DRAFT

CEQA INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

GOODRICK AVENUE BAY TRAIL GAP CLOSURE PROJECT
RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for:
City of Richmond
450 Civic Center Drive
Richmond, California 94804

Prepared by:
LSA Associates, Inc.
157 Park Place
Point Richmond, California 94801
(510) 236-6810
LSA Project No. BKF1504

January 2017
This page intentionally left blank.
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Name. Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project (PLN16-717)

Project Location. The project site is located along the eastern side of Goodrick Avenue, north of Richmond Parkway in the City of Richmond in Contra Costa County, California.

Project Description. The City of Richmond proposes to construct the Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project, a multi-use trail connection in Richmond, California. The Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project consists of constructing a 0.3-mile Class I bicycle and pedestrian trail along the eastern side of Goodrick Avenue, north of Richmond Parkway. The proposed trail would connect the existing Class I San Francisco Bay Trail segment along Richmond Parkway to a new 1.5-mile segment of the Bay Trail north of the project site. The Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project would be a segment of a continuous Bay Trail alignment that extends from Buchanan Street in Albany to Atlas Road and San Pablo Avenue in Richmond.

Findings. It is hereby determined that, based on the information contained in the attached Initial Study, the proposed project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation measures necessary to avoid the potentially significant effects on the environment are included in the attached Initial Study, which is hereby incorporated and fully made part of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The City of Richmond has hereby agreed to implement each of the identified mitigation measures, which would be adopted as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

\[\text{Signed}\]
Linda Velasco, Project Manager II

\[\text{Date}\]
1/10/2017
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Project Information

1. **Project title:**
   Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   City of Richmond Planning Division
   450 Civic Center Plaza
   P.O. Box 4046
   Richmond, CA  94804-1630

3. **Contact person and phone number:**
   Lina Velasco, Project Manager II
   510/620-6841
   Lina_Velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us

4. **Project location:**
   The project site is located along the eastern side of Goodrick Avenue, north of Richmond Parkway in the City of Richmond in Contra Costa County, California (refer to Figure 1, Project Location, Figure 2, Aerial Photo, and Figures 3a-3d, Site Photos).

5. **Project sponsor’s name and address:**
   City of Richmond Engineering Services Department
   450 Civic Center Plaza, 2nd Floor
   Richmond, CA  94804-1630
   510/307-8147
   Michael_Williams@ci.richmond.ca.us

6. **General plan designation:**
   Low Intensity Business/Light Industrial

7. **Zoning:**
   ILL (Industrial Limited Light)

8. **Description of project:**
   The City of Richmond (City) proposes to construct the Goodrick Avenue Bay Trail Gap Closure Project (proposed project). The proposed project consists of constructing a 0.3-mile Class I bicycle and pedestrian trail along the eastern side of Goodrick Avenue, north of Richmond Parkway. The proposed project would connect the existing Class I San Francisco...
Bay Trail (Bay Trail) segment along Richmond Parkway to a new 1.5-mile segment of the Bay Trail north of the project site, which is part of the Breuner Marsh Restoration and Public Access Improvements Project. The Breuner Marsh Restoration and Public Access Improvements Project, part of Point Pinole Regional Shoreline, is currently under construction by the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) and is scheduled for completion in spring 2017. The proposed project would be a segment of a continuous Bay Trail alignment that extends from Buchanan Street in Albany to Atlas Road and San Pablo Avenue in Richmond. Specific elements of the proposed project are described in more detail below.

**Multi-use trail.** The project alignment and all proposed improvements would be located within the existing Goodrick Avenue public right-of-way, which varies in width from a minimum of 68 feet at the northern end of the alignment to a maximum of 146 feet at the southern end of the alignment, near Richmond Parkway. The existing paved roadway varies from 18 to 40 feet in width. The proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail would consist of a 10-foot-wide paved trail with two 2-foot-wide gravel shoulders. The trail would be paved with asphalt on top of compacted fill. Existing accessible curb ramps at the northwest corner of the intersection of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway would be replaced to comply with current accessibility and Bay Trail design guidelines. Wayfinding signage would be installed at the intersection. In addition, the crosswalks across Goodrick Avenue would be striped to provide a safer crossing for cyclists and pedestrians in the area (refer to Figure 4, sections, and Figure 5a-5d, Trail Plan and Profile).

Currently, Goodrick Avenue is a two-lane road, with one travel lane in each direction. Implementation of the proposed multi-use trail would not result in changes to the number of lanes or reduce vehicle capacity along Goodrick Avenue.

**Utilities.** Existing public utilities within the vicinity of the project site include storm drain and sanitary sewer infrastructure owned by the City. In addition, the East Bay Municipal Utility District, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), Comcast, and AT&T also have infrastructure within the public right-of-way along Goodrick Avenue.

Chevron Corporation owns two pipelines within a 30-foot-wide easement adjacent to the east side of the project alignment. The western 5 feet of the easement is within the City right-of-way. The westernmost pipeline is 10 inches in diameter and transports refined petroleum products, such as diesel or gasoline. The eastern pipeline is 18 inches in diameter and transports natural gas at high pressures.

**Purpose of the project.** The primary purpose of the proposed project is to provide a permanent multi-use trail for use by bicycles and pedestrians that will:

- Provide safe and convenient bicyclist and pedestrian access to Point Pinole Regional Shoreline;
- Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians who cross Goodrick Avenue at Richmond Parkway; and
- Encourage non-vehicular transportation for commuters, shoppers, and nearby residents in the area.
**Need for the project.** Currently, Goodrick Avenue does not include sidewalks and is an unsafe walking and bicycling route. The proposed project would provide a safe travel route for bicyclists and pedestrians who want to travel along the Bay Trail and visit the Point Pinole Regional Shoreline. The proposed project would also provide a non-vehicular option for commuters to access nearby employment locations and for shoppers to visit the Hilltop Mall. Nearby residents of the North Richmond and Iron Triangle neighborhoods, located south of the project site and the Hilltop residential neighborhoods, located north of the project site, would benefit from improved access to the Bay Trail and surrounding amenities.

