

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Maggiore & Ghilotti Inc. Contractor's Yard, North Richmond County File #DP18-3020
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development,
Community Development Division
30 Muir Rd.
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Francisco Avila, Principal Planner, (925) 655-2866
4. **Project Location:** 2800 Radiant Avenue
Richmond, CA 94801
APN: 408-082-030 and 001
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Maggiore & Ghilotti Inc. (Owner and Applicant)
555 Du Bois Street
San Rafael, CA 94901
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within a Heavy Industrial (HI) General Plan land use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is located within the North Richmond Planned Unit District (P-1) zoning district.
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan for the purposes of constructing and operating a contractor's yard. The project includes: 1) raising the site's elevation between 8 and 12 feet, 2) grading of 155,000 cubic yards of soil (cut of 14,000 cubic yards and fill of 141,600 cubic yards which will be phased over an 5 year period), 3) access improvements along Radiant Avenue – widening where necessary, 4) drainage improvements and 5) exception requests to Section 914-2.004 (Offsite collect and convey requirements) and Section 914-12.010 (Detention Basins-Maintenance) of the code to allow for private maintenance of the detention infrastructure. The subject property will also be annexed into the Community Facilities District (CFD) 2010-1 formed for county wide street light financing, CFD 2006-1 (North Richmond Area Maintenance Services) for future maintenance of area wide medians and landscaping, and 2007-1 (Stormwater Management Facilities).

The project will be completed in two general phases. The first phase will include construction of the following: 1) stormwater control basins and outlet structure, 2) 2.72 acres of wetland mitigation, 3) several approximately 10-foot-high berms to retain the on-going soil import. The second phase will include: 1) removal of the temporary access bridge and construction of a new bridge and associated culverts, 2) on-going soil import, 3) installation of landscaping along Radiant Avenue, and paved parking area.

- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject site is located at the northern terminus of Radiant Avenue, just south of the Richmond Parkway and north of Parr Boulevard in unincorporated North Richmond. The assessor’s parcel number for the site is: 408-082-030. The property consists of 19.52 relatively flat acres and is currently undeveloped. Numerous roadway, railroad and utility easements are located throughout the property. Several groundwater contamination wells are located at the southeast portion of the site. Access to the property is gained via a shared private road (Radiant Avenue, Assessor’s Parcel Number: 408-082-001), which is located approximately 600 feet east of the Goodrick Avenue/Parr Boulevard intersection. Parcels in the vicinity range in size from 1-acre to over 25-acres and tend to be developed with industrial uses. The Union Pacific Railroad Road is located immediately to the east. The City of Richmond boundaries are located to the west, north and east.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement:** Building Inspection Division, Grading Division, Fire Department, East Bay Municipal Utility District, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Department, West County Wastewater District, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers and City of Richmond.
- 11. 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.?**

Pacific Legacy – Historic Preservation, Bay Area Division (consulting archaeologists), requested a search of the “Sacred Lands Inventory” maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on January 21, 2019, for the subject property. A response to this request was received on January 29, 2019, stating that the search was positive for Native American cultural resources listed on the Sacred Lands files within the project area. Pacific Legacy was provided with a list of potential Native American stakeholders who might have further information on the nature and location of cultural resources within the project vicinity. On January 30, 2019, letters of inquiry were sent to Irene Zwierlein (Chairperson) of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista; Ann Marie Sayers (Chairperson) of the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan; Charlene Nijmeh (Chairperson) of the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area; Katherine Erolinda Perez (Chairperson) of the North Valley Yokuts Tribe; Andrew Galvan of The Ohlone Indian Tribe; and Raymond Hitchcock (Chairperson) of Wilton Rancheria. The letters provided a brief description of the project and requested input on cultural resources in the project vicinity.

On February 22, 2019, Chairperson Ann Marie Sayers indicated that she has no concerns as long as there is no excavation. On February 26, 2019, Mr. Ed Silva Natural Resources Coordinator for the Wilton Rancheria indicated the he would like a copy of the final survey report. No further responses have been received to date.

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.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Environmental Determination

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 EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

Francisco Avila
Principal Planner

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development

August 5, 2021

Date

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Initial Study Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references, which are available for review either online or at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez, were consulted:

1. Application received by Contra Costa County on May 21, 2018 and subsequent revisions.
2. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020
3. Contra Costa County Code – Title 8 Zoning Ordinance
4. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
5. Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan
6. Clean Water Act
7. Agency Comments
8. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2008* prepared by the California Department of Conservation
9. Public Resources Code section 12220(g)
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District proposed Thresholds of Significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions
11. California Department of Toxic Substances Control website
12. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threat
13. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map
14. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Dam Failure Inundation Areas
15. Contra Costa County Code – Title 4 Health and Safety
16. California Storm Water Resources Control Board – Geo Tracker
17. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
18. Stormwater Control Plan prepared by Kier + Wright, dated November 5, 2020
19. Limited Soil Removal Report, Richmond Radiant Avenue Property, prepared by Edd Clark & Associates, July 2016 (October 2016 Addendum).
20. Pacific Legacy, Archaeological Pedestrian Survey 2800 Radiant Avenue, dated March 4, 2019.
21. Biological Resources Analysis Report for the Radiant Avenue Property, prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc., dated July 2015.
22. Schaaf & Wheeler Consulting Civil Engineers, Hydrology and Drainage Study for Proposed Development at Radiant Avenue for Maggiora and Ghilotti Inc., dated October 28, 2019.
23. Edd Clark & Associates, Inc. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (July 2015), and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report (September 2015)
24. Assembly Bill 617 (C. Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017)
25. Habitat Mitigation Monitoring Plan, Olberding Environmental, Inc., dated January 2021

1. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

*a-b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (**Less Than Significant Impact**)*

The subject property is located just southeast of the Richmond Parkway and Goodrick Avenue intersection. According to the 2005-2020 County General Plan, this stretch of road is not designated as a scenic route. The site is located within 0.5 miles of the San Pablo Bay, however, no vertical improvements (buildings) are proposed with the project. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are within the project area. The project includes raising the elevation of the site 8 to 12 feet, which represents a minor change in the overall massing of site. The vast majority of the site’s current elevation ranges from 15 to 21 feet above mean sea level (msl). Once grading has been finalized, the site’s elevation will be relatively consistent with surrounding properties within several feet of vertical elevation. This minor change in site elevation represents a less than significant impact compared to what the North Richmond Planned Unit Zoning District conditionally allows (40 feet maximum height for industrial buildings).

*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 points.) 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**)*

As proposed, the project will raise the elevation of the site between 8 to 12 feet and establish a contractor’s yard where multiple large pieces of earthmoving equipment and ancillary material will be located. The project also includes access and drainage improvements. Although these improvements are relatively consistent with the surrounding industrial land uses, landscaping will lessen the visual impact of the project given that the site has been vacant of development for decades. Therefore, the project sponsor is required to install new landscaping along the Western

frontage to provide a visual buffer between adjacent businesses and the myriad of construction equipment that will be stationed at this location. The project has been reviewed for compliance with the North Richmond Planned Unit District development standards, including the preliminary landscape design that has been submitted with the application. The final landscape plan must be reviewed by staff upon project approval and prior to applying for building/grading permits. Once the vegetation has fully matured, it is expected that the landscaping will provide an effective visual buffer of the site as seen from adjacent properties to the west. Therefore, given the site's location, relatively low profile and landscaping requirements, the proposal will have less than a significant impact on the site and surrounding North Richmond area upon implementation of Mitigation AES-1.

Potential Impact (I-1): *The North Richmond Planned Unit District development standards require proper screening of parking, loading, and other utility areas from the street and adjacent properties, as well as buffer planting on property lines. Compliance with these standards in the Final Landscaping Plan must be ensured to mitigate the visual impact of the development.*

Mitigation Measure AES-1: At least 30 days prior to submittal of a building/grading permit application, a Final Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division (CDD) staff for review and approval. Plant materials shall meet the guidelines specified in the North Richmond Design Guidelines for landscaping in industrial areas. The Final Landscape Plan is subject to a concurrent review for compliance with the State/County Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

- 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)*

The project will does not include any new buildings or surfaces that would create new sources of glare or light. The project primarily includes the import of 127,000 cubic yards of soil in order to establish the desired grades. The proposed use of the site is a contractor's yard that does not include any light sources at the time this environmental review is being prepared. Nevertheless, given the event lighting becomes necessary at the site, CDD review will be necessary to ensure the lighting plan is consistent with the surrounding industrial properties. Therefore, with CDD review of any proposed lighting in the future the project will represent a less than significant impact with the implementation of the mitigation below.

