater bodies and is responsible for implementation of state and federal water quality protection guidelines at the project site. The federal NPDES Nonpoint Source Program (established through the Clean Water Act) regulates the water quality of runoff. The NPDES Program objective is to control and reduce pollutants to water bodies from nonpoint discharges.

Construction

As described in Section 3.7, Geology and Soils, grading and construction activities would expose soils that could be susceptible to erosion-induced siltation of adjacent marine waters as a result of rain, windy conditions, and/or construction vehicles traveling over the exposed soils. However, because the proposed project would disturb more than 1 acre of soil, the applicant would be required to implement a SWPPP in compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit. SWPPPs are required to include erosion control measures, such as covering exposed soil stockpiles, lining the perimeter of construction areas with sediment barriers, and protecting storm drain inlets and adjacent bay waters. In addition, project grading and construction would be completed in compliance with the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program, which requires completion of an Erosion Control Plan and implementation of BMPs to reduce erosion.

Construction activities could also result in incidental spills of pollutants, including paint, concrete, mortar, and cement. BMPs would similarly be implemented in accordance with the SWPPP to control potential releases of these materials. With implementation of construction-related BMPs, project construction would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality.

As described in Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the construction operations may also disturb existing hazardous materials located under the surface. If this were to occur, the SWPPP in conjunction with coordination with CUPA and RWQCB regulations stipulate that the material exposed will be managed in accordance with state and federal requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed project would involve construction of three, two-story, mixed-use industrial buildings totaling 47,096 square feet of floor area on a 3.9-acre parcel. There is 36,011 square feet of existing impervious surfaces on site, which represents 21% of the total surface area. Approximately 55,252 square feet of the parcel area would be occupied by structures and other impervious surfaces (CSW/SSEG 2018), which is equivalent to 33% of the total surface area, or a 12% increase over existing conditions.

Stormwater runoff is the principal source of pollution entering surface water and groundwater in the San Francisco Bay region (City of Sausalito 2017). Based on NPDES stormwater regulations, the project would require on-site treatment of stormwater runoff. To maintain compliance with NPDES regulations, the City participates in the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program, which maintains compliance with the NPDES Storm Water Discharge Permit. This program provides annual reports to the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, including information on illegal discharge detection and elimination, street and storm drain

cleaning, municipal and creek maintenance, stormwater and creek protection controls for development projects, business inspections, and public health outreach and participation (County of Marin 2020b).

The most recent Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Annual Report identified Richardson Bay as exceeding coliform bacteria water quality standards (City of Sausalito 2017). A numeric target for pathogens was established by the State Water Resources Control Board when it created the Richardson Bay total maximum daily load in 2008. In addition, Richardson Bay is listed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as an impaired water body for the pesticides chlordane, DDT, and dieldrin, as well as coliform bacteria, dioxin-containing compounds, furan-containing compounds, invasive species, mercury, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). In 2009, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency approved a Basin Plan amendment incorporating total maximum daily loads for Richardson Bay and including an implementation plan to control pollutant sources and achieve needed reductions (City of Sausalito 2017).

Without implementation of a Stormwater Control Plan, post-construction land use could result in degradation of water quality in Richardson Bay by reducing the quality of stormwater runoff. Potential on-site sources of stormwater pollutants include incidental releases of oil, grease, and metals from vehicles in parking lots; fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides from landscape maintenance; litter during trash management; and animal waste. However, a Stormwater Control Plan was prepared for the project (CWS/SSEG 2018a), which recommends permanent low-impact-development operation-source-control BMPs to address potential sources of runoff pollutants. Water quality control features would include landscaping, biofiltration basins, and permeable paving.

Based on the Stormwater Control Plan, the project site was divided into five proposed drainage areas, with each area to control the runoff and treat the surface water prior to discharge to the storm drains and Richardson Bay (CWS/SSEG 2018a). Runoff would be directed to planter areas dispersed throughout the site and would have an additional filter system for the storm drain system prior to discharge to the Bay. From the planter areas, runoff would primarily flow across impervious pavement and then be diverted to bioretention basins, which would be located to take advantage of multiple existing discharge points. Permeable pavers would be installed in the northwest corner of the project site, in a small area of proposed parking and sidewalk, since the runoff in this area would not be directed to a bioretention area for treatment. With the exception of the northwest corner, proposed buildings, walkways, parking lots, and graded areas would all drain to bioretention facilities, which would be designed and constructed to the criteria in the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association Post-Construction Manual (BASMAA 2019). The bioretention facilities would be maintained in perpetuity by the property owner, in accordance with a Stormwater Facility Operation and Maintenance Plan, to be submitted to the City prior to completion of construction.

Based on implementation of the Stormwater Control Plan, which would include implementation of permanent low-impact-development BMPs and which would be constructed in accordance with criteria in the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association Post-Construction Manual, project operation would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) provides water services for the City. The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan Update indicates that MMWD's water supply is derived

primarily from a network of seven local, rain-fed reservoirs, supplemented with water from the Sonoma County Water Agency (MMWD 2016a). As a result, water demand for the proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, the project site is not located in an area of groundwater recharge, since it is located within an urban, developed area, immediately adjacent to Richardson Bay. Although project construction would result in an increase in impervious surfaces of 12%, incorporation of pervious landscaping and infiltration basins throughout the site would allow partial infiltration of runoff into on-site soils. As a result, the project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project site is located on a mild slope at low elevations near sea level, with compact soils throughout the site. As previously discussed for Threshold 3.10(a), following construction, runoff would be directed to planter areas dispersed throughout the site. From the planter areas, runoff would primarily flow across impervious pavement and then be diverted to five bioretention basins, which would be located to take advantage of multiple existing discharge points. Permeable pavers would be installed in the northwest corner of the project site in a small area of proposed parking and sidewalk, since the runoff in this area would not be directed to a bioretention area for treatment. Two of the five bioretention areas would provide water quality benefits, and provide capacity to detain runoff so that post-project peak stormwater flows would be less than or equal to existing conditions for the 100-year peak runoff storm event (CWS/SSEG 2018b). As a result, off-site runoff would not result in substantial on- or off-site erosive scour or siltation of Richardson Bay. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed previously for Threshold 3.10(c)(i), the proposed development would not increase the rate of peak surface water runoff because the project would incorporate bioretention systems, landscaped areas, and porous pavement into project design. As a result, the proposed project would not result in flooding on site or off site, and impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed previously for Threshold 3.10(c)(i), the proposed development would not increase the rate of peak surface water runoff because the project would incorporate bioretention systems, landscaped areas, and porous pavement into project design. As a result, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. In addition, as discussed for Threshold 3.10(a), based on implementation of the Stormwater Control Plan (CWS/SSEG 2018a;), which includes implementation of permanent low-impact-

development BMPs and which would be constructed in accordance with criteria in the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association Post-Construction Manual, stormwater runoff would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Liberty Ship Way is located near the waterfront of Richardson Bay, which is prone to flood and tsunami hazards. Rising sea levels and more severe storm flooding as a result of climate change are impacting Marin County, which has planned for the challenges of climate change in collaboration with Marin's cities and towns. Based on the City's General Plan Update (City of Sausalito 2017), the on-site marsh restoration easement located southeast of the Bay Trail is within a 100-year flood plain, for which base flood elevations have been determined. This area is susceptible to 1% annual chance flooding with potential wave action. However, none of the proposed structures would be located within this flood zone. Similarly, as shown in Figure 10, mapping by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2016) indicates that the southeast portion of the site, seaward of the Bay Trail, is located within a 100-year flood zone (Zone VE). The base flood elevations in the area are between 10 and 11 feet above mean sea level; the buildings would be set approximately 2 feet above those levels. However, the southwest, northwest, and northeast portions of the project site are located within a 500-year flood zone (Zone X), in which there is a 0.2% annual chance of flooding, or an area of 1% annual chance of flooding with average depths less than 1 foot. Proposed structures would be located in these areas.

To promote public health, safety, and general welfare, the City adopted Chapter 8.48, Floodplain Management, of the Sausalito Municipal Code, which includes methods of reducing flood losses (8.48.014), including restricting uses that are dangerous to health, safety, and property due to flooding; requiring that uses vulnerable to flooding be protected against flood damage; controlling the alteration of floodplains and natural drainages, which help accommodate or channel floodwaters; controlling filling, grading, dredging, and other development that may increase flood damage; and preventing or regulating the construction of flood barriers that would unnaturally divert floodwaters or that may increase flood hazards in other areas.

New construction is not prohibited by federal, state, or local laws within 500-year flood plains or tsunami inundation areas. In the unlikely event that flooding occurred on site, proposed structures and other improvements would not impede or redirect flood flows such that flooding would increase on adjacent properties. As a result, impacts associated with flood flows would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The site would not be subject to seiches, which are oscillations (i.e., sloshing) in an enclosed body of water due to seismically induced ground shaking. The entire project site is located within a potential tsunami inundation area (CGS 2019b) and would be subject to flooding in the unlikely event of a 500-year flood or tsunami. The proposed project would include industrial uses, and as a result, may include storage and use of hazardous materials. However, as discussed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, any facility in Marin County that handles or stores hazardous materials or hazardous waste materials in quantities that require implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan must submit the plan for approval by the County Certified Unified Program Agency prior to business operation.

Compliance with such a plan would ensure proper storage and handling of hazardous materials, thus minimizing the potential for releases during the unlikely event of a flood.