**Construction.** The City plans to construct the proposed multi-use trail and related infrastructure improvements as a single project. Construction of the project is anticipated to require approximately 4 months. Construction activities would include: clearing and grubbing existing vegetation, excavating surface soils, placing fill, paving with asphalt, striping crosswalks, improving drainage, and removing and installing fencing.

Construction activities would result in the removal of existing vegetation within the trail alignment (to approximately 4 inches in depth) and the excavation of surface soils (an additional 4 to 8 inches in depth). On the south side of the trail, near Richmond Parkway, lightweight fill would be placed on top of the existing soils to elevate the proposed trail to connect with Richmond Parkway trail as well as to bridge the existing petroleum pipelines. The fill slope on the east side of the trail would be graded to a 2:1 slope.

A vegetated drainage swale with up to 2:1 slopes and a maximum depth of two feet would be excavated on the east side of the proposed trail. Storm water would continue to discharge underneath Goodrick Avenue within existing culverts, maintaining the existing drainage pattern. The existing barbed wire fence located east of Goodrick Avenue would be removed during construction. A new chain link, barbed wire, wood, or wire fence would be installed on the east side of the proposed trail, west of the Chevron Corporation easement. Excavation for the fence posts would extend to a depth of approximately 24 inches.

The existing eucalyptus tree located on the east side of Goodrick Avenue near the center of the project alignment would be protected during construction, and the trail alignment would curve around the tree. Four ornamental fruit trees located at the northeast corner of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway would be removed to accommodate the planned sidewalk and ramp improvements.

A temporary construction staging area would be located in a paved, and currently closed, segment of Elmar Court, located immediately west of Goodrick Avenue near the south end of the project alignment. A construction staging plan would be implemented in order to minimize disruptions to vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, and nearby uses.

**Funding.** The proposed project is not currently funded; however, it is anticipated that funding would come from the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and/or grants.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The project site is located along Goodrick Avenue in the northwestern portion of the City in Contra Costa County. The San Pablo Bay is located to the north and west of the project site. From south to north, the project site extends for approximately 0.3 mile along Goodrick Avenue from the intersection with Richmond Parkway to the southern end of the new segment of the Bay Trail, proposed as part of the Breuner Marsh Restoration and Public Access Improvements Project at the southern end of Point Pinole Regional Shoreline. The east side of Goodrick Avenue is vacant land and is currently an open pasture used for grazing horses. West of Goodrick Avenue adjacent to Elmar Court are vacant graded parcels intended for light industrial development. The Richmond Rod and Gun Club, a large outdoor shooting range, is located west of Goodrick Avenue north of Elmar Court. Rheem Creek is located north of the project site and flows from east to west into the San Pablo Bay.

The area south of Richmond Parkway along Goodrick Avenue is dominated by industrial uses, including Beck Electric Supply, Sunbelt Rentals, Gardener’s Guild, Thomas Swan Sign Company, Inc., and Norcal Perlite. San Pablo Creek is located south of these industrial uses and flows from east to west into the San Pablo Bay.

The project site is designated as Low Intensity Business/Light Industrial in the Richmond General Plan 2030.\(^1\) The project site and surrounding area to the east, north, and west are located within the boundaries of Change Area 12. Change areas are defined as areas in which the City anticipates to develop or redevelop. According to the City’s General Plan, Change Area 12 is planned to be developed with low-intensity office and light industrial businesses that are compatible with surrounding habitat and open space resources, consistent with the planning policies, regulations, and design guidelines of the North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan (NRSSP).\(^2\)

The project alignment is relatively flat, with an elevation ranging from approximately 18 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the southern end of the project alignment to 9 feet amsl at the northern end of the project alignment. Vegetation within the project alignment consists of ruderal/non-native annual grasslands and seasonal wetlands abutting a horse pasture. One large eucalyptus tree is located within the project alignment.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

- City of Richmond (Authorization of Construction Contract)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Federal Clean Water Act [CWA] Section 404 Permit, Nationwide Permit [NWP] 14, Linear Transportation Projects, and/or NWP 42 Recreational Facilities)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement)

---

\(^1\) City of Richmond, 2012. Richmond General Plan 2030.

Photo 1: Southern end of proposed alignment looking north on Goodrick Avenue

Photo 2: Four ornamental fruit trees along Richmond Parkway
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Photo 7: Northern end of proposed alignment looking south on Goodrick Avenue

Photo 8: Breuner Marsh Improvements at the northern end of the proposed alignment
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ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

**Determination.** (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier 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.

Lina Velasco, Project Manager II
City of Richmond

Date: 1/10/2017
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This section identifies the environmental impacts of this project by answering questions from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Environmental Checklist Form. The environmental issues evaluated in this section include:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biology
- Cultural Resources
- Geology
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Services Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

All analyses take account the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Impacts are categorized as follows:

**Potentially Significant Impact** is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant, or where the established threshold has been exceeded. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may be required.

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce an effect from Potentially Significant Impact to a Less Than Significant Impact. Mitigation measures are prescribed to reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

**Less Than Significant** applies when the project will affect or is affected by the environment, but based on sources cited in the report, the impact will not have an adverse effect. For the purpose of this report, beneficial impacts are also identified as less than significant. The benefit is identified in the discussion of impacts, which follows each checklist category.

**No Impact** is adequately supported if referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. A No Impact Answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
Compliance Measures and Mitigation Measures are included as part of the proposed project to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, and/or compensate for potential project impacts on the environment. Compliance Measures are existing permits and/or regulations that the project must comply with; compliance measures are not unique to the individual project. Mitigation Measures mitigate specific project-related impacts and are unique to the project.
I. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Aesthetic components of a scenic vista generally include (1) scenic quality, (2) sensitivity level, and (3) view access. According to the City’s General Plan, the surrounding hills and the San Francisco and San Pablo bays are prominent scenic areas in City. The hills surrounding the City include the Berkeley Hills to the southeast, San Pablo Ridge to the southwest, Sobrante Ridge to the east, and Point Richmond to the southwest. The San Francisco and San Pablo bays are located to the south, west, and north of the City. The project site is located within the northwestern portion of the City, approximately 0.3 mile from the shoreline. Developed urban land extends between the project site and the hills to the east and southwest. Undeveloped open land lies between the project site and the shoreline, with the exception of the Richmond Rod and Gun Club to the west. The topography of the project site and area immediately surrounding the project site is generally flat. Due to the distance of the project site from the surrounding hills, and existing development in the area, scenic vistas of the surrounding hills are limited. However, scenic vistas of the San Francisco and San Pablo bays are possible from the project site and the surrounding area. Refer to Figures 3a-3d, Site Photos, for views of the project site and surrounding area.