Potential Impact (I-2): *The North Richmond Planned Unit District development standards require all outdoor lighting to be directed down and screened away from adjacent properties and streets. Compliance with this standard in any future Lighting Plan must be ensured to mitigate the visual impact of the development.*

Mitigation Measure AES-2: At least 30-days prior to applying for a building permit for lighting, the applicant shall submit for review and approval of CDD staff a Lighting Plan. Light standards shall be low-lying and deflected so that the lights shine onto applicant's property and avoid spilling into adjacent properties.

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-e) 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? (No Impact)

The project site is listed as being Urban and Built-Up Land by the 2012 San Francisco Bay Area Important Farmland Map. No prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance will be affected due to the project. According to County records, no Williamson Act Contract is applicable to the subject parcel. The project site is currently zoned as the North Richmond Planned Unit District (P-1) with a General Plan designation of Heavy Industrial (HI). If approved, one contractor's yard will be established by making the necessary grading improvements. Each of the contiguous parcels is developed with either industrial uses or urban uses such as roads, therefore, no forest land or timberland as defined by the California Public Resources code will be affected by the project.

3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less than Significant with Mitigations)*

The applicant is requesting approval to construct and operate a contractor's yard at the subject site. The project includes importing of 127,000 cubic yards of soil, construction of wetland mitigation areas, and access/drainage improvements. If approved, the majority of the site will have an elevation increase of 8-12 feet. Once construction activities have been completed, typical business operations are expected to generate up to 10 heavy-duty truck trips per day.

All air emissions related to construction within Contra Costa County are regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) pursuant to the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan. The purpose of the Clean Air Plan is to bring the air basin into compliance with the requirements of Federal and State air quality standards. BAAQMD has prepared CEQA Guidelines to assist lead agencies in air quality analysis, as well as to promote sustainable development in the region. According to the 2017 Clean Air Plan, construction projects of this scale that have included all of the BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigations, do not exceed the Thresholds of Significance for local community risks and hazards associated with Toxic Air Contaminates (TACs) and Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5. As such, with the implementation of the following BAAQMD, Basic Construction Mitigations, it is expected that the project would be consistent with the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan and represent a less than significant impact with regards to construction air emissions.

Potential Impact (3-1): *Exhaust emissions and particulates produced by construction activities may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: *The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans:*

- a. *All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- b. *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- c. *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.*
- d. *Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.*
- e. *Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).*
- f. *Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).*

- g. *Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.*
 - h. *Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.*
 - i. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
 - j. *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.*
 - k. *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.*
 - l. *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.*
 - m. *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 Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.*
- 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 with Mitigations**)*

As mentioned above, emission of particulate matter, fine particulate matter, and ozone precursors would be generated by the construction phase of the project. These emission generating activities will be temporary and significantly reduced to negligible amounts once construction has ceased and typical business operations begin to occur (up to 10 truck trips per day). Nevertheless, the construction phase of the project will be restricted to specific days of the week and to a limited number of work hours per day to lessen the amount of time during the week that construction-related activities would affect air quality. Additionally, it is expected that the project will take approximately 5 years of soil importation in order to establish the desired elevations which will further reduce any short-term air emissions. Therefore, with the addition of the following mitigation measure, the air quality impacts will be further reduced:

Potential Impact (3-2): *Construction activities may cumulatively increase criteria pollutants which the region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-2: *Non-emergency maintenance, construction, and other activities on the site related to this project are restricted to the hours of 7:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M., Monday through Friday, and shall be prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:*

New Year's Day (State and Federal)
Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
Washington's Birthday (Federal)
Lincoln's Birthday (State)
Presidents' Day (State and Federal)
Cesar Chavez Day (State)

Memorial Day (State and Federal)
Independence Day (State and Federal)
Labor Day (State and Federal)
Columbus Day (State and Federal)
Veterans Day (State and Federal)
Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
Day after Thanksgiving (State)
Christmas Day (State and Federal)

For specific details on the actual day the state and federal holidays occur, please visit the following websites:

Federal Holidays:

http://www.opm.gov/Operating_Status_Schedules/fedhol/2021.asp

California Holidays:

<http://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutFTB/holidays.shtml>

- c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less than Significant with Mitigations)*

The nearest residential community is located 1,000 feet to the east. The nearest school (Verde Elementary) is located 3,000 feet to the south. Nevertheless, light and heavy industrial projects that involve routine use of diesel operated equipment such as semi-trucks have intensive impacts on surrounding communities from an air quality and human health risk perspective. Specifically, impacts from PM emissions from trucks and other heavy-duty equipment such as Transportation Refrigeration Units are the key environmental challenge that light/heavy industrial projects face.

The cities of Richmond (unincorporated North Richmond included) and San Pablo are designated as an Assembly Bill (AB) 617, Community Air Protection Program (CAPP) community. With that designation comes an increased level of scrutiny on air quality, transportation impacts, toxic air contaminants (TACs), and human health risks related to light/heavy industrial projects. Community members from Richmond-San Pablo are currently developing a Community Air Monitoring Plan in an effort to reduce air pollution. To support these state and local efforts, developers and business operators must utilize Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to reduce existing levels of harmful air emissions when possible and to ensure that new development does not present an increased health risk in CAPP communities.

Furthermore, business operations that involve mobile PM sources such as semi-trucks must also utilize the newest semi-truck technology available to reduce and ultimately eliminate any further contribution of harmful air emissions. The following construction mitigations will compliment those detailed above and ensure that the project represents the least impact on the surrounding community as possible. Additionally, Mitigation Measure Air Quality 4 below requires the project to incorporate Best Available Control Technology to progressively reduce air emissions associated with their operations as new zero-low emissions technology is developed.

Potential Impact (3-3): *Exhaust emissions and particulates produced during construction activities may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.*

Mitigation Measure AIR 3: *The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during all construction activities related to the project:*

- a. *Provide the necessary infrastructure to support the zero and near-zero emission technology vehicles and equipment that will be operating on-site. Necessary infrastructure may include the physical (e.g., needed footprint), energy, and fueling infrastructure for construction equipment, on-site vehicles, and medium-heavy and heavy-heavy duty trucks.*
- b. *Portable equipment used during construction shall be powered by electricity from the grid instead of diesel-powered generators, to the maximum amount feasible.*
- c. *Construction contracts shall include language that requires all off-road diesel-powered equipment used during construction to be equipped with Tier 4 or cleaner engines, except for specialized construction equipment in which Tier 4 engines are not available. In place of Tier 4 engines, off-road equipment can incorporate retrofits such that emission reductions achieved equal or exceed that of a Tier 4 engine.*
- d. *Construction contracts shall include language that requires all off-road equipment with a power rating below 19 kilowatts (e.g., plate compactors, pressure washers), used during project construction be battery powered.*
- e. *Construction contracts shall include language that requires all heavy-duty trucks entering the construction site, during the grading and building construction phases be model year 2014 or later. All heavy-duty haul trucks shall also meet CARB's lowest optional low-NOx standard starting in the year 2022.¹*
- f. *At least 30-days prior to submitting for a grading or building permit, property owner/tenant/lessee shall submit for review and approval of CDD, a dust and litter control program. Any violation of the approved program or applicable ordinances shall require an immediate work stoppage. Construction work shall not be allowed to resume until, if necessary, an appropriate construction bond has been posted.*

Potential Impact (3-4): *Exhaust emissions and particulates produced by operation of diesel trucks/equipment during on-going business operations (delivery and pick-up, etc.) may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.*

Mitigation Measure Air Quality 4: *The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during all on-going business operations, and shall be included as part of contractual lease agreement language to ensure the tenants/lessees are informed of all on-going operational responsibilities.*

- a. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall ensure that all heavy-duty trucks (Class 7 and 8) domiciled on the project site are model year 2014 or later from start of operations, and shall expedite a transition to zero-emission vehicles, with the fleet fully zero-emission by December 31, 2025 or when commercially available for the intended application, whichever date is later.*

“Domiciled at the project site shall mean the vehicle is either (i) parked or kept overnight at the project site more than 70% of the calendar year or (ii) dedicated to the project site

¹ The regulation requires newer heavier trucks and buses must meet PM filter requirements beginning January 1, 2012. Lighter and older heavier trucks replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model year engines or equivalent. CARB's Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation is available at <https://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm>.