Although small quantities of commercially available hazardous materials may be used within the proposed buildings and in landscaped areas on the project site, quantities of these materials would not be above the state-defined thresholds or pose a threat to human or environmental health. The source of pollutants may be managed through standard hazardous materials source control BMPs during project operations. Although the project site is located in a 500-year flood zone and tsunami zone, with implementation of practices required by the City's Municipal Code (8.48.014), implementation of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (if applicable), and implementation of standard source control BMPs, the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation is low and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. As previously discussed, the project would comply with applicable water quality regulatory requirements, including implementation of a SWPPP, stormwater BMPs, and low-impact-development design, which would minimize potential off-site surface water quality impacts and contribute to a reduction in water quality impacts within the overall Richardson Bay Watershed. In addition, with compliance with regulatory requirements, the project would reduce potential water quality impairment of surface waters such that existing and potential beneficial uses of key surface water drainages throughout the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB Basin Plan would not be adversely impacted. As a result, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the San Francisco Bay RWQCB Basin Plan, and no impacts would occur.

As mentioned for Threshold 3.10(b), the proposed project would rely on water services provided by the MMWD, which derives most of its water from surface waters. As a result, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a groundwater management plan, and no impacts would occur.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 10 Flood Hazard Map

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site currently contains dry boat storage for approximately 85 small vessels and containerized storage. There is one existing building on site, the Harbormaster building, and no other permanent buildings occur within the project boundaries. The project would involve construction of three industrial buildings. The intended uses of the buildings would include a variety of marine services, manufacturing, general industrial, boat storage, repair and maintenance, commercial, and restaurant uses. The project design enhances connectivity through the site to the Bay Trail by expanding pedestrian access and public parking. There are no residences on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The parcel is designated for Industrial and Waterfront uses in the 2040 General Plan Update and the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sausalito (City of Sausalito 2020). The project site is zoned Industrial and Waterfront under the Marinship Overlay Zoning District (GeoData Analytics 2003). Approximately, 105,200 square feet of the project site is located within Industrial zoning and 65,005 square feet is located within Waterfront zoning. The purposes of the Industrial Marinship Zoning District include providing for non-polluting, low-intensity industrial uses; providing compatibility with an industrial area; providing for non-invasive industry with minimal community impacts; providing industrial service and art uses; encouraging a mixture of uses; providing urban development standards; providing public access to Richardson Bay; and maintaining the land use entitlements that are contained in the Industrial District Regulations (City of Sausalito 1989).

The Waterfront Marinship Zoning limits development to that which supports the marine industry. The Marinship Specific Plan intent for the Waterfront zone includes the following marine-oriented uses: boat harbors, piers, wharves, and launching ramps; boat storage; boat sales, rental, building, repair, and service; commercial and sport fishing facilities; wholesale and retail fish sales; marine equipment sales, manufacture, service, and repair; tax-exempt yacht clubs; and marine research laboratories. The project would be consistent with both zoning districts and their allowed uses. The project would also be consistent

with the site development standards of the Marinship Overlay Zoning District, as well as the parking requirements per the Marinship Specific Plan (City of Sausalito 1989). The project would not have an environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a,b) ***Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?***

No Impact. The California Department of Conservation's Division of Mining and Geology implements the Mineral Land Classification program, which divides land into four categories called Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on the quality of geologic information available on a given geographic area and the estimated economic value of the resource (DOC 1998). The project site is designated as MRZ-1, areas where significant mineral resources are unlikely to exist (CGS 2013). The Sausalito General Plan does not identify the presence of locally important mineral resource recovery site in the vicinity of the project site (City of Sausalito 2017). Implementation of the project would not result in a loss of availability of any known mineral resource. No impact would occur.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less-Than-Significant Impact Current existing outdoor ambient sound levels in the vicinity of the project site range from 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) to 65 dBA day-night noise level (L_{dn}) per Map GP-19 from the Health and Safety Element of the City of Sausalito General Plan (City of Sausalito 1995). In addition, Table 7-3 from the Health, Safety, and Community Resilience Element of the 2040 General Plan Update indicates that at a distance of 50 feet from the centerline of the intersection of Bridgeway and Marinship Way, near the northern entrance of the project site, the weighted average is 67 dBA as calculated from measurement data. Table 7-4 from the Health, Safety, and Community Resilience Element shows that, consistent with state planning guidelines, existing noise level exposures of up to 70 dBA L_{dn} are "conditionally acceptable" for industrial and manufacturing uses (City of Sausalito 2020); the project site is zoned "Industrial" by the City.

Existing noise levels ranging from 55 to 70 dBA L_{dn} would be either normally or conditionally acceptable for the proposed uses on the site depending on proximity to the dominant source of noise level exposure—in this case, the nearby roadway traffic. The following noise analyses demonstrates that the intended land uses of the project are compatible with the anticipated outdoor sound environment after implementation of the project.

Temporary Noise Increase

Construction noise is a temporary phenomenon, with emission levels varying from hour to hour and day to day depending on the heavy equipment in use, the operations performed, and the distance between the source and receptor. Equipment that would be in use during project construction would include, in part, backhoes, cranes, forklifts, pavers, rollers, and air compressors. The typical maximum noise levels for various pieces of construction equipment at a distance of 50 feet are presented in Table 3.13-1. Note that the equipment noise levels presented in Table 3.13-1 are maximum noise levels. Typically, construction equipment operates in alternating cycles of full power and low power, producing energy-average noise levels less than the maximum noise level. The average sound level of construction activity also depends on the amount of time that the equipment operates and the intensity of construction activities during that time.

Table 3.13-1. Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Equipment (L_{max}, dBA at 50 Feet)
Air compressor	78
Auger drill rig	84
Backhoe	78
Concrete mixer truck	79
Concrete saw	90
Crane	81
Dozer	82
Dump Truck	76
Front-end loader	79
Generator	72
Grader	85
Impact pile driver	95
Man lift	75
Paver	77
Roller	80
Welder/torch	73

Source: DOT 2006.
dBA = A-weighted decibels.

As shown in Table 3.13-1, the maximum noise levels at 50 feet for expected construction equipment would be 90 dBA for the concrete saw activity during initial demolition of the existing pavement on site, and then 95 dBA for the pile-driving as part of the foundation phase for each of the three planned project buildings.

Construction noise in a well-defined area typically attenuates at approximately 6 decibels (dB) per doubling of distance. Proposed project construction would take place both near and far from adjacent, existing noise-sensitive uses. For example, construction of Building A could occur as close as 215 feet to the nearest houseboats associated with the Galilee Harbor Community Association (GHCA) and 315 feet to the nearest existing homes south of Bridgeway. These distances represent the closest that construction activities would be to sensitive receptors as construction on other parts of the site would be farther away; however, for the purposes of providing a conservative analysis these two distances were used to assess potential construction noise impacts.

An Excel-based noise prediction model emulating and using reference data from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2008) was used to estimate construction noise levels at the nearest occupied noise-sensitive land use. (Although the Roadway Construction Noise Model was funded and promulgated by the FHWA, it is often used for non-roadway projects, because the same types of construction equipment used for roadway projects are often used for other types of construction.) Input variables for this predictive modeling consist of the equipment type, quantity (one each), the default duty cycle for each piece of equipment (e.g., percentage of time within a specific time period, such as an hour, when the equipment is expected to operate at full power or capacity and thus make noise at a level comparable to what is presented in Table 3.13-1), and the distance from the noise-sensitive receiver. No topographical or structural shielding was assumed in the modeling. The default Roadway Construction Noise Model duty cycle values (i.e., "acoustical usage factor") for the various pieces of equipment were derived from an extensive study of typical construction activity patterns at the "Big Dig" Central Artery project in Boston (DOT 2006).

Estimated aggregate noise levels from operating on-site equipment and processes for the major construction phases were calculated at the distances associated with the previously mentioned GHCA and Bridgeway community nearest noise-sensitive land uses. As presented in Table 3.13-2, Construction Noise Modeling Summary Results, the estimated construction noise levels are predicted to be as high as 76 dBA equivalent continuous sound level (L_{eq}) over an 8-hour period at the nearest GHCA houseboats or live-aboards when foundation pile-driving takes place.

Table 3.13-2. Construction Noise Modeling Summary Results

Construction Phase (expected equipment types)	Estimated 8-Hour L_{eq} (dBA)	
	*Nearest GHCA Receiver (215 feet)**	*Nearest Bridgeway Receiver (315 feet)*
Demolition (backhoe, concrete saw)	71	63
Grading (backhoe, grader, dump truck, front end loader, dozer)	73	64
Foundations (auger drill rig, impact pile driver)	76	68
Building Construction (crane, man-lift, generator, welder/torch)	64	56
Paving (concrete mixer truck, backhoe, air compressor, paver, roller)	69	61
Architectural Coating (air compressor)	52	44

Notes: L_{eq} = equivalent continuous sound level (time-averaged sound level); dBA = A-weighted decibel; GHCA = Galillee Harbor Community Association

* As much of the sound would travel over water, typical acoustical ground absorption is not accounted for in this calculation.