Visible elements of the proposed project would include the proposed asphalt trail, barbed wire, chain linked, wire, or wood fence, curb ramps, drainage improvements, and associated
intersection improvements (i.e., crosswalk striping and wayfinding signage). The proposed improvements other than small directional signs and fencing would be at-grade and would not obstruct the surrounding views of the hills or San Francisco or San Pablo bays. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?

No Impact. Caltrans Landscape Architecture Program administers the Scenic Highway Program, contained in Streets and Highways Code Sections 260–263. State highways are classified as either Officially Listed or Eligible. There are no Officially Listed or Eligible State Scenic Highways designated under the Scenic Highway Act located in the project vicinity.3 There are no historic buildings or rock outcroppings located on the project site or in the project vicinity. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the removal or damage of scenic resources. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project alignment extends along the east side of Goodrick Avenue for approximately 0.3 mile. The project alignment is surrounded by pasture land to the east, vacant graded parcels and an outdoor shooting range to the west, vacant land and the San Pablo Bay to the north, and transportation facilities and industrial uses to the south. As described in Response I a) above, the proposed project is a multi-use trail with associated improvements. Construction of the proposed project would require some vegetation removal and the removal of four small ornamental fruit trees located at the northeast corner of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway. All of the project elements would be constructed at grade. Due to the limited extent of tree removal and the existing visual character of the project site, these activities would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site and the surrounding area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. Streetlights, vehicle head and taillights, and lighting associated with Richmond Rod and Gun Club are the existing sources of light and glare in the project area. The proposed project would include construction of a new multi-use trail and associated improvements. Lighting would not be installed as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

## II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 nonagricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

**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 a non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would be located within the existing Goodrick Avenue public right-of-way. The project site is not used for agricultural production and is not designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Department of Conservation. Per the FMMP, the project site is designated Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land. Vacant land to the east of the project site is currently an open pasture used for grazing horses; however, this land does not qualify as Farmland per the FMMP. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

---

b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned ILL (Industrial Limited Light). Therefore, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use, is not used for agricultural production, and is not protected by a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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))?**

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned ILL (Industrial Limited Light) and is adjacent to Goodrick Avenue which is used for transportation purposes. The project site is not used for timberland production, is not zoned for forest land or timberland, and does not contain forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned ILL (Industrial Limited Light). The project site does not support any forest uses. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not designated or zoned for agricultural uses. The project site does not support any farmland, agricultural, or forest uses, and there are no significant farmland or forest resources in the immediate project vicinity. Implementation of the proposed project would not convert farmland to a nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest uses. Likewise, the proposed project would not contribute to environmental changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to a nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

---

III. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The project site is located in the City of Richmond in Contra Costa County, which is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD regulates air quality in the San Francisco Bay. The air quality plan applicable to the project site is the BAAQMD’s Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (Clean Air Plan), which was adopted on September 15, 2010. An update to the 2010 Clean Air Plan is currently underway. The Clean Air Plan is a comprehensive plan to improve Bay Area air quality and protect public health. The Clean Air Plan defines control strategies to reduce emissions and ambient concentrations of air pollutants; safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily affected by air pollution; and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to protect the climate. Consistency with the Clean Air Plan can be determined if the project: 1) supports the goals of the Clean Air Plan; 2) includes applicable control measures from the Clean Air Plan; and 3) would not disrupt or hinder implementation of any control measures from the Clean Air Plan. An evaluation of the proposed project’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan is provided below.

The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail and would be a segment of a continuous Bay Trail alignment that extends from Albany to the Point Pinole Shoreline to the cities of Richmond and San Pablo. The proposed project would be consistent with applicable Clean Air Plan.

---

Plan measures, including the Transportation Control Measure (TCM) D-1 Bicycle Access and Facility Improvements, and TCM D-2, Pedestrian Access and Facilities Improvements, which supports the expansion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving employment sites, educational and cultural facilities, residential areas, shopping districts, and other activity centers. Because the proposed project supports the goals of the Clean Air Plan, no impact related to this topic would occur, and no mitigation is required.

b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would occur in the short-term during construction activities, such as vehicle and equipment use. The proposed project would not generate long-term air pollutant emissions during operation as described below.

**Short-Term (Construction) Emissions.** Construction activities could generate exhaust emissions from utility engines, on-site construction vehicles, equipment hauling materials to and from the site, and motor vehicles transporting construction crews. Exhaust emissions during construction would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Although the construction phase of the proposed project would result in a net increase in criteria pollutants such as carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead (Pb), the emission of these criteria pollutants would be temporary in nature, and would cease when construction is completed.

Fugitive dust emissions are associated with excavation, land clearing, exposure, and cut-and-fill operations. Dust generated daily during construction would vary substantially, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions. On a limited basis, surrounding land uses and on-site construction workers may be exposed to blowing dust, depending on the prevailing wind. BAAQMD specifies mitigation measures for dust control related to construction projects. These mitigation measures are intended to reduce suspended particulate matter (PM) including PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ emissions to less-than-significant levels during the construction period. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 which requires the implementation of dust control measures would reduce air quality impacts during construction to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** Consistent with guidance from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the following controls shall be implemented at the construction site to control construction emissions:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- 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 shall be prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
• 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 Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points regarding maximum idling time.

• 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.