(defined as more than 70% of the truck routes (during the calendar year) that start at the project site even if parked or kept elsewhere).

Zero-emission heavy-duty trucks which require service can be temporarily replaced with model year 2014 or later trucks. Replacement trucks shall be used for only the minimum time required for servicing fleet trucks.

- b. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall utilize a “clean fleet” of vehicles/delivery/vans/trucks (Class 2 through 6) as part of business operations as follows: For any vehicle (Class 2 through 6) domiciled at the project site, the following “clean fleet” requirements apply: (i) 33% of the fleet will be zero emission at start of operations, (ii) 65% of the fleet will be zero emission vehicles by December 31, 2023, (iii) 80% of the fleet will be zero emission vehicles by December 31, 2025, and (iv) 100% of the fleet will be zero emission vehicles by December 31, 2027.*

“Domiciled at the project site” shall mean the vehicle is either (i) parked or kept overnight at the project site more than 70% of the calendar year or (ii) dedicated to the project site (defined as more than 70% of the truck routes (during the calendar year) that start at the project site even if parked or kept elsewhere).

Zero-emission vehicles which require service can be temporarily replaced with alternate vehicles. Replacement vehicles shall be used for only the minimum time required for servicing fleet vehicles.

The property owner/tenant/lessee shall not be responsible to meet “clean fleet” requirements for vehicles used by common carriers operating under their own authority that provide delivery services to or from the project site.

- c. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall make all reasonable efforts to procure the zero emission vehicles/trucks required to meet the “clean fleet” requirements in (a) and (b) above. In the event that there is a disruption in the manufacturing of zero emission vehicles/trucks or that sufficient vehicles/trucks are not commercially available for the intended application, the “clean fleet requirements” may be adjusted as minimally as possible by the CDD to accommodate the manufacturing disruption or unavailability of commercially available vehicles/trucks. The property owner/tenant/lessee shall provide all necessary documentation describing efforts made to meet clean fleet requirements as part of any adjustment request. The CDD staff may seek the recommendation of the California Air Resources Board in determining whether there has been a manufacturing disruption or insufficient vehicles/trucks commercially available for the intended application.*
- d. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall ensure all on-site equipment and vehicles (e.g., yard hostlers, yard equipment, forklifts, yard trucks and tractors, and pallet jacks) used within the project site are zero-emission from start of operations.*
- e. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall use the cleanest technologies available, and provide the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles and equipment that will be operating on-site.*

- f. *At least 30 days prior to applying for building permits, the property owner/tenant/lessee shall submit plans for review and approval of CDD staff, which include the necessary infrastructure for future use of zero emission vehicles, including both heavy-duty and delivery trucks (e.g., installation of conduit specifically designated for truck charging equipment in the future).*
 - g. *Idling is strictly prohibited on the subject property and adjacent streets in the Richmond/San Pablo area. The property owner/tenant/lessee shall inform all truck drivers associated with the business of this prohibition.*
 - h. *Applicant/tenant/lessee shall periodically sweep the property to remove road dust, tire wear, brake dust and other contaminants in paved parking lots.*
 - i. *Applicant/tenant/lessee shall not use diesel back-up generators on the property unless absolutely necessary. If absolutely necessary, at the time of initial operation, generators shall have Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that meets CARB's Tier 4 emission standards or meets the most stringent in-use standard, whichever has the least emissions. In the event rental back-up generators are required during an emergency, the units shall be located at the project site for only the minimum time required. Applicant/tenant/lessee shall make every effort to utilize emergency back-up generators that meet CARB's Tier 4 emission standards or have the least emissions.*
 - j. *The property owner/tenant/lessee shall monitor and ensure compliance with all current air quality regulations for on-road trucks including CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation, Periodic Smoke Inspection Program, and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.*
 - k. *The operation of Transportation Refrigeration Units (TRUs) is prohibited on the subject site. Any proposed use of TRUs at the subject location will require submittal of a Development Plan modification application.*
 - l. *As determined by the CDD, the property owner/tenant/lessee shall install sound walls and/or vegetation, when appropriate, to effectively block diesel emissions from existing nearby sensitive receptors (e.g., schools and residential neighborhoods).*
 - m. *The property owner shall add mitigation measures Air Quality 4, a through m, as part of contractual lease agreement language to ensure the tenant/lessee is informed of all on-going operational responsibilities.*
- 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**)*

Objectionable odors are typically associated with agricultural or heavy industrial land uses such as refineries, chemical plants, paper mills, landfills, sewage-treatment plants, etc. There is nothing in the project description that would indicate that the proposal would be a source of objectionable odors beyond that which is ordinarily associated with the mass grading; therefore, the project's impact to nearby sensitive receptors is considered less than significant with respect to odors.

4. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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)*

The proposal is not anticipated to significantly affect the migration of wildlife as the site is not within a “Significant Ecological Area and Selected Location of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Area”, as mapped in the 2005-2020 General Plan. The entire site was completely occupied for many years prior to 1980’s, however, the site has remained vacant since that time. In July of 2015, Olberding Environmental, Inc (consulting biologists), prepared a Biological Resources Analysis Report for the entire 19-acre site. The analysis included a site survey which was conducted on July 16, 2015. The survey identified several wetland features which will be discussed further in section c. below. Twelve special-status plant species were listed by a query of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) that occurred within 5 miles of the Property. However, none of the listed plants were found on the property. Also, after a thorough research of the biology of the special status plants, it was determined that all had low potential to occur on site due to lack of suitable habitat. Therefore, a rare plant survey is not required for the site prior to construction activities.

A total of 5 special-status bird species were identified as having a potential to occur on the property. The following bird species have a moderate potential to nest and forage on the

property including short-eared owl, and northern harrier. An additional three bird species have a moderate potential to forage on the property including white-tailed kite, red-tailed hawk, and yellow-headed blackbird. The following 7 species have low potential to occur due to lack of suitable habitat: burrowing owl, Alameda song sparrow, California black rail, California clapper rail, Caspian tern, double crested cormorant, and San Pablo song sparrow. If project construction-related activities such as tree and vegetation removal or grading take place during the nesting season (February through August), preconstruction surveys for nesting passerine birds and raptors will be required as described in the mitigation measure below.

No signs of bat use were observed on the property during the July 2015 survey. Based on habitat suitability, it was determined that bats have low potential to utilize the site in a roosting and foraging capacity. No large group of trees and structures were found on the property. Only a single small ornamental tree was found on the property which cannot support a colony of bats. If project construction-related activities such as tree removal take place, no pre-construction bat survey is required. Lastly, due to the lack of suitable habitat, neither the salt marsh harvest mouse, Alameda whipsnake nor western pond turtle are presumed to occupy the site.

Potential Impact (4 - 1): *Special-status bird species, and other nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, could be impacted by the construction phase of the project.*

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: If project construction-related activities would take place during the nesting season (February through August), preconstruction surveys for nesting passerine birds and raptors (birds of prey) within the property and the surrounding area of influence should be conducted by a competent biologist prior to the commencement of the tree removal or site grading activities. Since there is only a single small tree located on the property, the survey should focus on low vegetation and ground nesters. If any bird listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act is found to be nesting within the project site or within the area of influence, an adequate protective buffer zone should be established by a qualified biologist to protect the nesting site. This buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet from the project activities for passerine birds, and a minimum of 200 feet for raptors. The distance shall be determined by a competent biologist based on the site conditions (topography, if the nest is in line of sight of the construction and the sensitivity of the birds nesting). The nest site(s) shall be monitored by a competent biologist periodically to see if the birds are stressed by the construction activities and if the protective buffer needs to be increased. Once the young have fledged and are flying well enough to avoid project construction zones (typically by August), the project can proceed without further regard to the nest site(s).