Although Section 12.16.140.A of the City's Municipal Code limits construction hours to allowable timeframes on weekdays (8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.) and Saturdays (9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), it does not quantify a specific threshold on permissible construction noise. Hence, for purposes of this analysis and owing to the lack of a local noise limit, this assessment adopts the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance daytime threshold of 80 dBA L_{eq} over an 8-hour period for residential receptors (FTA 2018). On this basis, all predicted construction phase noise levels for the nearest GHCA and Bridgeway residences are less than this federal guidance, and would therefore support a less-than-significant impact finding. No mitigation measures would be needed. However, construction activities on site would still need to conform with City's Health and Safety Element policies (HS-3.5) that require proper noise-reducing baffles on heavy equipment, restriction of construction activity to the aforementioned allowable time periods per the City's Municipal Code, and consideration of temporary noise walls. Temporary noise walls are not expected to be needed as given the predicted project construction noise levels shown in Table 3.13-2 would be compliant with the FTA guidance.

Because occupation of a completed Building A is anticipated to occur prior to commencement of site work for Buildings B and C, there will be an opportunity for Building A to be exposed to temporary on-site construction noise. For instance, when pile-driving occurs for Building B, the nearest potentially occupied space in Building A would only be about 50 feet away. However, the site plans show that Building A is intended for boat storage on its first floor and warehousing/storage on its second floor. Such uses are not usually considered noise-sensitive; hence, and for informational purposes, adverse noise effects are not expected for Building A when construction of Buildings B and C take place.

Durable Noise Increase

Off-Site Transportation Noise

The proposed project would result in the creation of additional vehicle trips on local roadways (e.g., Bridgeway), which could result in increased traffic noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. However, the addition of project-attributed traffic to existing Bridgeway peak hour volumes, as analyzed by Robert L. Harrison Transportation Planning (2018), is predicted to be no more than a 2% increase, which, per acoustical principles, would result in no more than an insignificant 0.1 dB change to existing traffic noise emission levels. To put this in perspective, a doubling of traffic volume on a roadway causes a 3 dB change, which is considered barely perceptible. Hence, off-site transportation noise impacts due to the project would be less than significant.

On-Site Operation Noise

The proposed project would have three buildings (A, B, and C) that, according to site plans, would feature heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment and can be summarized as follows:

- Building A: Due to expected manufacturing and storage uses depending on the occupying lessee, HVAC equipment locations for this structure are not yet determined. However, it is likely that wall-mounted exhaust fans or air-cooled condensing units would be placed near the building façade. For purposes of this analysis, such condensing units could be comparable to Carrier CA16-NA-060 (5-ton refrigeration capacity) units that have a sound power level of 78 dBA (Carrier 2012), and as many as six (i.e., one per lessee) may be installed near a facade. If all six were operating, the sound level would be 86 dBA (i.e., 78 + 10*LOG[6] per principles of logarithmic addition for identical sound emission sources).
- Building B: The design of this building features a centrally located “well” area for mechanical equipment on the roof level bounded on four sides by the sloped roof structure. Given the sound-path occlusion formed by the roof, noise emission from the contained mechanical equipment would be reduced prior to propagation toward the neighboring community. For purposes of this analysis, as many as 12 air-cooled condensing units comparable to a Carrier CA16-NA-060 would be arrayed within the rooftop well, producing an aggregate sound emission level of up to 89 dBA (i.e., 78 + 10*LOG[12] per principles of logarithmic addition for identical sound emission sources).
- Building C: The design of this building features a rooftop area for mechanical equipment that is bounded by a solid screen. One side of this wall, facing Building B, is an architectural louver (presumably to facilitate air intake for the HVAC units). Given the sound-path occlusion formed by this effectively three-sided equipment screen, aggregate noise emissions from the contained mechanical equipment would be reduced prior to propagation toward the neighboring community. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the operating rooftop air-handling units (and/or other equipment on this bounded rooftop area) would emit an aggregate outdoor noise emission level comparable to as many as 12 aforementioned Carrier CA16-NA-060 air-cooled condensing units.

Based on the above-described anticipated operating HVAC equipment noise emission levels, at approximate distances of 215 feet to the nearest façade of Building A, 330 feet to the rooftop well of Building B, and 275 feet to the rooftop equipment area of Building C, the closest GHCA houseboat (or live-aboard) would receive a project-attributed sound exposure level of 46 dBA. This predicted HVAC noise level is 14 dB less than the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) ambient base noise level of 60 dBA classified for Waterfront-zoned property, per Section 12.16.040 of the City's Noise Ordinance.

At approximate distances of 450 feet to the nearest façade of Building A, 510 feet to the rooftop well of Building B, and 630 feet to the rooftop equipment area of Building C, the closest residence south of Bridgeway would receive a project-attributed sound exposure level of 36 dBA. This predicted HVAC noise level is 19 dB less than the daytime ambient base noise level of 55 dBA classified for Waterfront-zoned property per Section 12.16.040 of the City's Noise Ordinance.

Since Section 12.16.130 of the City's Noise Ordinance allows up to a 5 dB increase over the ambient base noise level, and thus no exceedances would occur based on these two predictions, noise impacts from project-attributed operation of stationary sources during expected business hours (i.e., equipment would be inoperative or operating at much lower noise emission levels at night) would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-Than-Significant Impact Construction activities may expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, causing a potentially significant impact. Caltrans has collected groundborne vibration information related to construction activities (Caltrans 2013). Information from Caltrans indicates that continuous vibrations with a peak particle velocity of approximately 0.2 inches per second is considered "annoying." For context, heavier pieces of construction equipment, such as a bulldozer that may be expected on the project site, have peak particle velocities of approximately 0.089 inches per second or less at a reference distance of 25 feet (FTA 2018).

Groundborne vibration attenuates rapidly—even over short distances. The attenuation of groundborne vibration as it propagates from source to receptor through intervening soils and rock strata can be estimated with expressions found in FTA and Caltrans guidance. Table 3.13-3 presents predicted vibration velocity levels for the operating equipment type of each construction phase anticipated to generate the highest levels of groundborne vibration.

Table 3.13-3. Predicted Construction Vibration Propagation

Construction Phase (expected equipment producing highest vibration emission)	Vibration Velocity Levels (peak particle velocity in inches per second)	
	*Reference PPV (at 25 feet)**	*PPV at Nearest Bridgeway Residence (at 315 feet)*
Demolition (backhoe)	0.089	0.002
Grading (dozer)	0.089	0.002
Foundations (impact pile driver)	0.644	0.014
Building Construction (crane)	0.089	0.002
Paving (roller)	0.210	0.004

* from FTA 2006.
PPV = peak particle velocity

None of the predicted groundborne vibration velocity levels are expected to exceed the human annoyance criterion of 0.2 inches per second peak particle velocity; therefore, such impact would be less than significant.

Additionally, construction vibration at sufficiently high levels can present a building damage risk. However, anticipated construction vibration associated with the proposed project would not yield levels that would surpass this risk. Per Caltrans, the recommended peak particle velocity threshold is 0.5 inches per second for newer residential structures and 0.3 inches per second for older residential structures—both of which are less stringent that the aforementioned threshold to annoy occupants of such structures; thus, vibration damage risk to nearby structures would be less than significant.

For informational purposes, this analysis predicted that on-site pile-driving activity for the installation of foundations at Buildings B and C might exceed 0.2 inches per second peak particle velocity at the nearest façade of a newly completed Building A; however, the predicted vibration velocity level would still be less than the FTA-recommended threshold of 0.5 inches per second peak particle velocity for modern steel buildings. Hence, this on-site construction activity vibration might be perceptible to someone temporarily visiting a boat storage stall in Building A, but based on this analysis, would not risk damaging the new building structure.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. The closest airports to the project site are more than 10 miles away (San Rafael Airport to the north, and San Francisco International Airport to the south), and would therefore not be expected to cause excessive noise level exposures. Hence, impacts under this assessment category would be less than significant.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project would involve construction of three new industrial buildings on a site zoned Industrial and Waterfront under the Marinship Overlay Zoning District (City of Sausalito 2003). Access and circulation for vehicles and pedestrians would be improved. The project would not include housing, and thus would not directly induce population growth. Approximately 84 new jobs would be created with the project (McDonald 2020). The existing labor force in Marin County is estimated to be approximately 143,000 people, which would be sufficient to provide for the project's employment demand (State of California Employment Development Department 2020). The scale and type of the project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site currently contains dry boat and containerized storage and does not contain existing housing. There would be no displacement of people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

The project site is located in an area that currently receives public services of fire, police, public schools, parks, and other services by the City. Per the City's Zoning designations, this parcel is identified to be a combination of Industrial and Waterfront Zoning and provide a mix of uses, including Light Industrial,

Marine Commercial, Office, Specialized Education, Restaurant Lounge, and Storage Areas (Sausalito Municipal Code, Title 10, Chapter 10.10.010 and Chapter 10.10.020). The development would not provide residential uses; thus, the project would not contribute to population growth. The proposed development is not anticipated to impact existing public services to the severity to require new or altered government facilities. Therefore, no significant impacts to the City's public services are projected as described below.

Fire protection?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Southern Marin Fire District provides fire protection and prevention services to the City, including the project site. The project would be required to comply with the Municipal Code Chapter 8.40, Fire Code, and Fire Department standards in effect at the time of project development, including building specifications, access design, the location and spacing of fire hydrants, and other plan check and design review requirements. The closest fire station to the project site is 333 Johnson Street, approximately 0.75 miles away (South Marin Fire District 2017). Therefore, due to the design of the project and proximity to the fire station, new or physically altered fire protection facilities would not be needed, and the project's impact on fire protection facilities would be less than significant.