• The contractor shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions. Long-term air emissions impacts are associated with any change in permanent use of the project site by on-site stationary and off-site mobile sources that substantially increase vehicle trip emissions. Because the proposed project is a multi-use trail for bicyclists and pedestrians, no stationary sources are associated with the proposed project. Once complete, the proposed project would not generate vehicle or other emissions. Furthermore, the proposed project would contribute to an overall reduction in air quality emissions associated with vehicles by providing an alternative mode of transportation for commuters, shoppers, and residents in the surrounding area. Therefore, long-term operation of the proposed project would not contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and no mitigation is required.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. As discussed in Response III b) above, construction of the proposed project may result in net increases in criteria pollutants. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, construction of the proposed project would not be expected to result in significant levels of criteria air pollutants or pollutant precursors.

Operation of the proposed project would not generate long-term air quality emissions that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or pollutant precursors, and no mitigation is required.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, and athletic fields. The project site is surrounded by pasture land to the east, vacant graded parcels and an outdoor shooting range to the west, vacant land and the San Pablo Bay to the north, and transportation facilities and industrial uses to the south. No sensitive receptors are located within the vicinity of the project site. However, construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding land uses and construction workers to airborne particulates and fugitive dust, as well as a small quantity of
pollutants associated with the use of construction equipment (e.g., diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, described above, would reduce construction-related emissions to a less than significant level. Because no sensitive receptors are within the vicinity of the project site, construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

Operation of the proposed project would not generate long-term air quality emissions and therefore, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no mitigation is required.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction of the proposed project, some objectionable odors may emanate from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment. These odors, however, would be short-term, limited to the construction period, and are not expected to be substantial. Non-motorized transportation facilities, such as the proposed project, do not generate odors during operation and would not result in objectionable odors in the long-term. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local and regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, Regional, or State habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

The discussion and analysis provided in this section is based on a Biological Assessment Memorandum (LSA, November 2015) and a Clean Water Act Jurisdictional Delineation (LSA, November 2015).

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The project site consists of ruderal/non-native annual grasslands and potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands. The eastern side of the project site is currently vacant land that is used as pasture for grazing horses. Vegetation within the project site has been disturbed by the existing roadway and by grazing in areas accessible to horses.

LSA reviewed the following electronic databases for special-status species that could potentially occur within the vicinity of the project site:

- California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) Rarefind 5 (CDFW 2015)
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS 2015)
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) online species list (USFWS 2015)

In addition, LSA conducted a general biological field survey in August and September 2015 to assess the biological condition of the project area for the presence of various special-status biological resources, including plants, wildlife, and habitat suitability for special-status species. Based on a review of the CNDDB, CNPS, and USFWS searches and observations during LSA’s reconnaissance-level surveys, 11 special-status animal species were identified as potentially occurring in the project vicinity. No special-status plant species are likely to occur on or adjacent to the project site due to the highly disturbed conditions and subsequent lack of suitable native substrates such as serpentine rock outcrops or suitable native habitats (i.e., native grasslands, woodlands, or salt marsh). Due to the absence of salt marsh habitat and the project site’s highly disturbed condition, only six special-status animal species have the potential to occur on or adjacent to the project site. These special-status species include northern harrier (Circus cyaneus), San Francisco (salt marsh) common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas sinuos), burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia), short-eared owl (Asio flammeus), loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus) and San Pablo vole (Microtus californicus sanpabloensis). Out of these six special-status species, only the San Pablo vole is likely to occur on the project site. The five remaining species which are all birds, may briefly forage over the project site, but are unlikely to nest on or near the project site due to poor quality habitat and the proximity to the Richmond Rod and Gun Club and Goodrick Avenue. These species are not discussed further.

The project site contains potentially suitable habitat for San Pablo vole which is a California species of special concern. Impacts to San Pablo vole could occur in the form of direct mortality or from habitat loss. In addition, indirect impacts may occur with implementation of the proposed project as a result of increased noise or human activity during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires the installation of silt fencing around the entire portion of the work area prior to construction activities to minimize potential impacts to San Pablo vole during construction. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, potential construction-related impacts to San Pablo vole would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Prior to ground disturbance, silt fencing shall be installed around the entire portion of the work area to exclude San Pablo voles and other wildlife species from entering the project site. After the fencing is installed, all ground vegetation within the fenced area shall be cleared. Construction work shall start as soon as possible (and no longer than one
week) after vegetation has been cleared. All exclusion measures and initial ground disturbance activities shall be monitored by a biologist familiar with San Pablo vole identification. If any San Pablo voles are observed in the work area during the vegetation removal effort or later construction activity, the resident engineer shall halt work in the immediate construction zone until the species leaves the area voluntarily.

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, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Plant communities within the project area consist of ruderal/ non-native annual grasslands and potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands. Wetlands are considered a sensitive natural community by the City, County, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Approximately 0.17 acre of potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands was delineated within the project site. The project site does not support riparian habitat.

In addition, other potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands are located adjacent to the project site. Construction of the proposed project may result in direct and indirect impacts to potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands adjacent to the construction footprint. In order to mitigate temporary direct impacts to wetlands, exclusion fencing would be installed to mark the limits of the construction footprint to deter construction personnel and equipment from impacting adjacent wetlands, as specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-2. Indirect impacts to adjacent wetlands may result from degraded water quality due to construction-related runoff reaching drainages located near the site. As discussed in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit. The Construction General Permit requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), including fiber rolls, hydroseed, silt fences, and biofilter bags, which would reduce potential impacts to water quality during construction (Compliance Measure WQ-1). Therefore, implementation of Mitigation BIO-2 and adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 would reduce temporary impacts to wetlands to less than significant levels.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently impact 0.17 acre of potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands. Any impacts to these wetlands would be mitigated at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1, as specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-3. In addition, in accordance with State and federal requirements, impacts to waters of the United States or State during project implementation would require appropriate permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and RWQCB, as specified in Compliance Measure BIO-1. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and adherence to Compliance Measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts to wetlands to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: All potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands located adjacent to the construction footprint shall be avoided during construction and no fill shall be allowed to enter these wetlands. Exclusion fencing shall be installed to mark the limits of the construction footprint to deter construction personnel and equipment from accessing and impacting the
seasonal wetlands. A biological monitor shall oversee the installation of the fencing and monitor the work area on a weekly basis to ensure avoidance of the seasonal wetlands.