- 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, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)*

According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Public Access Lands map, the project site is not located in or adjacent to an area identified as a wildlife or ecological reserve by the CDFW. According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located in or adjacent to a significant ecological area. Thus, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- 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)*

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act uses the Army Corps of Engineers definition of wetlands, which are defined as, “areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.” On behalf of the applicant Olberding Env. Inc. has prepared a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (wetland delineation) dated March 15, 2016. The wetland delineation indicated that the subject property has 0.84 acres of Seasonal Wetland Habitat that drains to off-site channels that flow to San Pablo Creek and San Pablo Bay. The wetland delineation was deemed adequate by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in a letter dated March 31, 2020.

As part of the grading activities associated with the project, all 0.84 acres of wetland features will be permanently or temporarily impacted. As mitigation, the applicant will construct 1.68 acres of wetland mitigation area and 1.04 acres of upland habitat plus a 520-foot linear mitigation swale that will extend around the southeastern corner of the site. This swale extension will connect with an existing drainage feature at the site. The 1.68 acres of wetland habitat would mitigate at a 2:1 ratio. As part of the application and permitting process of the Section 404 permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps, a Habitat Mitigation Monitoring Plan, dated January 2021, has been prepared to ensure long-term success of the mitigation area/features. Therefore, given the planned replacement wetland and upland features, it is expected that impacts to wetlands and other waters will be less than significant as mitigated.

- 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 wildlife nursery sites? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Due to the fact that the entire site and much of the surroundings have been developed with industrial uses, the possibility that the project would interfere with any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites, is unlikely. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident of migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or 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)*

The Conservation Element of the County’s General Plan addresses the County’s policies regarding the identification, preservation and management of natural resources in the unincorporated County. Within the Conservation Element, the “Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas” (Figure 8-1) identifies significant resources throughout the County. The map shows no resources in the vicinity of the

project site. The entirety of the property where work is to take place is disturbed and would not be considered native habitat, and the property is not located in or adjacent to any identified significant ecological resource. Thus, the project is not expected to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any developable undeveloped property, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. Based on the submitted plans and staff's site visit on April 18, 2020, no protected trees exist on the subject site or on adjacent properties within close to areas where work would occur. Thus, the project complies with the County's Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance.

- 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)*

There is one adopted habitat conservation plan in Contra Costa County, the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP). The plan was approved in May 2007 by the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy, comprised of the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, and Contra Costa County. The HCP/NCCP establishes a coordinated process for permitting and mitigating the incidental take of endangered species in East Contra Costa County. The plan lists Covered activities that fall into three distinct categories: (1) all activities and projects associated with urban growth within the urban development area (UDA); (2) activities and projects that occur inside the HCP/NCCP preserves; and (3) specific projects and activities outside the UDA. As the project does not fall into any of these categories, the project is not covered by, or in conflict with the adopted HCP.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations)*

Historical resources are defined in the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5 as a resource that fits any of the following definitions:

- Is listed in the California Register of Historic Places and has been determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historic Resources Commission;
- Is included in a local register of historic resources, and identified as significant in a historical resource survey that has been or will be included in the State Historic Resources Inventory; or
- Has been determined to be historically or culturally significant by a lead agency.

The results of a historical resources evaluation were detailed in a report prepared by Pacific Legacy – Historic Preservation, Bay Area Division, dated March 4, 2019. The reports indicated that archival and records searches revealed one known archaeological site (P-07-000813, CA-CCO-773H) had been recorded within the project area. CA-CCO-773H consists of two abandoned CA 1950s era railroad spurs originally associated with the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, which was acquired by Southern Pacific Railroad. The spurs extended from the main Southern Pacific line to the east of the project parcel and approximately north-south through the project area entering the adjacent parcel to the south. The spurs were evaluated and determined to be ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to lack of integrity. Subsequent to their recording and evaluation, they have been dismantled and removed from the site. No other structures or improvements are located on this vacant site.

The archaeological sensitivity map of the County’s General Plan (Figure 9-2), identifies the project area as “Largely Urbanized Area,” which may contain significant archeological resources. While unlikely since the site is fully disturbed, subsurface construction activities always have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources. Historic resources can include wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources, there could be a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, in the abundance of caution, the mitigation below will address the unlikelihood that a find is discovered during construction activities.

Potential Impact (5-1): *Surface construction activities could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources.*

CUL-1: *The following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented during project related ground disturbance, and shall be included on all construction plans:*

- All construction personnel, including operators of equipment involved in grading, or trenching activities will be advised of the need to immediately stop work if they observe any indications of the presence of an unanticipated cultural resource discovery (e.g. wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; deposits of wood, glass, ceramics). If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during ground disturbance activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and a qualified archaeologist contacted to evaluate the finds and, if*

necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the County and other appropriate agencies.

If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If eligible, deposits will need to be avoided by impacts or such impacts must be mitigated. Upon completion of the archaeological assessment, a report should be prepared documenting the methods, results, and recommendations. The report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa County agencies.

- b) *If human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation. If the human remains are of a Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the property and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.*

Upon completion of the assessment by an archaeologist, the archaeologist should prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa agencies.

As a result there would be a less than significant adverse environmental impact on historical resources.

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5? (**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations**)*

As stated previously, the project site does not appear to host any historical resources. However, subsurface construction activities always have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources. In keeping with the CEQA guidelines, if archaeological remains are uncovered, work at the place of discovery should be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources, there could be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure **Cultural Resources I** would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

- c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations**)*

There is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously human remains, there could be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure **Cultural Resources I** would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

6. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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 With Mitigations)*

Environmental effects related to energy include the project’s energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type during construction and operation; the effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies; the effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy; the degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards; the effects of the project on energy resources; and the project’s projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives, if applicable. The following factors demonstrate a project’s significance in relation to these effects: (1) why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed; (2) The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste; (3) The potential for reducing peak energy demand; (4) Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems; and (5) Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

The proposed project’s energy demand would be typical for a development of this scope and nature, and would comply with current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, enforced by the Building Inspection division. That the Legislature added the energy analysis requirement in CEQA at the same time that it created an Energy Commission authorized to impose building energy standards indicates that compliance with the building code is a necessary but not exclusive means of satisfying CEQA’s independent requirement to analyze energy impacts broadly. In response, this report also considers energy consumption related to transportation and efficiency measures not included in the building design. The type of vehicles used as part of normal business operations can directly affect the energy consumption, as well as, air quality. As previously mentioned in the Air Quality Section, AB 617 legislation has designated North Richmond and the surrounding area as a Community Air Protection Program community. Therefore, consideration must be given to the energy efficiency and air emission potential of all vehicles associated with projects within the area.

As discussed in the transportation section, the project is anticipated to have 10± vehicles arrive per day to drop off and pick up material and equipment. No customers will be allowed at the site and no more than 20 employees will be visiting the site to load/drop off material and equipment. As such, Mitigation Measure *Air 4* requires that the business fleet be electric and by 2027 all

heavy duty trucks be electric as well. With the implementation of these mitigation measures. Energy is also consumed with construction equipment, however with the implementation of Mitigation Measure *Air 3*, the most efficient construction vehicles will be utilized for this project. Furthermore, implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that the project is minimizing energy use in the North Richmond area and represents a less than significant impact from energy consumption.

Potential Impact (6-1): *Production of project related energy has potential to incrementally increase environmental pollutants at point sources.*

Energy-1: *At least 30-days prior to applying for the initial building/grading permit, the applicant shall also pay the Contra Costa County, Department of Conservation and Development, Current Planning Division, a flat not-to-exceed amount of \$75,000 as its fair share contribution towards the cost of planning and/or constructing a Solar Project for the benefit of the North Richmond area. The Solar Project must benefit North Richmond residents as mitigation for the construction of the project with its associated emissions and truck traffic. The County will work with the District One Supervisor and the North Richmond Community to define and develop the Solar Project.*

Other measures that are included in the project that demonstrate the projects efficiency include the inclusion of permeable pavement and vegetated landscaping, which would reduce the contamination and quantity of stormwater discharge from the site. Compliance with the State Model Water Efficient Landscape requirements indicates that water related energy use would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Thus, with the implementation of the mitigation measure above, the project would have a less than significant impact due to energy consumption.