Police protection?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Sausalito Police Department provides police protection services to the City, including the project site. The police station is located 1 mile from the project site at 29 Caledonia Street. Police officers regularly patrol within the City limits; the project site is located directly off of a major thoroughfare (Bridgeway), and it would be expected that police response to the project site would occur within acceptable response times (City of Sausalito 2020). The project would not induce population growth and would include on-site security measures. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Schools?

No Impact. The proposed project would consist of the construction of three industrial buildings and would not directly result in population growth that would increase K–12 enrollment in the Sausalito Marin City School District. There would be no need for new or expanded school facilities. No impact would occur.

Parks? Other public facilities?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would consist of the construction of three industrial buildings and would not directly result in population growth. The project would improve access to and lighting on the Bay Trail. Access and demand for parks and other public facilities in the project vicinity would not substantially increase over existing patterns. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a,b) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project would involve construction of three industrial buildings on a site that currently is occupied by dry boat and containerized storage. The project would also include improvements to the Bay Trail and enhance pedestrian access to the shoreline. The project would not induce population growth. There are sufficient parks and recreational facilities close to the project site, including Schoonmaker Beach, Dunphy Park, and Lagendorf Park. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of existing facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. Furthermore, there would be no adverse physical effect on the environment from construction related to recreational facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

This section analyzes the transportation impacts of the project based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), which focuses on recently adopted analysis criteria and impact metrics pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743 for determining the significance of transportation impacts. Per SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis changed from a level of service (LOS) or vehicle delay approach to the analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The related updates to the CEQA Guidelines required under SB 743 were approved on December 28, 2018 and were required to be implemented on July 1, 2020.

Accordingly, for CEQA purposes, this section analyzes the project-related impacts pertaining to VMT. An LOS/delay-based analysis has also been prepared and is provided for informational purposes only. This analysis can be found in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) (Dudek 2021) prepared for the project (see Appendix D).

Project Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates were based on the project description and characteristics as well as the expected land uses associated within each of the three buildings proposed as part of the project. Trip generation was estimated by using trip rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers 10th Edition Trip Generation book (2017). Accordingly, AM and PM peak hour trip generation volumes were computed. Table 3.17-1 presents the trip generation estimates for the proposed project.

Table 3.17-1. Project Trip Generation

Land Use[1]	Quantity	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	*Out*	*Total*	*In*	*Out*	*Total*
Building A - Manufacturing	3.176 TSF	12	2	0	2	1	1	2
Building A - Warehousing	15.576 TSF	27	2	1	3	1	2	3
Building A - Total		*39*	*4*	*1*	*5*	*2*	*3*	*5*
Building B - Manufacturing	13.561 TSF	53	6	2	8	3	6	9
Building B - Medical Clinic	4.553 TSF	174	13	4	17	4	11	15
Building B - Total		*227*	*19*	*6*	*25*	*7*	*17*	*24*
Building C - Marine Industrial	4.767 TSF	24	3	0	3	0	3	3
Building C - Marine Commercial	4.585 TSF	173	3	1	4	9	9	18
Building C - Restaurant	2.166 TSF	243	12	10	22	13	8	21
Building C - Total		*440*	*18*	*11*	*29*	*22*	*20*	*42*
Project Total		**706**	**41**	**18**	**59**	**31**	**40**	**71**

Note:

[1] Trip rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition, 2017.

Based on Table 3.17-1, the proposed project would generate approximately 706 daily trips, 59 AM peak hour trips (41 inbound and 18 outbound), and 71 PM peak hour trips (31 inbound and 40 outbound).

The following describes the project's potential impacts to transportation policies and ordinances, VMT, hazards related to geometric design, and emergency access.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project could potentially affect portions of the circulation systems within the jurisdictions of the City of Sausalito (City) and Marin County (County) and the transit agencies of Marin Transit and Golden Gate Transit. Therefore, the following consistency requirements would apply.

City of Sausalito Circulation Element

The following policies within the 2020 draft General Plan Circulation Element are applicable to the project:

Policy CP 1.1 Street Network: Emphasize maintenance and improvements to the street network that will not require construction or major roadway widening.

Policy 3.1 Public Bus Service: Encourage the maintenance of a safe, efficient, and reliable bus service.

Policy 3.2 Alternative Transportation: Improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system and reduce the reliance on the private automobile by emphasizing alternative transportation modes.

Policy 5.2 Bicyclist Safety: Provide a safe environment for bicycling along city streets and bicycle trails.

Policy 5.5 Bicycle Route Design and Standards: Ensure that all existing and proposed bike routes, lanes, paths, and intersections are compliant with the most up-to-date standards to reduce conflicts between bicyclists, vehicles, and pedestrians, promote safety, and encourage the use of nonmotorized travel modes.

Policy 5.6 Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails: Continue to support the San Francisco Bay Trail, Bay Area Ridge Trail, and other agencies and jurisdictions in their efforts to provide bicycle and pedestrian trails throughout the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area.

Policy 5.9 Accessibility: Ensure city sidewalks and pathways are accessible for people of all abilities.

Policy 5.11 Development Plan Review: New development and substantial remodels in the Marinship should give special attention to the establishment and enhancement of pedestrian and bicycle pathways.

Policy 6.3 Marinship Circulation: Promote functional circulation improvements in the Marinship.

Policy 8.1 Contemplative Path: Identify a contemplative, predominantly pedestrian, pathway through the Marinship for interpretive, educational, and celebratory purposes to memorialize the historic events that occurred in the Marinship as provided for in program W-1.3.2.

Policy 8.2 Pedestrian Access: Promote and enhance safe public access to the Marinship without compromising the operations of industrial and maritime businesses.

The proposed project would be consistent with the Marinship Specific Plan, and as such would comply with all the policies associated and mandated with land uses and development with the Marinship area. The project is not expected to severely delay, impact, or reduce the service level of transit in the area, nor is it not expected to create unsafe alternative transportation options. Bicyclist and pedestrian safety would be maintained at existing levels, and would even be improved by the connection and improvement of the Bay Trail. The Bay Trail runs along the boundary of the project site and provides a regional pedestrian and bicycle connection to other areas of Marin County. Within the project site, all pedestrian connections would be accessible and adhere to all City guidelines for design.

Therefore, as discussed above, impacts related to applicable General Plan policies/programs related to transportation would be less-than-significant.

Additionally, as noted above, per SB 743 the focus of transportation analysis changed from LOS or vehicle delay to VMT. Accordingly, for CEQA purposes, project transportation impacts are based on VMT. An LOS/delay-based analysis has also been prepared and is provided for informational purposes only (see Appendix D).

Congestion Management Program

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) addresses the problem of increasing congestion on regional highways and principal arterials through a coordinated approach involving the state, county, cities, and transit providers. The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) has been designated as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for the County of Marin, including the City of Sausalito.

The CMP identifies arterial roadways and freeway segments within the study area that may require specialized analysis according to the procedures outlined in TAM's *Final Report 2015 CMP Update* (2015). The nearest CMP facilities identified within the City of Sausalito and nearest to the project study area, include, U.S. Highway 101 between Spencer Avenue and the Golden Gate Bridge, and the arterial roadway segment of Bridgeway between Gate 5 Road and Gate 6 Road. Additionally, if a major development results in a net increase of 100 or more PM peak hour vehicle trips, then TAM requires the project to be analyzed. As shown in Table 3.17-1 above, the proposed project would generate fewer than 100 PM peak hour vehicle trips, and thus, would not generate substantial traffic along CMP facilities. Therefore, the project would be exempt from any further CMP analysis, and impacts related to applicable CMP policies/programs related to traffic would be less-than-significant.

Transit Facilities

The City is served by both Marin Transit and Golden Gate Transit. The nearest bus stop locations are at the Marinship Way-Easterby Street/Bridgeway intersection, as well as the Napa Street/Bridgeway intersection, both of which are approximately a 0.25-mile distance from the proposed project. The following information is representative of existing conditions prior to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Marin Transit Routes 17 and 61 provide daily service, while Routes 71X and 115 provide weekday service only. Route 17 provides frequent service to the City of San Rafael every 15-30 minutes during peak hours and every hour on weekends. Route 61 provides service to Bolinas on an hourly basis on weekdays, and

every 2 hours generally on weekends (weekend service limited between the months of March and October only). Route 71X provides weekday only service to the City of Novato every 30 minutes during peak hours and hourly thereafter. Route 115 provides limited weekday service to the communities of Mill Valley and Strawberry with one coach in service during both the AM and PM peak periods.

Golden Gate Transit Routes 2, 4, and 92 provide only weekday service, while Route 30 provides weekday and weekend service as well. Route 2 is generally a commuter route that provides service between Marin City and the City of San Francisco only during the AM and PM peak periods with a headway of 20 minutes. Route 4 is a commuter route that provides service between Strawberry Village and the City of San Francisco with 15-20-minute headways during the AM and PM peak period, and hourly service thereafter. Route 92 is a commuter route that provides service between the Manzanita Park & Ride and the City of San Francisco with hourly service throughout the day, ending during the PM peak period commute. Route 30 provides service between the San Rafael Transit Center and the Salesforce Transit Center within the City of San Francisco with service generally provided on an hourly basis on both weekdays and weekends.

Golden Gate Transit also manages the Sausalito Ferry, which is approximately one mile south of the project site and provides service to the City of San Francisco Ferry Building. Service is provided every weekday on an hourly basis during the AM and PM peak period and thereafter every two to three hours. Weekend service is limited generally to afternoon arrivals and departures.