**Compliance Measure BIO-1:** Prior to construction, the City shall obtain all necessary permits for impacting potentially jurisdictional waters of the United States or State from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404 Nationwide Permit) and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401 Water Quality Certification).

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3:** Prior to construction, impacts to potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands shall be mitigated at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 (i.e., 1 acre created [and preserved] for every acre impacted) by the City of Richmond in coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If feasible, replacement habitat shall be created/preserved in the same general area as the original impact. Off-site mitigation may be approved if the amount of required replacement habitat exceeds that which is available near a given impact site, or credits may be purchased at a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-approved mitigation bank.

c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** LSA conducted a jurisdictional delineation of potential waters of the United States at the project site in September 2015. The delineation resulted in a total of 7,530 square feet (0.17 acre) of potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands and 50 square feet (less than 0.01 acre) of non-wetland waters of the United States, for a total potential jurisdictional area of 7,580 square feet (0.17 acre) within the project site. These potentially jurisdictional features consist of six seasonal wetlands and two culverts that drain these seasonal wetlands.

As described in Response IV b) above, construction of the proposed project may result in direct and indirect impacts to wetlands through temporary disturbance during construction and degraded water quality from construction runoff that may reach the adjacent drainages. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires the installation of exclusion fencing and adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 requires compliance with the Construction General Permit. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 and adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 would reduce temporary impacts to wetlands to less than significant levels.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently impact 0.17 acre of potentially jurisdictional seasonal wetlands. Any impacts to wetlands would be mitigated at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1, as specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-3. In addition, in accordance with State and federal requirements, impacts to waters of the United States or State during project implementation would require appropriate permits from ACOE and RWQCB, as specified in Compliance Measure BIO-1. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and adherence to Compliance Measure BIO-1 would reduce permanent impacts to wetlands to less than significant levels.
d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** The project site does not support suitable habitat for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Implementation of the proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. In addition, the proposed project would replace an existing fence along the east side of the multi-use trail. The proposed project is not likely to impact or interfere with local wildlife movement or existing movement corridors. In addition, wildlife species likely to occur in the area are generalists that are adept at moving through urban landscapes. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not affect the ability of wildlife to move through the vicinity of the project site.

The project site provides suitable nesting habitat for migratory birds and raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code. If construction is conducted during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), construction activities could directly impact nesting birds in the form of direct mortality, particularly from the destruction of nests and mortality of young, or from habitat loss. In addition, indirect impacts could occur as a result of construction-related noise and increased human activity in the area, causing adults to abandon nests in nearby trees or other vegetation. If possible, construction activities should occur outside of the nesting season. However, if construction activities are scheduled during the nesting season, preconstruction nesting bird surveys would be required in order to prevent potential impacts to nesting birds, as specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-4. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, potential construction-related impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4:** The project should avoid construction activities during the bird nesting season (February 1 through August 31). If construction activities are scheduled during the nesting season, a qualified biologist should conduct a preconstruction survey of all suitable nesting habitat (i.e., field, trees, shrubs, buildings) within 300 feet of the project site (where accessible) no more than 14 days prior to the onset of construction activities. If the survey indicates the presence of nesting birds, protective buffer zones in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be established around the nests. Generally, for raptor nests, the size of the buffer zone shall be a 300-foot radius centered on the nest; for other birds, the size of the buffer zone should be a 50- to 100-foot radius centered on the nest. In some cases, these buffers may be increased or decreased depending on the bird species and the level of disturbance that will occur near the nest. Additional monitoring may be required if buffers are reduced in size to ensure that site preparation and development activities do not stress the nesting birds. Buffers shall remain in place until the young have fledged and are foraging independently.

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.** One mature blue gum eucalyptus tree (*Eucalyptus globulus*) and four ornamental fruit trees are located on the project site. The four ornamental fruit trees...
located at the northeast corner of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway would be removed to accommodate the sidewalk and ramp improvements. The eucalyptus tree located on the east side of Goodrick Avenue near the center of the project alignment would be protected during construction. The removal of the four fruit trees would require a tree removal permit from the City pursuant to Richmond Municipal Code Section 10.08.030. The Richmond Municipal Code requires a tree removal permit from the Parks and Landscaping Superintendent for any trees that are proposed to be cut, trimmed, pruned, planted, removed, injured, or interfered with within the City. Because the proposed project would obtain a tree removal permit, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the City’s municipal code. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

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. No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans apply to the project site. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur, and no mitigation is required.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human resources, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 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, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code § 5024.1 (c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

This discussion and analysis provided in this section is based on a Cultural Resources Study (LSA, March 2016). The project area for cultural resources is the Area of Potential Effects (APE), which is the area where ground-disturbing activities would occur.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. CEQA defines a “historical resource” as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) listed in, or determined eligible for listing

...
in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1(k); (3) identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); or (4) determined to be a historical resource by a project’s Lead Agency (PRC Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)).

Background research was conducted to identify cultural resources and previous cultural resource studies in or within a 0.5 mile radius of the APE. The background research consisted of a records search, literature and map review, and archival research. On August 25, 2015, LSA conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Resources Information System (CHRIS) located at California State University, Rohnert Park. It included a review of federal and state inventories including California Inventory of Historic Resources, Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California, California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, National Register of Historic Places (National Register), National Historic Landmarks, and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

The background research identified one prehistoric cultural resource in or adjacent to the APE and ten cultural resources within 0.5 mile radius of the APE. The prehistoric cultural resource site within or adjacent to the APE was first identified in 1907 and since then, numerous subsurface artifacts have been recovered including obsidian and chert flakes, basalt flake, bifaces, utilized flakes, ground and/or battered stone objects, a small awl tip, bone fragments and some pulverized shell. On September 14, 2015, an LSA archaeologist conducted a pedestrian field survey of the APE to determine if there was evidence of cultural resources including this prehistoric cultural resource site. On December 18 and 19, 2015, LSA conducted Phase I testing to determine if the boundary of the prehistoric cultural resource site extended into the proposed project’s APE. The Phase I testing determined that there is no evidence that the prehistoric cultural resource site is within the APE. However, it was determined that the soils within the APE have a high sensitivity for buried archaeological resources which could be encountered during construction activities. Such archaeological deposits, if intact, may qualify as historical resources under Public Resource Code (PRC) §21084.1 due to potential eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. If project construction encounters and disturbs unknown archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources, the proposed project would result in a material impairment of the deposits’ ability to convey their significance (i.e., diminish their scientific data value) and result in a significant impact under CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b).