- b) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The Climate Action Plan includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County.

The project would not conflict with the policies outlined in the CAP. Furthermore, as the policies in the CAP are recommendations and not requirements, the project would not conflict with the CAP and, thus, would not be considered to have a significant impact. The proposed project's energy demand would be typical for a development of this scope and nature, and would comply with current state and local codes concerning energy consumption.

7. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo (A-P) zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Hayward fault, which is mapped approximately 1.25 miles east of the project site. However, because the site is not within the Hayward A-P zone, the risk of fault rupture is generally regarded as low. As a result, the potential impact from surface fault rupture would be less than significant.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Figure 10-4 (Estimated Seismic Ground Response) of the General Plan Safety Element identifies the site in an area rated “High” damage susceptibility. The General Plan requires

that in areas prone to severe levels of damage from ground, where the risks to life and investments are sufficiently high, geologic-seismic and soils studies be required as a precondition for authorizing public or private construction. However, the project does not include any structures or buildings of appreciable size. The vast majority of work being done at the site is mass grading with a final surface being able to support construction vehicles. Thus, no seismic specific geotechnical reports are required at this time. Therefore the risk of ground shaking to the intended use of the site as a contractor's yard is considered less-than-significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Less Than Significant Impact)

According to the North Richmond Planned Unit District Map, the site is located in an area of "high to moderate" liquefaction potential. The soils on the site are considered to be "moderately expansive" by the Soils Survey of Contra Costa County (1977). Such soils require special foundation design measures to avoid/minimize the damage potential. However, as mentioned above, no structures or buildings are being proposed with this project. Therefore, the liquefaction risk at the site is considered less-than-significant in regards to this specific project.

iv) Landslides? (Less Than Significant Impact)

In 1975 the United States Geological Survey (USGS) issued photo-interpretation maps of landslide and other surficial deposits of Contra Costa County. This mapping is presented on page 10-24 of the Safety Element of the County General Plan. According to this USGS map, there are no suspected landslides in proximity of the proposed project. It should be recognized that the USGS landslides are mapped solely on the basis of geologic interpretation of stereo pairs of aerial photographs analyzed by an experienced USGS geologist. The mapping was done without the benefit of a site visit or any subsurface data. Furthermore, landslides mapped by the USGS are not classified on the basis of the (a) activity status (i.e. active or dormant), (b) depth of slide plane (shallow or deep seated), or (c) type of landslide deposit, and they do not show landslides that have formed since 1975. Consequently the USGS map is not a substitute for a detailed site-specific investigation. Nevertheless, the map fulfills its function, which is to flag sites that may be at risk of landslide damage, where detailed geologic and geotechnical investigations are required to evaluate risks and develop measures to reduce risks to a practical minimum. Thus, a less than significant impact can be expected regarding landslide hazards as none are present on the subject site.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The project site is largely level and requires the review and issuance of a grading permit. Typical Best Management Practices will be included as part of the grading permit. Furthermore, the Storm Water Control Plan for the project indicates that overall runoff from the project will be 10% ± less than what is currently calculated at the site, due to proposed wetlands ponds and controlled

drainage directed to stormdrain facilities on-site. Thus, a less than significant impact can be expected in regards to soil erosion or topsoil loss.

- 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)*

As discussed in a) iii above, the project site is in an area that has “high to moderate” liquefaction potential. However, incorporation typical grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. Thus, the environmental impact from an unstable geologic unit or soil would be considered to 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)*

With regard to its engineering properties, the underlying clayey soil is expansive. The expansion and contraction of soils could cause cracking, tilting, and eventual collapse of structures. However, no structures are proposed with this project.

- e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)*

The project does not require a septic or wastewater-disposal system; no buildings or structures that would house restrooms are proposed with this project. Therefore, there will 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 Mitigations)*

Similar to archaeological resources, there is a possibility that buried fossils and other paleontological resources could be present and accidental discovery could occur. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources, there could be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure **Cultural Resources 1** would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level. No unique geologic features exist on the site.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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)*

Greenhouse gases are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere and contribute to global climate change. Greenhouse gases include gases such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and various fluorocarbons commonly found in aerosol sprays. Typically, a single residential or commercial construction project in the County would not generate enough greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to substantially change the global average temperature; however, the accumulation of GHG emissions from all projects both within the County and outside the County has contributed and will contribute to global climate change.

Senate Bill 97 directed the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA Guidelines for evaluation of GHG emissions impacts and recommend mitigation strategies. In response, OPR released the Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change, and proposed revisions to the State CEQA guidelines (April 14, 2009) for consideration of GHG emissions. The California Natural Resources Agency adopted the proposed State CEQA Guidelines revisions on December 30, 2009 and the revisions were effective beginning March 18, 2010.

The bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂/yr is a numeric emissions level below which a project’s contribution to global climate change would be less than “cumulatively considerable.” This emissions rate is equivalent to a project size of an approximately 541,000-square-foot industrial use. Future construction and operation of the contractor’s yard would create some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. As the project does not exceed the screening criteria (for example, threshold of 540 construction employees, 10 employees proposed) the project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions that exceed the threshold of significance.

- b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

At a regional scale, the BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan that addresses GHG emissions as well as various criteria air pollutants. The BAAQMD Plan included a number of pollutant reduction strategies for the San Francisco Bay air basin, many of which are included as part of Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. As the proposed project does not include any new buildings or structures that would house employees, the application of Title 24 requirements would not apply.

Within Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors convened a Climate Change Working Group (CCWG) in May 2005, to identify existing County activities and policies that could reduce GHG emissions. In November 2005, the CCWG presented its Climate Protection Report to the Board of Supervisors, which included a list of existing and potential GHG reduction measures. This led to the quantification of relevant County information on GHGs in the December 2008 Municipal Climate Action Plan.

In April 2012, the Board directed the Department of Conservation and Development to prepare a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the reduction of GHG emissions in the unincorporated areas of the County. In December 2015, the Climate Action Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The Climate Action Plan includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County.

The project does not conflict with the policies outlined in the CAP. The project does not include any new housing which would incorporate Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (CCC) emission reduction measures (as referenced in Appendix E “Developer Checklist” of the CCC). Nevertheless, the project does not conflict with the implementation of these emission reduction measures and therefore would not be considered to have a significant impact.

9. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

SUMMARY:

- 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)*

The proposed project includes importing 127,000 cubic yards of soil over a 5-year period. During the construction period, there would be use of hazardous materials, including fuels, lubricants and similar construction materials. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (Cal/OSHA) requirements. With compliance with existing regulations, the project would have a less than significant hazardous materials impact during construction.

Truck maintenance operations typically involve the use or production of materials classified as “hazardous” in the California Health and Safety Code, including gasoline, ketone, and lead. Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Chapter 450-2 provides regulations administered by the Contra Costa County Department of Health Services, regarding hazardous material response plans, inventories, and risk management. Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Section 450-2.008(b) requires the establishment of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP), if necessary, that specifies the use, quantities, storage, transportation, disposal and upset conditions for hazardous materials in accordance with state and county regulations. Thus, an HMBP may be required to ensure no significant public exposure from the potential use of hazardous materials at the project site, because truck maintenance may include limited chemical usage. Compliance with County regulations would ensure this impact 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 likely release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The proposed contractor’s yard would involve routine handling and use of small quantities of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, etc.). Consequently, if quantities are of a sufficient quantity, a HMBP may be required to ensure no significant public exposure from the release of hazardous materials at the project site occurs. As described above, compliance with Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Chapter 450-2 suggests that the neither the construction phase nor the operational phase of the project will represent a significant impact. Therefore, compliance with County regulations would result in this impact being less than significant.

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

There are no schools located within a quarter mile of the project site. The closest school to the site is Verde Elementary School, located at 2000 Giaramita Street in Richmond. This school is over one-half mile to the south of the project site. Due to the distance between the site and the school, the proposed project would not emit or handle hazardous substances that would impact the school.

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

The site is not listed on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites (Cortese) List that is maintained pursuant to California Government Code section 65962.5. Nevertheless, several surrounding properties have history of chemical release that has affected the eastern portion of the subject property. As a result, Edd Clark & Associates, Inc., has prepared both a Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) for the site.