The project would not relocate any existing bus stops and would not require any changes to existing and future routes as described above. The project would not require an increase in service frequency or additional routes to serve the Marinship area.

Therefore, development of the project would not conflict with the existing bus routes or bus stops. Impacts to transit would be less-than-significant.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities are typically divided into several classifications that describe their efficacy. Class I (separated right-of-way) bicycle paths are completely separated from roadways and can be typically shared with pedestrians. Class II (painted) bicycle lanes are designed to be on-street and include a painted stripe to indicate the separation between bicyclists and motorists. Class III (signed) bicycle routes are designated to be on-street, however, they are provided on slower roadways that facilitate safe equal sharing of the roadway between bicyclists and motorists. Class IV (protected) bicycle lanes are separated from roadways and provide for exclusive use for bicyclists, including motorists, pedestrians, and other alternative transportation forms that are not permitted.

Currently, there is an existing Class II (painted) bicycle lane along both sides of Bridgeway, however the southern portion of the roadway narrows south of Marinship Way and becomes a Class III bicycle (signed) route, while the northern portion remains a Class II bicycle lane.

Additionally, the Bay Trail along the boundary of the project site provides a Class I bicycle path as well as shared pedestrian facilities. The proposed project would improve the section of the Bay Trail along its frontage with improved lighting and safety elements. Due to the industrial history of the Marinship area, Liberty Ship Way generally lacks sidewalks and adequate pedestrian amenities. However, development of the proposed project would include bicycle and pedestrian amenities. For pedestrians, the project would

provide a connection to the Bay Trail from Liberty Ship, Marinship Way, and Bridgeway, and the Bay Trail itself would be renovated to accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclists as well as other alternative forms of transportation. Details of the proposed pedestrian and accessible path of travel information is provided in the TIS. Development of the project would not conflict with the existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities and would include improvements to pedestrian facilities around the project site. Therefore, impacts to pedestrian or bicycle facilities would be less than significant.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focuses on VMT for determining the significance of transportation impacts. As shown in the analysis below, the project's impact due to conflicts or inconsistencies with Section 15064.3(b) would be less than significant.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

The City has not yet adopted significance thresholds for VMT; therefore, in the interim, the California State Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) recommended threshold of 15% below existing per capita VMT per service population for the region has been used for this analysis. This threshold has also been used in the draft 2020 General Plan Update.

The CEQA Guidelines state that "…generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts" and define VMT as "the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project…" It should be noted that "automobile" refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. Heavy-duty truck VMT could be included for modeling convenience and ease of calculation (for example, where models or data provide combined automobile and heavy truck VMT). Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. The OPR Technical Advisory (OPR 2018) provides guidance and tools to properly carry out the principles within SB 743 and how to evaluate transportation impacts in CEQA. The OPR Technical Advisory was utilized within this analysis as the primary reference for the analysis of VMT and transportation-related impacts.

The Technical Advisory and the draft 2020 General Plan Update suggests that the City may screen out VMT impacts using project size, map-based screening, transit availability, and provision of affordable housing. The applicability of each of these screening criteria to the proposed project is described below.

- **Screening Threshold for Small Projects** (110 daily trips or less): Since the project generates more than 110 trips per day as shown in Table 3.17-1, this threshold cannot be considered.
- **Map Based Screening for Residential and Office Projects:** Currently, the City does not have VMT maps that can be utilized to identify areas with low VMT for projects.
- **Presumption of Less Than Significant Impact for Affordable Residential Development:** The project is not a residential development and does not include affordable residential units.
- **Presumption of Less Than Significant Impact Near Transit Stations:** Proposed CEQA Guideline Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1), states that lead agencies generally should presume that certain projects (including residential, retail, and office projects, as well as projects that are a mix of these uses) proposed

within 0.5 miles of an existing major transit stop[4] or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor[5] would have a less-than-significant impact on VMT. This presumption would not apply, if the project:

- Has a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of less than 0.75
- Includes more parking for use by residents, customers, or employees of the project than required by the jurisdiction (if the jurisdiction requires the project to supply parking)
- Is inconsistent with the Plan Bay Area 2040 and/or
- Replaces affordable residential units with a smaller number of moderate- or high-income residential units

The project site is located within 0.5 miles of several bus routes however, the service intervals are greater than 15 minutes during peak commute hours and therefore the project cannot be screened using the proximity to transit availability criteria.

However, as mentioned above, under the draft 2020 General Plan, the project site would be screened-out of a potential significant VMT impact since approximately 95% of the land uses under the General Plan would be located within 0.5 miles of the Bridgeway and U.S. Highway 101 corridors that would provide high-quality transit service and the project would not be excluded based on the criteria above.

- **Presumption of Less Than Significant Impact for Local Serving Retail and Other Uses:** For development projects, if the project leads to a net increase in provision of locally-serving retail and public facility uses, transportation impacts from such uses can be presumed to be less than significant. Generally, local-serving retail and similar uses less than 50,000 square feet can be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact because by improving destination proximity, local-serving developments tend to shorten trips and therefore reduce VMT.

Since the project proposes a high percentage of local-serving uses such as marine commercial, restaurant and medical offices, it is not anticipated to increase VMT significantly. Further, since overall square footage of the local-serving retail portion of the project is less than 50,000 square feet, it would be screened out from further VMT analysis.

The above mentioned VMT screening criteria for local serving retail and other uses, would apply to the project in addition to the high-quality transit screening applicable to the City's draft 2020 General Plan. Therefore, a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

As described in Section 2, Project Description, it is anticipated that approximately 84 employees would work at the project. Therefore, the following program contained in the Circulation and Parking Element of the General Plan that assists in reducing VMT could apply to the project.

- Program CP-2.4.3 Requires the City to update the adopted Trip Reduction Ordinance to require employers with 50 or more employees to provide incentives for their employees to use transportation alternatives to get to work.

[4] Pub. Resources Code, § 21064.3 ("'Major transit stop' means a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.")

[5] Pub. Resources Code, § 21155 ("For purposes of this section, a high-quality transit corridor means a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.").

Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 150645.3, subdivision (b), and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project would not include construction of new roadways or require any temporary road closures of public roadways. As described below, improvements and roadway modifications would be required to remedy potentially hazardous conditions as a result of the project's contribution toward vehicular queuing on public roadways. Any and all improvements required within the public right-of-way would be required to comply with standards set forth by the City to ensure that the project does not introduce an incompatible design feature that would impede operations on project-adjacent roadway facilities.

Project Site Access

As discussed previously in Section 2, Project Description, access to the project site would be provided via Liberty Ship Way, which loops at the western edge of the project site and connects to Marinship Way. Although Liberty Ship Way is approximately 24-feet wide, it narrows to approximately 20-feet wide just west of the project site. For approximately 270-feet, the primary entrance to the site would be designated as one-way from the southern loop of Liberty Ship Way. Pending redevelopment of the 60D Liberty Ship Way building that causes the constraint, the one-way portion of the roadway may ultimately widen to accommodate the project's 24-feet wide drive aisle, thereby allowing for two-way traffic within the entirety of the site. Although the ingress path along Liberty Ship Way provides sufficient roadway width per City requirements, the southernmost corner of the 60D Liberty Ship Way building abuts the northern edge of the roadway as shown in Figure 4, Project Site Plan.

As part of the project, a curb and guardrail system would be added to the northern edge of the roadway to reduce potential hazards with the southernmost corner of the 60D Liberty Ship Way building. Additionally, the segment adjacent to this building, west of the driveway to 30 Liberty Ship Way and east to the proposed project parking lot, which are deteriorated and include old railroad tracks, would be repaved. After the one-way segment, the roadway would become two-way and would have 24-foot wide parking lot drive aisles, which are large enough to adequately accommodate delivery vehicles. The portion of Liberty Ship Way within the site boundary and internal driveways within the site would be owned and maintained by the project applicant.

Egress from the site would be possible via the parking lot and drive aisles of the existing parking areas north of the site, before connecting back to the northern section of the Liberty Ship Way loop. Building A would be accessed directly via the most western drive aisle of the site and from the center drive aisles that would also connect Building B and Building C. Parking would be provided on all sides of Building A and all sides of Building B except for the southern edge where the center drive aisle would be located. Building C would have parking primarily located along its western edge and would have access to both parking areas near Building B and Building A. The circulation plan has been approved by the fire department and emergency services for access. Additionally, accessible pedestrian routes, consistent with ADA requirements, would be provided throughout the project site. All supporting information for project access, including truck turning radii, site circulation, and accessible path of travel is provided in the TIS.

Therefore, based on the information above and described in detail within the TIS, the project would not create a significant impact to the project driveways or impede egress or ingress for the roadways near the project site, and hazards due to geometric design features would be less than significant.

Queuing Analysis for Future Year Conditions

Due the variety of land uses proposed for the project, a queuing analysis was prepared. Queuing was analyzed utilizing the SimTraffic software, which calculates the 95th percentile (design) queue. All queuing analysis data and SimTraffic queuing worksheets are further provided within the TIS. For the purposes of this analysis, the future year conditions analyzed were the Opening Year 2023 and the 2040 scenarios. Both scenarios were evaluated to compare the baseline (no project) condition with the addition of project traffic.