Implementation of the Mitigation Measure CULT-1, which requires an archaeological and Native American monitor on-site during all soil disturbing activities, would reduce potential impacts to previously undiscovered historical resources to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: An archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor shall be on-site during all soil disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. If any archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the Construction Contractor shall immediately cease work in the vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine the appropriate treatment of the discovery. If it is determined that the archaeological resources qualify as historical resources under PRC §21084.1, project-related impacts to such resources shall be avoided, if feasible. An attempt at impact avoidance shall be
undertaken in consultation with the monitoring archaeologist. If avoidance is not feasible, the deposits shall be evaluated for their CRHR eligibility. If the deposits are not eligible, a determination shall be made as to whether they qualify as a “unique archaeological resource” under requirements and definitions of CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (c) and PRC §21083.2. If the evaluation determines that the deposit is neither a historical nor unique archaeological resource, the avoidance of potential impacts to the deposit is not necessary. If the deposit is eligible, impacts to the resource shall be mitigated. Mitigation may consist of excavating the archaeological deposit in accordance with a data recovery plan (see CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b)(3)(C)) developed in consultation with descendant community representatives; recording the resource; preparing a report of findings; and accessioning recovered archaeological materials at an appropriate curation facility. Public educational outreach may also be appropriate. Upon completion of the evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation, the archaeologist shall prepare a draft report to document the methods and results of the investigation(s). The draft report shall be submitted to the City of Richmond and the Northwest Information Center.

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** As discussed in Response III a) above, one prehistoric cultural resource site was identified in or adjacent to the APE; however, based on the Phase I testing, there is no evidence that the site is within the proposed project’s APE. However, it was determined that the soils within the APE have a high sensitivity for buried archaeological resources which could be encountered during construction activities. Such deposits, if intact, may qualify as historical resources under PRC §21084.1 due to potential eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. If they qualify, they shall be treated as historical resources consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(c)(1-2). If the deposits do not so qualify but do qualify as unique archaeological resources as defined in PRC §21083.2, then their disturbance by project construction would result in a material impairment of the deposits’ ability to convey their significance (i.e., diminish their scientific data value) and result in a significant impact under CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b). Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, which requires an archaeological and Native American monitor on-site during all soil disturbing activities and compliance with existing regulations, would reduce potential impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources to less than significant levels.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A geoarchaeological sensitivity study prepared for Caltrans District 4 identified the geological deposits underlying the project area as Holocene (11,800 years ago to present) age alluvial sediments. The project site is within Goodrick Avenue public right-of-way and has been previously disturbed. No subsurface excavation was conducted for the presence of paleontological resources due to the young and poorly developed soils underlying the project area. A majority of construction activities would involve minor ground disturbance with excavation of surface soils extending no deeper than 12 inches. Excavation for the fence posts would extend to a depth of approximately 24 inches. Because the geological deposits underlying the project site are not sensitive for paleontological resources and because
excavation associated with the proposed project would be minor, paleontological resources are not anticipated to be encountered during construction activities. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur to paleontological resources, and no mitigation is required.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. As discussed in Response III a) above, one prehistoric cultural resource site was identified in or adjacent to the APE. Based on the Phase I testing, there is no evidence that the site is within the proposed project’s APE and no cultural resources or human remains were encountered. However, ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to disturb previously unknown human remains. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during construction activities, the proper authorities shall be notified and standard procedures for the respectful handling of human remains during the earthmoving activities would be implemented, as specified by Mitigation Measure CULT-2. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 would reduce potential project impacts related to unknown buried human remains to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: If human remains are encountered during project construction, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the Contra Costa County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, the archaeologist who served as monitor during the implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 shall be contacted to assess the situation, in consultation with the descendant community also involved with the pre-construction testing, as well as the Coroner’s representative. Project personnel shall not collect or move any human remains and associated materials. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD), which will likely be the representative of the descendant community already involved, to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the investigation’s 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 draft report shall be submitted to the City of Richmond, the descendant community involved in the treatment of the resources, and the Northwest Information Center.

e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either:

1) 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, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or

2) a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code §5024.1 (c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?
**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** As discussed in Response III a) above, one prehistoric cultural resource site was identified in or adjacent to the APE; however, based on the Phase I testing, there is no evidence that the site is within the proposed project’s APE. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to this cultural resource site. The soils within the APE have a high sensitivity for buried archaeological resources which may be encountered during construction activities. Such deposits may qualify as tribal cultural resources under PRC §21074. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, which requires an archaeological and Native American monitor on-site during all soil disturbing activities and compliance with existing regulations, would reduce potential impacts to undiscovered tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslide?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

This discussion and analysis provided in this section is based on a Geotechnical Exploration (ENGEO, October 2015).

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As with the entire San Francisco Bay Area, the project site is subject to strong ground motion resulting from earthquakes on nearby faults. The project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is the Hayward Fault, located approximately 1 mile to the east of the project site. Ground rupture could occur at the project site during a major earthquake on the Hayward Fault.