In August 2015, a total of 31 soil samples were collected from areas of the site identified as potentially having contamination. Contaminants of concern (COCs) detected were petroleum hydrocarbons, arsenic, lead, polychlorinated biphenyls, and dieldrin. These COCs were detected above Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) in 13 of the 31 shallow soil samples.

In July 2016, those locations with elevated COCs were over-excavated approximately 2.5 feet below the ground surface. Confirmation samples were collected to ensure any remaining concentrations of COCs were below the respective ESLs. Two confirmation samples contained dieldrin at concentrations exceeding ESL, therefore, additional over-excavation was performed in September 2016.

Upon the conclusion of the September 2016, soil removal, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board determined in a letter dated October 14, 2016, that the concentrations of any residual COCs remaining in shallow site soils should not pose a threat to human health or the environment. The letter concluded that “No Further Action” is appropriate for the site, despite the fact the project is proposing to add clean fill to the site which will further limit any potential contact with existing site soils. Therefore, due to the site remediation activities and testing that has occurred on this site, the project represents a less-than-significant impact.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (**No Impact**)*

The project site is not within an airport influence area, not within an airport safety zone, and outside of the 55-60 dB CNEL airport noise contour. Thus, there would not be any hazard related to a public airport or public use airport.

- f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (**Less Than Significant Impact**)*

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County’s adopted emergency response plan related to Parr Boulevard or the project site. Thus, project impacts on emergency response would be a less than significant.

With respect to proposed onsite improvements, the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project plans and provided comments that require compliance with all applicable codes and standards. Furthermore, the Fire Protection District would review the construction drawings for the project at the time of submittal of a building/grading permit application.

- g) *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The project site is in a developed area within the urbanized community of Contra Costa County, which is designated as an “urban un-zoned” area by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and therefore, would not have a significant risk of wildland fire. Additionally, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map characterizes this area as a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone area. Therefore, there would not be a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.

10. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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**)*

In the San Francisco Bay Region, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) includes permit requirements for stormwater runoff under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The RWQCB regulates stormwater runoff from construction activities under the NPDES permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The Contra Costa County Watershed Program administers the stormwater program for a project after it is constructed.

The RWQCB administers the NPDES stormwater-permitting program in the Bay Area. Under current regulations, construction activities of 1 acre or more are subject to the permitting requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Discharge of Stormwater Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). Since the project would involve more than 1 acre of construction activities, it would be subject to these regulations. The project applicant must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the SWRCB to be covered by the General Construction Permit prior to the beginning of construction. The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP).

The project applicant will be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) as part of the construction phase of the project. The SWPPP will include specifications for Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented before, during and after project construction to control surface discharge and pollutants. Post construction drainage control will be managed by a system of bio-retention planters, wetland mitigation areas, and earthen conveyance channels that will be utilized as self-treating and self-retaining areas. These drainage control features are included as part of the Storm Water Control Program (SWCP) which has been reviewed (prepared by Kier & Wright Civil Engineers, dated April 3, 2019) and deemed preliminarily complete. Routine maintenance of the basins/swales will generally involve maintaining unobstructed flow in drainage features, preventing and repairing any erosion in the mitigation areas, and maintaining the health of required vegetation.

The selection, sizing, and preliminary design of the water treatment BMPs identified in the Stormwater Control Plan for the project will be required to meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board Order R2-2003-022 as part of the plan's final review prior to initiation of the project. Two exceptions are being requested: 1) exception from Section 914-2.004 (Offsite collect and convey requirements); and 2) exception from Section 914-12.010 (Detention Basins-Maintenance) of the code to allow for private maintenance of the detention infrastructure. These exceptions are being supported by staff provided that:

- The existing drainage pattern is maintained and concentrated storm drainage is not discharged onto adjacent property,
- On-site detention is employed to reduce the resultant stormwater runoff from the site. Post-project runoff rate shall be at least 10% less than the existing pre-project rate for the prescribed design storm, and
- Maintenance and oversight of the detention facilities shall be comparable to those measures employed for Stormwater Management Facilities. This includes and Operation and Maintenance Plan, maintenance agreement, etc.

Contra Costa County Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements. Contra Costa County has jurisdiction over discharge of storm-water runoff as well as drainage facilities within the boundaries of the project site. The Contra Costa County Clean Water Program is the local entity responsible for implementing compliance with the federal Clean Water Act to control stormwater pollution. The Program is comprised of Contra Costa County, 17 incorporated cities, and the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The Program complies with the Joint Municipal NPDES permit issued by the San Francisco Bay and Central Valley RWQCBs. The permits mandate that participating municipalities implement their approved Stormwater management Plan. The program includes the implementation of BMPs that include construction controls (such as model grading ordinances), legal and regulatory approaches (such as stormwater ordinances), public education and industrial outreach (to encourage reduction of pollutants at various sources), public education and industrial outreach (to encourage reduction of pollutants at various sources), public activities, wet weather monitoring, and special studies. All stormwater controls have been designed in accordance with Contra Costa County C.3 handbook guidelines. The project would not violate the provisions of the County's Clean Water Program.

- 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)*

Ground water occurs at a depths near the surface. The Project will not adversely affect groundwater or reduce the water available to the public since a public groundwater source is not affected. No potable water wells are being proposed and furthermore, the site is serviced by municipal water, therefore, there is no need to utilize groundwater for this project.

- c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the 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 includes approximately 14,000 cubic yards of cut and 141,600 cubic yards of fill with 127,000 cubic yards of import from off-site. A grading permit would be required for this work and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent erosion or siltation on- or off-site during construction will be implemented. Furthermore, the stormwater control plan prepared for the project includes BMPs to reduce sediment discharges during construction and operation. Thus, a less than significant impact is expected.

- 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)*

The project includes a SWCP with C.3 compliant storm water controls including pervious areas, wetland mitigation areas, and storm drains that would collect storm water, allow percolation into the ground, and convey excess runoff to existing municipal stormwater facilities. The wetlands mitigation ponds will decrease the amount of surface runoff discharged from the site by 10%. The County Public Works Department has reviewed the applicant's preliminary stormwater control plan and determined that drainage facilities in

the area could accommodate the surface runoff without resulting in flooding. Accordingly, the proposed project would not 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Proposed drainage improvements will help eliminate localized water ponding by collecting and treating the surface flows from all areas of the project using the SWCP as described above. All exposed slopes will be stabilized and vegetated. The bio-retention/detention basins would reduce peak discharge rates, particularly compared to conventional inlet and pipe storm drain systems. Additionally, as proposed, the majority of the site's rainwater runoff will be directed to the proposed wetland mitigation areas which will benefit from the added flow.

- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows? (No Impact)*

The project is located in area that is outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area. Furthermore, the improvements on the site are not expected to create any barrier that would impede or redirect flood flows, should flooding occur.

- d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (No Impact)*

The project is located in area that is outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area. The proposed project would not be susceptible to inundation by seiche or tsunami. The California Geological Survey (2009) has projected and mapped the tsunami hazard posed by a tidal wave that passes through the Golden Gate and into San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay and Carquinez Strait. The project site is not included in the inundation area on any tsunami hazard map.

- e) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As stated above, the proposed project would comply with applicable water quality and discharge requirements. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to control stormwater runoff. The Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) prepared for the proposed project includes stormwater controls as required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program and Municipal Regional Permit. Thus the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), effective January 1, 2015, established a framework of priorities and requirements to facilitate sustainable groundwater management throughout the State. The intent of SGMA is for groundwater to be managed by local public agencies and newly-formed Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to ensure a groundwater basin is operated within its sustainable yield through the development and implementation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP). The Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin, East Bay Plain Subbasin, referred to as DWR Basin 2-009.04 East Bay Plain, is a Medium Priority groundwater basin based on the Groundwater Basin Prioritization by the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) and is located in western Contra Costa County as well as in Alameda County.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project physically divide an established community? (No Impact)*

Development of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project will occur on a vacant parcel within an overall industrial portion of North Richmond.