The Opening Year 2023 scenario consists of existing traffic volumes (collected in 2018 and adjusted by 2% per year to represent 2020 existing conditions), ambient growth from the background growth of traffic within the study area (approximately 2% per year), and cumulative projects. As described in the TIS, counts were originally obtained in 2018 for the following back-to-back signalized intersections adjacent to the project site:

- Marinship Way-Easterby Street/Bridgeway
- Spring Street/Bridgeway

For the purposes of consistency, the year 2020 counts were compared to those utilized within the 2020 City of Sausalito draft General Plan Circulation Element and were deemed to be adequately consistent for both intersections. Finally, the City of Sausalito Community Development Department provided a list of cumulative projects within the study area. The 2040 baseline traffic volumes were obtained directly from the City of Sausalito 2020 draft General Plan Circulation Element and from the General Plan's Appendix F Transportation Supporting Information document. Thereafter, the project trip generation as shown in Table 3.17-1, was added to both the Opening Year 2023 and the 2040 baseline scenarios separately so that the traffic impacts of the project could be fully analyzed for both future conditions. The TIS provides additional detail and information for the analysis and discussion on traffic volumes.

As shown in Tables 3.17-2 and 3.17-3, the calculated 95th percentile (design) queue for the Opening Year 2023 plus Project and 2040 plus Project conditions at all intersections do not exceed the storage lengths provided, except for the eastbound left-turn lane at the Marinship Way-Easterby Street/Bridgeway intersection. The longest forecast queue exceeds the available storage length of 75 feet by 5 feet (less than one car length) in the AM and by 21 feet (approximately one car length) in the PM peak hour. In both baseline conditions, the queue exceedance is nearly identical when compared to the plus-project condition.

The City does not have a relevant significance criterion in place, however the exceedance of a storage lane may potentially create hazardous conditions for drivers proceeding eastbound at the intersection as the eastbound left-turn lane overflows into the nearest through lane. Therefore, the project would contribute to this potentially hazardous condition. It is important to note that the draft General Plan's Appendix F Transportation Supporting Information document identifies the same queuing issue in both its existing and future year 2040 scenario. The recommendation concluded is the extension of the median at the intersection.

Therefore, a recommended solution would be to extend the existing median in the eastbound approach approximately 55 feet, to create a 130-foot storage length for the eastbound left-turn lane. As shown in the analysis, the 95th percentile queue would not exceed the storage length under this condition. Since the project would contribute to the deficient condition, the project would be responsible for paying its fair share to implement mitigation.

Table 3.17-2. Opening Year 2023 plus Project Queuing Summary

Intersection	Movement	Vehicle Storage Length[1]	Opening Year 2023[2]		Opening Year 2023 plus Project[2]		Change in Queue		Exceeds Vehicle Storage Length?	
			AM	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*
Marinship Way-Easterby Street/ Bridgeway	EBL	75	111	60	116	81	5	21	**Yes**	**Yes**
	EBT[3]	240	183	125	220	150	37	25	No	No
	WBL	100	39	57	46	67	7	10	No	No
	WBT[3]	1,200	135	132	139	151	4	19	No	No
	NBLTR[3]	500	135	110	143	99	8	-11	No	No
	SBLT[3]	190	36	97	45	108	9	11	No	No
	SBR	150	52	70	49	74	-3	4	No	No
Spring Street/ Bridgeway	EBT[3]	250	121	119	139	118	18	-1	No	No
	WBL	75	25	32	27	35	2	3	No	No
	WBT[3]	215	112	117	103	109	-9	-8	No	No
	NBLR[3]	400	69	50	64	52	-5	2	No	No

Notes:
1 Measured in feet.
2 Based on 95th percentile (design) queue length in SimTraffic 10.
3 Length measured to nearest intersection.

Table 3.17-3. 2040 plus Project Queuing Summary

Intersection	Movement	Vehicle Storage Length[1]	2040 Baseline[2]		2040 plus Project[2]		Change in Queue		Exceeds Vehicle Storage Length?	
			AM	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*	*AM*	*PM*
Marinship Way-Easterby Street/Bridgeway	EBL	75	112	81	115	96	3	15	**Yes**	**Yes**
	EBT[3]	240	221	167	232	188	11	21	No	No
	WBL	100	38	68	41	59	3	-9	No	No
	WBT[3]	1,200	193	168	204	179	11	11	No	No
	NBLTR[3]	500	120	74	130	92	10	18	No	No
	SBLT[3]	190	72	155	67	141	-5	-14	No	No
	SBR	150	48	85	53	75	5	-10	No	No
Spring Street/Bridgeway	EBT[3]	250	177	182	204	180	27	-2	No	No
	WBL	75	53	52	48	60	-5	8	No	No
	WBT[3]	215	139	146	148	157	9	11	No	No
	NBLR[3]	400	75	80	87	83	12	3	No	No

Notes:
1 Measured in feet.
2 Based on 95th percentile (design) queue length in SimTraffic 10.
3 Length measured to nearest intersection

Therefore, for the potentially hazardous conditions identified that would result in an exceedance of the storage length of the eastbound left-turn lane at the Marinship Way-Easterby Street/Bridgeway intersection, the following mitigation measure is provided.

MM-TRAF-1 Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall pay its fair share towards, or construct the following improvement and be reimbursed based on its fair share costs of the improvement, as determined by the Public Works Director:

- Extend the existing median on the eastbound approach, approximately 55 feet, for a total eastbound left-turn storage length of 130 feet.
- Re-optimize the signal timing and phasing for both intersections.

With the implementation of MM-TRAF-1, the maximum 95th percentile queue of 129 feet would be accommodated within the newly extended 130-foot storage lane. Therefore, the project would not create a significant impact to adjacent intersections and hazards due to geometric design features would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 2, Project Description, and under Threshold C above, the existing Liberty Ship Way roadway would provide primary site access and create a loop at the western edge of the project site that connects to Marinship Way. The primary ingress to the site would be via a one-way entry way from the southern portion of Liberty Ship Way, with a 20-foot wide path of vehicular travel. A curb and guardrail system would be added to the northern edge of roadway adjacent to 60D Liberty Ship way as part of the project to reduce potential hazards. The internal circulation of the site would accommodate two-way traffic and include 24-foot wide parking lot drive aisles large enough to adequately accommodate all vehicles and have been approved by the fire department and emergency services for access. Emergency vehicles would be able to access all buildings and driveways within the project site. The project site would be accessible to emergency responders during construction and operation of the project. Therefore, the impacts of the project as it relates to resulting in inadequate emergency access would be less than significant.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

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

a,b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As noted in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, there are no known tribal cultural resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, identified within the project site or in its immediate vicinity. The project site has historically been used for marine industrial uses and is composed of fill. The NWIC records search conducted for the project site did not identify any previously recorded archaeological resources within the project site or 0.25-mile buffer (Appendix C). Dudek requested a search of the NAHC's Sacred Lands File on January 7, 2020, for the project site. The NAHC results, received January 15, 2020, indicated that the Sacred Lands File search identified possible cultural resources within the

records search area. The NAHC then provided a list of Native American tribes culturally affiliated with the location of the project site, and recommended contact with them for further information. Letters were sent to each of the contacts to request information on resources in the area on January 16, 2020. No responses to Dudek's requests for information had been received at the time of this IS/MND. NAHC and tribal correspondence documents are included in Appendix C, Cultural Resources Report. If any responses are received in the future, they will be forwarded to the City. Since no known tribal cultural resources occur at the project site or would be affected by the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site contains existing water and sewer lines. The points of connection for gas, electrical, sanitary sewers, and storm drains are located in the easterly portion of the project site, with additional storm drains southeast of proposed Building B.

The site would be provided water service by the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD), which would determine the necessary facilities and water entitlement for the project upon the fulfillment of its requests reported in its letter dated July 25, 2007 (MMWD 2007). The project would require a Landscape Review Permit, new service permits for potable and recycled water, and permits for backflow and fire service permit. This would also include the review and approval of the placement of a new fire hydrant and water main extension. Site development would comply with all MMWD requirements for new water facilities, rules and regulations in effect at the time service is requested, and all landscape and irrigation plans shall be designed in accordance with the most current MMWD landscape and backflow prevention requirements.

The Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary District (SMCSD) currently serves the project site as the wastewater treatment provider (SMCSD 2020). The project proposes a sanitary sewer connection with the existing SMCSD gravity main that parallels Bridgeway. The sanitary sewer for the buildings on the project site would discharge into an existing street manhole in front of 30 Liberty Ship Way. The applicant's engineer reported that the sanitary sewer design would consist of solvent welded polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe so that the system can be converted to a pressure system in the future, if needed. Conversion to a force system could be accomplished by constructing a flush-surface wet-well and installing submersible pumps hooked up to the PVC discharge line with an emergency power back-up system for the pumps.

As stated in the letter, the City engineer reviewed the sewer system and was satisfied with the details provided, with conditions that the project provide welded or PVC pipe that is pressure tested, the project designate an area for a potential future pump station, and the project provide sewer that accounts for an estimated 1 foot settlement that may occur in the next 50 years. If, at any time in the future the need for the pump station arises, the applicant would install the sanitary pump station to support the proposed development. The incorporation of MM-UT-1 would address these conditions and would reduce the potential impacts to wastewater facilities to less than significant.