Implementation of the proposed project would construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail. The proposed project would not result in the construction of habitable structures consistent with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act (1972). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not increase the risks to human health or safety related to fault rupture compared to the existing conditions. A less than significant impact would occur related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

**ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** The project site is located in a seismically active region that has historically been affected by strong seismic ground shaking. Ground shaking is a general term referring to all aspects of motion of the earth’s surface resulting from an earthquake, and is normally the major cause of damage in seismic events. The extent of ground-shaking associated with an earthquake depends on the magnitude and intensity of the earthquake, distance from the epicenter, and local geologic conditions. Major active faults in the region that could cause ground shaking at the project site include the Hayward Fault, located approximately 1 mile northeast, the Concord-Green Valley fault, located approximately 16 miles northeast, and the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 17 miles southwest. The Richmond Bay Plain and shoreline where the project site is located is subject to a heightened risk of ground shaking because of a greater depth of soft alluvial soils and bay mud. According to the City’s General Plan Map 12.4 Seismic Shaking Potential, the project site is on alluvium with a thickness of approximately 400 feet. Therefore, it is likely that the project site would be subject to severe seismic ground shaking during an earthquake. Ground shaking generated by the fault movement is considered a potentially significant impact that may potentially affect the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Exploration, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, potential project impacts associated with seismic ground shaking would be reduced to a less than significant level.

---
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Mitigation Measure GEO-1: All grading operations and construction activities shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Exploration prepared by ENGEO (October 2015). Recommendations in the Geotechnical Exploration address or include, but are not limited to, the following: settlement mitigation, earthwork activities, site clearing, over-optimum soil moisture conditions, acceptable fill, fill compaction, slopes, and subgrade and aggregate base compaction.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Liquefaction is the transformation of saturated, loose, fine-grained sediment to a fluid-like state because of earthquake shaking or other rapid loading. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are loose to medium dense, saturated sands, silty sands, sandy silts, non-plastic silts and gravels with poor drainage, or those capped by or containing seams of impermeable sediment. According to the Association of Bay Area Government’s liquefaction susceptibility mapping9, the soil liquefaction potential on the project site is moderate. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Exploration, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, potential project impacts associated with liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. Seismically induced landslides and other slope failures are common occurrences during or soon after earthquakes in areas with significant ground slopes. The project area is generally level and no substantial natural slopes exist on the project site. According to the City’s General Plan Map 12.1 Landslide Potential, the project site is in Category 1- Stable. Category 1 applies to areas of 0 to 5 percent slope that are not underlain by landslide deposits. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. During construction activities, soil would be exposed and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion compared to the existing conditions. Additionally, during a storm event, soil erosion could occur at an accelerated rate. The increased erosion potential could result in short-term water quality impacts as identified in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality. Under the Construction General Permit, a SWPPP and construction BMPs detailed in the SWPPP would be required during construction activities. Construction BMPs would include Erosion Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion. With incorporation of Erosion Control BMPs, as required by Compliance Measure WQ-1, impacts related to erosion during construction would be less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surface of 0.37 acre. This nominal increase in impervious surface is not anticipated to substantially increase volume of runoff during a storm that would increase the potential for soil erosion. However, vegetated bioretention swales would be implemented as part of the proposed project to reduce the volume and rate of runoff from the project site and to treat pollutants of concern, including sediment, as specified in Compliance Measure WQ-2. Currently, storm water runoff from the southern end of the project site flows from east to west through an existing culvert underneath Goodrick Avenue and eventually outfalls to the ocean. The drainage culvert is located south of Elmar Court. Storm water runoff north of Elmar Court flows north through an existing culvert and eventually outfalls to the ocean north of the project site. The proposed project would excavate the existing culvert near the southern end of the project site; however, the existing drainage pattern would be maintained. Storm water would continue to flow from east to west and to the north, eventually draining to the Bay. Therefore, because the existing drainage pattern would be maintained and because the proposed project includes the implementation of vegetated bioretention swales, impacts related to this topic would be less than significant.

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?

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** The project site is relatively flat and is not located in an area identified as susceptible to landslides. Therefore, there is no potential for seismically induced landslides to occur at the project site, and no mitigation is required.

Liquefaction-induced lateral spreading is defined as finite, lateral movement of gently to steeply sloping, saturated soil deposits caused by earthquake-induced liquefaction. Lateral spreading is generally caused by liquefaction of soils with gentle slopes. Since the project site is relatively flat and the potential for liquefaction to occur on the project site would be moderate, the risk of lateral spreading is considered to be moderate. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Exploration, which stipulates appropriate design provisions including recommendations to prevent risk from liquefaction or lateral spreading. These recommendations would be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential project impacts associated with liquefaction-induced settlement and lateral spreading to a less than significant level.

The project site is not located on Karst formations and has not been subjected to mining activities; thus, the risk of subsidence or collapse is expected to be low, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** Expansive soils generally have a substantial amount of clay particles, which can give up water (shrink) or absorb water (swell). The extent or range of the shrink/swell is influenced by the amount and kind of clay present in the soil. Expansive
soils are common throughout California and can damage foundations and slabs unless properly treated during construction. As stated above, the Richmond Bay Plain and shoreline where the project site is located consist of deep soft alluvial soils and bay mud which have high clay content, and thus, a high potential to be expansive. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Exploration, which stipulates appropriate design provisions including recommendations to prevent risk from expansive soils. These recommendations would be implemented with project design and construction. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 the risk associated with expansive soils would be reduced to less than significant levels.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not generate wastewater. The proposed project consists of constructing a Class I bicycle and pedestrian trail. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required for the proposed project. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Impact Analysis

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance?

Less Than Significant Impact. The following section describes the proposed project’s construction and operational related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and contribution to global climate change.

Short-Term (Construction) GHG Emissions. Construction activities, such as site preparation, site grading, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew would produce combustion emissions from various sources. During construction of the proposed project, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Furthermore, CH₄ is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change.