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

General Plan

The subject property has a Heavy Industrial (HI) land use designation and the proposed development is consistent with this designation. The designation allows for activities requiring large areas of land with convenient truck and rail access. Uses may include metalworking, chemical or petroleum product processing and refining, heavy equipment operation and similar activities. Light industrial land uses are also allowed within lands designated Heavy Industrial and they can be developed according to light industrial definition and standards found in that designation. The contractor’s yard use is allowed within the HI designation with certain limitations as described in the table below:

	Maximum Allowed	Proposed
Site Coverage:	30%	0%
Floor Area Ratio:	0.67	0%
Employees Per Gross Acre:	45	≤8*

*Estimated 8 staff with occasional visits to intermittently drop-off or pick-up equipment.

Thus, as proposed, the project is consistent with Contra Costa County General Plan development guidelines for the HI land use designation.

The project would also be consistent with the General Plan policies for development within the North Richmond Specific Geographic Area, as outlined below:

- Policy 3-185 requires that all outside storage areas be screened from public streets. The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan that includes a mix of trees and shrubs along the western edge of the property. Additionally, adequate landscaping to provide screening would

be included as a condition of approval (COA). Thus, the project, which includes storage of heavy equipment would be screened from the nearest occupied properties.

- Policy 3-186 requires project applicants to provide a site history for uses that have previously been on the property as part of any permit application process. As appropriate, soils analysis for toxic wastes are required for permit applications. The applicant has provided a Phase I and II environmental site assessment (ESA) for the subject property, which includes a review of historic uses on the site. In accordance with the findings of those reports, remedial action has occurred and a “No Further Action” determination has been issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Policy 3-187 directs development proposals to be compatible with the North Richmond Redevelopment Plan. The proposed use would be consistent with the allowed uses outlined for this site in the North Richmond Redevelopment Plan, as shown in the use matrix and development standards in the plan. As shown in the use matrix, sites with a Heavy Industrial land use designation are suitable for trucking yards, equipment repair, auto garages, and administrative offices. Thus, each and all aspects of the project would be compatible with the North Richmond Redevelopment Plan for the subject property upon issuance of a development plan permit.

Based on the consistency with the applicable policies and land use designation standards, the project would conform with the County’s General Plan.

Zoning

The project site is zoned P-1 (North Richmond Planned Unit District) which has specific development standards for industrial uses. The project does not include any buildings which may be occupied by office workers etc. Therefore, the floor area ratio, height, off-street parking, and setbacks requirements are not applicable to this project. Nevertheless, prior to construction of any proposed buildings on-site, the applicant will be required to submit a Development Plan Application to ensure the new improvements are also consistent with the development standards as prescribed within the North Richmond P-1.

12. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *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? (No Impact)*

Known mineral resource areas in the County are shown on Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the General Plan Conservation Element. No known mineral resources have been identified in the project vicinity, and therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

- b) *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 project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

13. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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)*

Activities at the project site are not expected to expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of the Community Noise Exposure Levels shown on Figure 11-6 of the General Plan Noise Element. Figure 11-6 shows that levels of 75 dB or less are normally acceptable and noise levels between 70 dB to 80 dB are conditionally acceptable in industrial areas. Types and levels of noise generated from the uses associated with the proposed contractor’s yard would be similar to noise levels from the existing developments in the area. Thus, project noise impacts to the existing surrounding land uses would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Project construction does not include any components (e.g., pile-driving) that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels. Additionally, normal activities at the contractor’s yards would not generate ground-borne vibrations during project operations. Furthermore, even if the project resulted in groundborne vibrations, the project is located in an industrial area of the County where typical activities could result in localized groundborne vibration without being considered excessive.

- 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? (No Impact)*

As discussed in Section 9.e, the project site is not within an airport influence area, not within an airport safety zone, and outside of the 55-60 dB CNEL airport noise contour. Thus, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would result in the development of a contractor’s yard. According to the applicant, the proposed project would have up to 20 full-time employees which will only visit the site to pick-up and drop-off equipment. Using a conservative assumption that no employee is

currently a resident of the County, and based on the Census 2010 estimate of 3.27 persons per household for the adjacent City of San Pablo (the city with the highest per household size), the population of the area could increase by 33 (less than 0.1% of the County population). Thus, the potential maximum increase in population 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 is currently a vacant industrial property, and does not include any dwelling units. Thus, the proposed project would not displace any existing housing and would have no impact on housing displacement.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES – 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:				
a) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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:

- a) *Fire Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Fire protection to the project site would be provided by the fire station located at 13928 San Pablo Avenue (approximately two miles driving distance to the site). Using an average travel speed of 35 miles per hour, an engine responding from Station 70 would take less than five minutes to reach the project site. This response time is typical for areas in the project vicinity. In addition, as detailed in the comment letter for the proposed project from the Fire District, the project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of the California Fire Code and applicable Contra Costa County Ordinances that pertain to emergency access and fire suppression systems. Prior to the issuance of building/grading permits, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the fire district. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project relating to fire protection would be less than significant.

b) *Police Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the North Richmond area. The addition of one new industrial use in the project area would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the area. Furthermore, the proposed contractor's yard does not include any crowd inducing activities such as alcohol sales, etc. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant.

c) *Schools? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Indirectly, as described in Section 14.a above, the project could result in a maximum increase of 33 persons in the North Richmond area. Conservatively, an estimated 10 of these persons (1 in 3 per household) may be children between the ages of five to 19. The 10 school-age children would have an indirect impact on the schools. The project is within West Contra Costa Unified School District. The increase of ten students (less than 0.1 percent) would not significantly impact the district.

d) *Parks? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in Section 14.a, the proposed project would include a contractor's yard with up to 10 employees. The project employees and their families could increase population in the project area by an estimated 33 persons. As a result, there could be an increase in use of parks in the surrounding area. These parks provide recreational facilities such as playgrounds, picnic and barbecue areas, and youth and adult recreational programs. Given the number of parks in the North Richmond area, and the project's relatively small indirect addition to the population, the impacts of the proposed project on parks would be less than significant.

e) *Other public facilities? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Libraries:

The Contra Costa Library operates 28 facilities in Contra Costa County, including the San Pablo Library at 2999 Chattleton Lane (approximately 2 miles driving distance to the east). The Contra Costa Library system is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. A portion of the property taxes on the project site would go to the Contra Costa Library system. Accordingly, the impact of the use of the public libraries by project employees and their families who live in or move to the area, would be less than significant.

Health Facilities:

The Contra Costa County Health Services Department (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 11 health centers and clinics in the County. County health facilities generally serve low income and uninsured patients. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes, including a portion of the taxes on the project site. Thus, the impact of the use of public health facilities by project employees and their families who live in or move to the area, would be less than significant.

16. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The Contra Costa County General Plan bases the need of parks and other recreational facilities on the needs and changes in the number of people living in the County. As stated throughout this study, the project involves operation of a contractor's yard. Therefore, no new residential neighborhoods will be constructed or required as part of this development. Additionally, the proposed project does not consist of eliminating or altering any existing recreational facilities within the County. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact the amount of parks and other recreational facilities that would be required within the subject area and County as a whole.

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As described above, use of public recreational facilities by potential new residents would incrementally increase use of the facilities, but would not be expected to result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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 project proposes to construct a contractor's yard aimed at storing heavy equipment. Access to the site will be provided by Radiant Avenue which is a private road 22 feet in width. One driveway will be constructed to allow vehicular ingress/egress at the terminus of the private road. The nearest public street is Parr Boulevard, approximately 870 feet south of the project location. According to the applicant, during the construction phase of the project, the import of fill (127,000 cubic yards) will occur over an approximated 5-year period. As these trips would be dispersed throughout the day, it is highly unlikely that the project would generate greater than 100 peak hour trips (10 trips per day once operational). Therefore, a full Traffic Impact Analysis is not required as projects generating less than 100 peak hour trips generally will not create or exacerbate a significant circulation impact. Nevertheless, Considering Parr Boulevard is a major transportation route and Radiant Avenue is an un-controlled intersection, vehicles queuing to make left turns from Parr to Radiant Avenue could cause undesired traffic congestion. Therefore, the project's construction phase will include a condition of approval which details the preferred truck route (Parr Boulevard alone, or via Goodrick Avenue if approaching the site from the north) and frequency if high volumes of truck traffic is expected.

Thus, the project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed project would not alter the local infrastructure in a way that could hinder future establishment of public transportation. The project does not propose a design that would prevent the use of bicycles or other alternative modes of transportation, thus there would be a less than significant impact.