MM-UT-1 Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, detailed sewer plans shall be submitted to the City of Sausalito engineer for review and approval. The plans shall include the use of welded or PVC pipe that is pressure tested and shall provide designation of an area for a future pump station. Such design shall also account for an estimated 1-foot settlement that may occur in the next 50 years. If, at any time in the future the need for the pump station existing the applicant shall install the sanitary pump station to support the proposed development.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The MMWD provides water services for the City. The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan Update shows that MMWD's water supply comes primarily from a network of seven local, rain-fed reservoirs, supplemented with water from the Sonoma County Water Agency. Water within the

MMWD's service area is largely used for single- and multi-family residential homes, which make up 75% of the total demand, and commercial, industrial, and landscape, which comprise the remaining 25%. MMWD manages a distribution system of reservoirs, tanks, pumps, and pipeline to deliver water (MMWD 2016a).

The state is currently undergoing an effort to update the requirements for water shortage contingency planning. As part of urban water management planning, MMWD is required to provide a Water Shortage Contingency Plan that outlines how the supplier will prepare for and respond to water shortages. MMWD has a developed a rationing plan that includes five triggers that were selected because they provide the district more flexibility in addressing dry periods early. They were designed to allow MMWD to manage its supplies through a 6-year severe drought, and the amount of rationing is determined by the amount of water in the reservoirs. Additionally, MMWD has a number of prohibitions that it implements during periods of rationing, including limiting landscape irrigation, prohibiting use of potable water for washing hard surfaces, replacement of leaks in pipes, and other restrictions (MMWD 2016b). The proposed project would comply with the conditions set forth by MMWD as outlined in MM UT-1 to ensure the impacts to water supplies would be less than significant.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. In discussion with SMCSD staff, SMCSD has indicated that adequate wastewater infrastructure is available to accommodate the new development, and that the project would not cause the SMCSD to exceed wastewater treatment requirements required by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB (Simmons 2008). Upon development of detailed sewer design plans, the project may require a permit from SMCSD or other routine monitoring, pre-treatment, or sampling of discharges based on an assessment of pollutants expected to be discharged from the project site (Simmons 2008). Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, an assessment shall be completed outlining the pollutants expected to be discharged from the project. The assessment shall be submitted for approval to the Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary Sewer District. Appropriate permits from the Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary Sewer District shall be obtained prior to installation of the sewer system. Compliance with these standard requirements and development of a detailed sewer plan and pollutant assessment to be reviewed and approved by the SMCSD would ensure that wastewater treatment be designed to meet standards set by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB. Impacts to wastewater would be less than significant.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan for Marin County, intended to provide structure and guidance for waste management programs, incorporates the following solid waste planning documents (County of Marin 2007):

- Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- Non-Disposal Facility Element
- Household Hazardous Waste Element

Furthermore, the Marin Hazardous and Solid Waste Joint Powers Authority, also known as Zero Waste Marin, consists of representatives from all over Marin County to help residents and businesses meet the County of Marin's Zero Waste goal by 2025 (County of Marin 2020c).

The project is anticipated to be accommodated in the Marin County and the City of Sausalito's existing solid waste disposal system, which is served by the City's franchised provider of garbage and recycling, Bay Cities Refuse Service. Solid waste disposal needs would be consistent with the Industrial and Waterfront zoning districts, and there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste, as discussed above. There would be no impact.

3.20 Wildfire

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

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. Refer to Section 3.9(f).

b,c,d) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project site is located in an urban area and is not within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as mapped by the County of Marin (County of Marin 2019) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE 2008). Fire Hazard Severity Zones do exist within the City between the 450-foot to 1,120-foot elevation line on the west side of Bridgeway (South Marin Fire District 2017). However, the project site is bounded by the San Francisco Bay shoreline to the north and east. The shoreline is not susceptible to wildfire since it consists of beaches and marsh vegetation. The project would comply with City of Sausalito Municipal Code Section 8.40 and Sausalito Ordinance No. 1240, which define the fire code, emergency access requirements, and building standards (City of Sausalito 2019). The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, or expose people or structures to significant risks. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

As discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, the project site is adjacent to a marsh restoration area on the San Francisco Bay. The project site is occupied by dry boat and containerized storage and generally lacks suitable habitat for most special-status plant species due to a combination of unsuitable habitat conditions and the high level of human activity in the area. However, the project site does contain trees and other vegetation that have the potential to support nesting birds that are protected under the California Fish and Game Code and under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In the event that any such nesting birds are present during construction activities associated with the proposed project, the birds would be protected in accordance with mitigation measure MM-BIO-1, which would require a nesting bird survey to be completed if construction occurs during the nesting season. In accordance with mitigation measure MM-BIO-1, any nesting birds or raptors that are discovered within or near a construction area would be monitored by a qualified biologist, who would have the authority to cease construction if there is any sign of distress to the nesting bird. Any impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project are therefore expected to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on historical resources. However, the proposed project would include ground disturbing activities that could result in the inadvertent discovery of sub-surface cultural and/or paleontological resources. In the unlikely event that sub-surface cultural and/or paleontological resources were to be discovered during construction activities associated with the proposed project, the resource(s) would be protected in accordance with mitigation measures MM-CUL-1, MM-CUL-2, and MM-GEO-1. Therefore, the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. For these reasons, impacts to cultural resources resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As such, effects to biological and cultural resources and potential for project-related activities to degrade the quality of the environment would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures MM-BIO-1, MM-CUL-1, MM-CUL-2, and MM-GEO-1.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

As described throughout this IS/MND, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts involving aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and utilities and service systems. However, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. Furthermore, the analysis presented in Section 3.2, Air Quality, and Section 3.17, Transportation, considers potential cumulative impacts associated with development in the area. This analysis determined that cumulative air and traffic impacts would be less than significant. All reasonably foreseeable future development in the City of Sausalito would be subject to the same land use and environmental regulations that have been described throughout this document. Furthermore, all development projects are guided by the policies identified in the General Plan and by the regulations established in the Municipal Code. Therefore, compliance with applicable land use and environmental regulations would ensure that environmental effects associated with the proposed project would not combine with effects from reasonably foreseeable future development in the project vicinity to cause cumulatively considerable significant impacts. For these reasons, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated (see Sections 3.1, Aesthetics, Sections 3.4, Biological Resources, 3.5, Cultural Resources, 3.8, Geology and Soils, 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 3.17, Transportation, and 3.19 Utilities and Service Systems). No further mitigation is required.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As described in this IS/MND, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics and hazards and hazardous materials. With implementation of mitigation measure identified in Section 3.1, Aesthetics, of this IS/MND, impacts regarding light and glare on nighttime views would be reduced to a less-than-significant level (MM-AES-1). In addition, the as outlined in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, incorporation of MM-HAZ-1 would ensure adherence to the post-closure deed restrictions on the project site and reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not exceed significance thresholds or result in significant impacts for the other environmental categories typically associated with indirect or direct effects to human beings: air quality, noise, and public services. As such, direct or indirect adverse impacts on human beings would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. No further mitigation is required.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 References and Preparers

4.1 References

AEI Consultants. 2018. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 70-74 Libertyship Way, Sausalito, Marin County, California*, AEI Project No. 386898. May 2, 2018.

AEI Consultants. 2011. *Risk Management Plan for Diesel Impacted Portions of 30 Liberty Ship Way and 76 Liberty Ship Way Sausalito, California,* AEI Project No. 263064. May 3, 2011.

BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2010. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. May 2010. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/draft_baaqmd_ceqa_guidelines_may_2010_final.pdf?la=en.

BAAQMD. 2012. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. Updated May 2012. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_Final_May%202012.ashx?la=en.

BAAQMD. 2017a. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. Updated May 2017. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en.

BAAQMD. 2017b. *Spare the Air: Cool the Climate – Final 2017 Clean Air Plan*. April 19, 2017. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en.

BASMAA (Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association). 2019. *Post-Construction Manual, Design Guidance for Stormwater Treatment and Control for Projects in Marin, Sonoma, Napa, and Solano Counties*. January 2019.

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2008. "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA" [map]. 1:100,000. Marin County. https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6709/fhszl_map21.pdf.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2013. *Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual*. Division of Environmental Analysis, Environmental Engineering, Hazardous Waste, Air, Noise, Paleontology Office. Sacramento, California. September 2013.

Caltrans. 2020. "California Scenic Highway Mapping Program, Designated and Eligible Routes." Accessed February 10, 2020. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

CAPCOA (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association). 2008. *CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*. January 2008.

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2014. *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan Building on the Framework Pursuant to AB 32 – The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*. May 2014. Accessed August 2016. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.

CARB. 2017. *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan*. November 2017. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.

Carrier. 2012. "CA16NA 018-061 Single-Stage Air Conditioner w/ Puron Refrigerant. Catalog No: CA16NA-06PD." https://resource.carrierenterprise.com/is/content/Watscocom/carrier_ca16na03600g_article_1404816230548_en_ss?_ga=2.123164302.489492439.1570570581-792571132.1570570581.

CAT (California Climate Action Team). 2006. *Climate Action Team Report to the Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature*. Sacramento, California. March 2006. http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/reports/2006report/2006-04-03_FINAL_CAT_REPORT.PDF.

CAT. 2010. *Climate Action Team Biennial Report*. Sacramento, California: California Environmental Protection Agency, California Climate Action Team. April 2010. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2010publications/CAT-1000-2010-004/CAT-1000-2010-004.PDF.

CDFW (California Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2018. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*. March 20, 2018. Accessed January 2020. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline.

CDFW. 2019a. Natural Communities List Arranged Alphabetically by Life Form. November 8, 2019. Accessed January 2020. https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities/List.

CDFW. 2019b. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database. August 2019. Special Animals List. Periodic publication. 67 pp. Accessed January 2020. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=109406&inline.