- b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?(Less Than Significant Impact)*

The project proponent has a longstanding history of performing Bay Area roadway projects, etc. Centrally locating the contractor's yard in the proposed location, will provide a convenient in-fill staging site which is encouraged to reduce potential vehicles miles traveled of employees. Nevertheless, with a maximum of 10 employees visiting the site per day, the proposal will not exceed any vehicle miles traveled (VMT) threshold. Additionally, existing public transportation infrastructure is located within 1/3 of a mile (AC Public Transit and Richmond Parkway Transit Center), the project will offer public transit alternatives to employees which will further reduce VMT for the project. Therefore, the project represents a less than significant impact with regards to vehicles mile traveled.

- 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)*

There are no increased hazards due to a design feature such as curves or intersections. The project's ingress/egress will be provided by one newly designed driveway at the terminus of Radiant Avenue. Comments received from the Public Works Department stated that the design of the project conforms to applicable design standards. The Contra Costa Fire Protection District has also reviewed the project for conformance with the Fire District standards, which include emergency access, and no comments of concern were received. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with regards to the geometric design of the project.

North Richmond Neighborhood Cut-Through Semi-Truck Traffic

The project is located approximately 0.75 miles north of the North Richmond residential neighborhood. The North Richmond Municipal Advisory Council (NRMAC) frequently indicates that the area experiences high truck volumes on local streets. Per the mitigation measure below, the applicant will be prohibited from operating heavy duty trucks outside of the designated truck route for the North Richmond area (currently Richmond Parkway, Parr Boulevard, Goodrick Avenue and Giant Highway).

Potential Impact (17-1): *Truck traffic associated with the project may negatively impact (air quality and pedestrian safety) within the nearby residential portions of North Richmond and surrounding communities.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1: *The operator of the contractor's yard shall prevent all truck traffic from driving through local residential neighborhood streets of the North Richmond area. Truck traffic shall remain on roadways within the industrial area and utilize the designated truck route (currently Richmond Parkway, Parr Boulevard, Goodrick Avenue and Giant Highway).*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-2: *At least 30-days prior to applying for a building/grading permit the applicant shall pay the Contra Costa County, Department of Conservation and Development, Current Planning Division, a flat not-to-exceed amount of \$25,000 as its fair share contribution towards the cost of a General Plan update for the North Richmond area.*

- d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The Contra Costa Fire Protection District has reviewed the project for conformance with the Fire District standards, which include emergency access, and no comments of concern were received. Furthermore, the project proponent must submit improvement plans to the Fire District prior to issuance of permits to ensure all applicable code sections have been satisfied. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact. (***Less Than Significant Impact***)

18. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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)? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations)*

As discussed in Sections 5.a through 5.c above, no historical resources have been identified on the project site. Further, according to the County’s Archaeological Sensitivities map, Figure 9-2, of the County General Plan, the subject site is located in an area that is considered “largely urbanized,” and is generally not considered to be a location with significant archaeological resources. Given all of these factors, there is little potential for the project to impact undiscovered cultural resources on the site.

Pertaining to the significance of tribal cultural resources, there are no onsite historical resources, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) that are included in a local register of historic resources.

Nevertheless, the expected construction and grading could cause ground disturbance which may impact heretofore undocumented cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigations Measure **Cultural Resources I** would reduce the impact on archeological resources during project related work to a level that would be considered less than significant.

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations)*

As discussed in Sections 5.a through 5.c above, no historical resources have been identified on the project site. It is not likely that the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the

significance of a tribal cultural resource that meets the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, for the reasons stated above.

Nevertheless, the expected construction and grading could cause ground disturbance which may impact heretofore undocumented cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigations Measure ***Cultural Resources 1*** would reduce the impact on archeological resources during project related work to a less than significant level.

19. 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 telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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 telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The project site is considered to be at an in-fill location within the unincorporated North Richmond area of the County. As such, wastewater, electric, gas, and telecommunication facilities are available to the property. Utilizing the subject property as a contractor's yard (storage only – no offices), it is highly unlikely that a substantial demand will be place on respective utility service systems. Nevertheless, agency comments for the project have indicated that sufficient capacity exists within facilities to accommodate the proposed use at this location. Thus, no significant environmental effects are expected from the construction or operational components of the project.

- 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 project site would receive water service from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). EBMUD has reviewed the project and indicated that the project proponent must adhere to all conditions (installation of water-efficiency measures, payment of fees, etc.) as part of connecting to the water services. Accordingly, the impact of providing water service to the proposed project 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)*

The subject property is within West County Wastewater District service boundaries. The district has provided comments stating that the project must adhere to all requirements prior to installing sanitary sewer mains, laterals and/or appurtenances. As proposed, the project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, therefore,

- 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 proposed project would generate construction solid waste and post-construction operational solid waste. Construction waste would be hauled to one of the recycling centers and/or transfer stations located in the area. The recycling center and/or transfer station would sort through the material and pulls out recyclable materials. Future construction of the proposed project would incrementally add to the construction waste headed to a landfill; however, the impact of the project-related incremental increase would be considered to be less than significant as the vast majority of the project consists of grading (compared to warehouse building construction, etc.). Furthermore, construction on the project site would be subject to the CalGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program administered by the CDD at the time of application for a building/grading permit. The Debris Recovery Program would reduce the construction debris headed to the landfill by diverting materials that can be recycled to appropriate recycling facilities therefore, the impact of the project-related waste is considered to be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste. The proposed project would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that would conflict with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that no hazardous materials will be processed or stored on the site. The

project is to store construction equipment related to applicant's local projects. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

20. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: (No Impact)

As discussed in section 9.g above, the project site is in a developed area within the urbanized community of Contra Costa County, which is designated as an “urban un-zoned” area by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and therefore, would not have a significant risk of wildland fire. Additionally, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map characterizes this area as a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone area. Thus, no impact is expected.

a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
N/A

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?*
N/A

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??*
N/A

- 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?*

N/A

21. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations)*

The combination of type and location of the proposed project creates a scenario where there is fairly minimal potential for adverse impacts to plant/animal communities, examples of California history, or environment in general. However, the construction phase of the project may have impacts on unforeseen cultural resources yet to be discovered and air quality. To mitigate those potential impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into this project that once implemented will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Furthermore, Phase 1 of the project will establish the necessary drainage, wetland mitigation and grading features (berms) that will accommodate all rainwater runoff and soil import during the anticipated 5 years of soil import. Once constructed, the proposed project will not place significant demand on utilities for operation, and will not produce significant amounts of hazardous waste as the primary function of the site is to provide storage of construction vehicles/equipment.

- 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.) (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations)*

Construction of the proposed project includes import of 141,600 cubic yards of soil to accomplish the intended site elevations (10-12 feet above current grades). The proposed contractor's yard use will generate approximately 10 truck trips per day and include drainage/landscaping improvements which are not expected to significantly alter the environmental characteristics of the site. However, the construction phase includes import of a significant amount of soil. As this quantity of soil will require substantial numbers of diesel truck trips, mitigations have been incorporated into the project to ensure that the impact to air quality and traffic are less than significant for the construction phase of the project.

Nevertheless, staff is aware of several other similarly sized projects in the general North Richmond area. Each project is over 20 acres in size (new warehouses at 506 Brookside Drive and at 81 Parr Boulevard) and are required to complete an independent environmental review to mitigate each projects' potential impacts. Both of those projects are at various stages of County review/approval at the time this analysis was completed, although the primary concerns with those respective projects are the operational impacts compared to the temporary impacts anticipated by the construction of the proposed project. Due to the anticipated relatively low operational daily traffic trips (16 per day), the incremental and foreseeable traffic or air impacts, have been identified and mitigated as part of this document, that once implemented will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project as mitigated, along with the other identified North Richmond projects would have a less than significant cumulative effect on the environment.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations**)*

The proposed contractor's yard will primarily be used for equipment storage. No processing or manufacturing of hazardous materials is included as part of this project. The associated air quality impacts are considered negligible due to the low number of anticipated truck trips (up to 16 per day). As of the date of this initial study, staff is unaware of any studies or other reports that have been issued that indicate the project will result in a direct or indirect hazard to humans.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Site Plan**
- 3. MMRP**