CDFW. 2020a. Rarefind 5: Commercial version. Online database. California Natural Diversity Database. CDFW, Biogeographic Data Branch. Accessed January 2020. https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data.

CDFW. 2020b. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database. January 2020. Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List. Quarterly publication. 140pp.

CDFW. 2020c. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Natural Diversity Database. January 2020. State and Federally Listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California.

CGS (California Geological Survey). 2002. California Geomorphic Provinces. Note 36: 4 pp.

CGS. 2013. "Aggregate Resource Sector Map in North San Francisco Bay." ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_205/.

CGS. 2019a. "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation." https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.

CGS. 2019b. "Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, State of California, County of Marin, San Francisco North Quadrangle." Scale 1:24,000. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Tsunami/Maps/Tsunami_Inundation_SanFranciscoNorth_Quad_Marin.pdf.

City of Sausalito. 1989. *Marinship Specific Plan*. May 2, 1989. http://www.sausalito.gov/home/showdocument?id=1454.

City of Sausalito. 1995. *General Plan Health and Safety Element*. https://www.sausalito.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=4036.

City of Sausalito. 2003. Zoning Map. https://www.sausalito.gov/home/showdocument?id=1133.

City of Sausalito. 2015. *City of Sausalito Climate Action Plan*. Adopted June 16, 2015. https://www.sausalito.gov/home/showdocument?id=17750.

City of Sausalito, 2017. *City of Sausalito General Plan Update*. Accessed on January 15, 2020. https://www.sausalitogeneralplan.org/general-plan-update.

City of Sausalito. 2019. *City of Sausalito General Plan Update, Chapter 5: Environment and Infrastructure*. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58a48f232994cabcb6356fbb/t/5bb29f7a7817f7d3ea240e10/1538432907864/5.Sausalito.GPU_ENVIRONMENT-compressed.pdf.

City of Sausalito. 2020. *Final Draft General Plan. Accessed on January 25, 2020. https://www.sausalitogeneralplan.org/general-plan-update*

City of Sausalito. 2020. "Police Department." Programs & Services. Accessed January 15, 2020. https://www.sausalito.gov/departments/police-department/programs-services.

CNPS (California Native Plant Society). 2020. *Rare Plant Program. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California* (online edition, v8-03 0.39). http://www.rareplants.cnps.org.

CNRA (California Natural Resources Agency). 2009. Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action.

County of Marin. 2007. *Marin Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan*. Adopted November 6, 2007.

County of Marin. 2019. "Marin Geo Hubs." Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Last modified 2019. https://gisopendata.marincounty.org/datasets/MarinCounty::fire-hazard-severity-zone?geometry=-122.508%2C37.860%2C-122.476%2C37.866.

County of Marin. 2020a. Marin County Department of Public Works, CUPA Program. https://www.marin county.org/depts/pw/divisions/public-services/cupa.

County of Marin. 2020b. "About MCSTOPPP." https://www.marincounty.org/depts/pw/divisions/creeks-bay-and-flood/mcstoppp/about-mcstoppp.

County of Marin. 2020c. Zero Waste Marin: "What is Zero Waste?" Zero Waste in Marin County. https://zerowastemarin.org/who-we-are/what-is-zero-waste/.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. U.S. Dep. Interior, Fish and Wildl. Serv. FWS/OBS - 79/31.

CWS/SSEG (CWS and Stuber-Stroeh Engineering Group). 2018a. *Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan*. June 20, 2018.

CWS/SSEG. 2018b. *Preliminary Hydrology Study*. June 20, 2018.

DLRP (Division of Land Resource Protection). 2016. "Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Marin County. California Department of Conservation." Accessed January 10, 2020. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp.

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 1998. *Guidelines for Classification and Designation of Mineral Lands*.

DOT (U.S. Department of Transportation). 2006. *FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model: User's Guide*. Final Report. FHWA-HEP-06-015. DOT-VNTSC-FHWA-06-02. Cambridge, Massachusetts: DOT, Research and Innovative Technology Administration. August 2006.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2020. "EnviroStor Database: South Pacific Division Laboratory (80001193). https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=80001193

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2016. "National Flood Insurance Program, Flood insurance Rate Map. Marin County, California." March 16, 2016. https://www.sausalito.gov/home/showdocument?id=17802.

FHWA (Federal Highway Administration). 2008. Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Software Version 1.1. U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Environmental Measurement and Modeling Division. Washington, D.C. December 8, 2008.

FTA (Federal Transit Administration). 2006. *Transit Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment*. Federal Transit Administration, Office of Planning and Environment. May 2006.

FTA. 2018. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. FTA Report No. 0123. September.

GeoData Analytics LLL. 2003. "City of Sausalito Zoning Map" [map]. 1 inch = 400 feet. Sausalito, California: City of Sausalito.

Golden Gate Transit. 2020. "Golden Gate Transit Bus Schedules." Accessed December 29, 2020. https://www.goldengate.org/bus/schedules-maps/

Kipping, Ted (Tree Shapers LLC). 2018. *Tree Report Re On Site Two Existing Iron Barks at Liberty Ship Way, Sausalito, CA*. Letter report prepared for Brent McDonald, SWA Group. May 7, 2018.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2014. *Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report: A Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Contribution of Working Groups I, II, and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/.

ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers). 2017. *Trip General Manual.* (10th Edition).

Marin Transit. 2020. "Marin Transit Service Map." Accessed December 29, 2020. https://marintransit.org/map

McDonald, Brent. 2020. Email from Brent McDonald to Hannah Young of Dudek on January 24, 2020, regarding Libertyship II, Estimated number of people.

MMWD (Marin Municipal Water District). 2007. Letter from Marin Municipal Water District prepared by Joseph Eischens. July 25, 2007.

MMWD. 2016a. *2015 Urban Water Management Plan Update*. http://marinwater.org/DocumentCenter/View/3828/MMWD-2015-UWMP-Final---Report-Only?bidId=.

MMWD. 2016b. *Water Resources Plan 2040*. https://www.marinwater.org/DocumentCenter/View/4712/WRP-2040-Public-Draft_9jan16?bidId=.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program, Risk Assessment Guidelines, Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*. February 2015.

OPR (Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 2018. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. State of California. Accessed December 29, 2020 at http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company. 2020. 2020 Corporate Responsibility and Sustainability Report. February 2015. Accessed January 19, 2021.

Norris, R.M., and R.W. Webb. 1990. *Geology of California* (2nd edition). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Salem Howes (Salem Howes Associates Inc.). 2006. *Geotechnical Investigation Liberty Shipway II*. Prepared for City of Sausalito. October 5, 2006.

Salem Howes. 2018. Geotechnical Review of Project Drawings, 70-74 Libertyship Way, Sausalito, AP 063-080-06. Prepared for City of Sausalito. June 21, 2018.

Sawyer, J.O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. Evens. 2009. *A Manual of California Vegetation*. 2nd edition. Sacramento, California: California Native Plant Society.

Schlocker, J., 1958. *Geology of the San Francisco North quadrangle, California*: U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 782, scale 1:24,000.

Shuford, W.D., and T. Gardali, T. 2008. "California Bird Species of Special Concern: A Ranked Assessment of Species, Subspecies, and Distinct Populations of Birds of Immediate Conservation Concern in California." *Studies of Western Birds 1*. Western Field Ornithologists, Camarillo, California, and California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento.

Simmons, Robert. 2008. Phone conversation with Robert Simmons of Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary Sewer District on April 30, 2008.

SMCSD (Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary District). 2020. "District Overview/Operations." Who We Serve. Accessed January 15, 2020. http://www.sausalitomarincitysanitarydistrict.com/aboutus/who-we-serve.

South Marin Fire District. 2017. "District Overview." https://www.southernmarinfire.org/about/district-overview.

State of California Employment Development Department. 2020. "Long-Term Industry Employment Projections." https://data.edd.ca.gov/Employment-Projections/Long-Term-Industry-Employment-Projections/sp6i-jezb/data.

SVP (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology). 2010. *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*. http://vertpaleo.org/Membership/Member-Ethics/SVP_Impact_Mitigation_Guidelines.aspx.

Transportation Research Board. 2016. *Highway Capacity Manual*. 6th ed. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.

USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture). 2020. Web Soil Survey. USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Accessed January 2020. http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2020a. Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) resource list. Accessed January 2020. https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/location/KVV4CGQHNRDY7MDDA5NI5LCCV4/resources.

USFWS 2020b. National Wetlands Inventory. Accessed January 2020. fws.gov/wetlands/NWI/index.html.

VerPlanck, Christopher. 2021. "Street Level Tracks on Liberty Ship Way." Memo prepared by VerPlanck Historical Preservation Consulting for the Sausalito Community Development Department.

WRA (WRA Environmental Consultant). 2007. *Biological Resources Assessment*. December 2007.

4.2 List of Preparers

Dudek
1630 San Pablo Avenue, Suite 300
Oakland, California 94612

Hannah Young, AICP, Project Manager
Kara Laurenson-Wright, Deputy Project Manager
Ian McIntire, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases Specialist
Mark Storm, Acoustician
Ryan Henry, Biological Resources Specialist
Adam Giacinto, Cultural Resources Specialist
William Burns, Cultural Resources Specialist
Perry Russell, Hydrogeologist
Dennis Pascua, Transportation
Mladen Popovic, Transportation

Appendix A

CalEEMod Output

Appendix B

Biological Resources

Appendix C

Cultural Resources Report

Appendix D

Traffic Impact Analysis