The proposed project would construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail. Construction activities would generate GHG emissions during construction activities on-site as well as from the transportation of material between the construction site and staging area. Construction is anticipated to be completed within 6 months. These potential impacts would be limited to the duration of construction activities and GHG generation would halt once the proposed project is completed. Therefore, the generation of GHG emissions during construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Long-Term (Operational) GHG Emissions. Long-term operation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions. The proposed project would construct a Class I bicycle and pedestrian trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project would contribute to an overall reduction in GHG emissions by providing an alternative mode of transportation for commuters, shoppers, and residents in the surrounding area. Therefore, the
generation of GHGs during operation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

**No Impact.** The City’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted in October 2016 to provide a framework of policies and programs to achieve the City’s health and environmental goals. The CAP supports the community’s goals and policies in the City’s General Plan 2020, and is founded on four main goals: GHG emissions reduction, healthy and resilient community, prosperous local economy, and engaged community and educated youth. The CAP provides a strategy for meeting the Assembly Bill (AB) 32 goal of reducing GHG emissions to 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, as well as measures that will enable further reductions by 2030 and over subsequent years. The CAP objectives and strategies are organized into 8 objectives, each with specific strategies for implementation. The proposed project would implement or support the following applicable CAP objectives and strategies:

- **Objective 3: Sustainable Transportation and Land Use**
  - Strategy TL2: Promote “Complete Street” Improvements
  - Strategy TL3: Improve Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure
  - Strategy TL6: Expand Car Sharing, Bike Sharing and Ride Sharing
  - Strategy TL8: Outreach and Education to Support Public Transit and Active Transportation

- **Objective 6: Green Infrastructure, Urban Forestry and Agriculture**
  - Strategy GA3: Support Green Infrastructure and Streetscape Design

The proposed project would directly support Strategies TL2 and TL3 by constructing a Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. Additionally, the installation of a vegetated drainage swale would support Strategy GA3. The proposed project would also indirectly support Strategies TL6 and TL8 by expanding bicycle infrastructure, thereby enabling greater use of the Bay Area Bike Share program and supporting the City’s efforts to provide outreach and education for active transportation.

Other measures in the CAP would apply to other project types, such as residential or commercial developments, or refer to measures the City will implement Citywide to increase energy efficiency of buildings and facilities; increase use and generation of renewable energy; promote sustainable transportation and land use; support zero waste; promote water conservation; support green infrastructure, urban forestry, and agriculture; promote green business and industry; and improve communitywide resiliency to climate change.

The City’s General Plan includes an Energy and Climate Change Element which provides policy direction for protecting energy resources and responding to climate change. The goals and policies included in the Energy and Climate Change Element are based on approved State legislation (AB 32 and Senate Bill [SB] 375) and air emissions standards adopted by the

---

California Air Resources Board (CARB). As stated above, AB 32 was passed in 2006 and required the CARB to implement a comprehensive statewide program to reduce GHG emissions. SB 375, which was signed into law in 2008, is intended to enhance the CARB’s ability to reach AB 32 goals by developing regional GHG emissions reduction targets to be achieved within the transportation sector. The following goals and policies from the Energy and Climate Change Element promote the development of pedestrian and bicycle trails through the City as an alternative-mode of transportation to help reduce GHG emissions:

- Goal EC2 Clean and Efficient Transportation Options
- Policy EC2.4 Safe and Convenient Walking and Bicycling
- Action EC2.E Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans
- Action EC2.F Promote Bicycle Use

The proposed project would be consistent with the goals and policies mentioned above and would not conflict with any State or regional plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. As discussed in Response VII a) above, the proposed project’s short-term construction and long-term operational GHG emissions would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, because the proposed project is consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident condition(s) involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Hazardous materials are chemicals that could potentially cause harm during an accidental release and are defined as being toxic, corrosive, flammable, reactive, an irritant, or a strong sensitizer. Hazardous substances include all chemicals regulated under the
United States Department of Transportation\textsuperscript{11} “hazardous materials” regulations and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)\textsuperscript{12} “hazardous waste” regulations. Hazardous wastes require special handling and disposal because of their potential to damage public health and the environment.

Exposure to hazardous materials during the construction of the proposed project could result from the improper handling or use of hazardous substances or an inadvertent release resulting from an unforeseen event (e.g., fire, flood, or earthquake). The severity of any such exposure is dependent upon the type, amount, and characteristic of the hazardous material involved; the timing, location, and nature of the event; and the sensitivity of the individual or environment affected.

Minor amounts of fuels, motor oils, paints, and other hazardous materials would be used during construction of the proposed project. The small quantities of hazardous materials that would be transported, used, or disposed of would be well below reportable quantities. Although fuels, motor oils, and paints have hazardous properties (fuels, for example, are flammable), they would be handled in small quantities that would not create a substantial hazard for construction workers and/or the public. Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials laws and regulations would minimize the risk to the public presented by these potential hazards during construction of the project. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

Operation of the proposed project (i.e., use of the proposed multi-use trail by bicycles and pedestrians) would not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{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?
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Less Than Significant Impact.} Construction activities may involve the use of minor amounts of hazardous materials. However, the use of hazardous materials would be in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. Operation of the proposed project (i.e., use of the proposed trail by bicycles and pedestrians) would not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{c)} Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?
\end{itemize}

\textbf{No Impact.} The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project site is Lake Elementary School, located approximately 0.7 miles away.


mile to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport to the project site is the Buchanan Field Airport, located approximately 17 miles to the east of the project site. Due to the distance from the Buchanan Field Airport, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

f) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** The Brookside Hospital Heliport- 17CA is located approximately 2.2 miles to the southeast of the project site. The proposed project is a multi-use trail, does not include any habitable structures, and would not induce population growth in the area. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

g) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** No local adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plans are applicable to the project site. However, construction activities associated with the proposed project would require traffic controls as necessary for the proposed improvements, which could affect emergency response. Mitigation Measure TR-1, provided in Section XVI, Transportation/ Traffic, requires the preparation of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) during final design to address impacts to local circulation during construction, including emergency access. The TMP would include notices in local media, temporary signage, and advance notice to local emergency service providers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. Therefore, with the implementation of
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Mitigation Measure TR-1, potential impacts to emergency response or emergency evacuation plans during construction would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The proposed project would provide a trail connection between the existing Bay Trail and a new proposed segment. The trail alignment would be located along Goodrick Avenue, within public right-of-way. Implementation of the proposed project would not bisect any identified evacuation routes and would not impact emergency response plans either physically or by using personnel that would otherwise be needed to implement an emergency plan. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in an area of moderate wildland fire threat. However, the proposed project is a new multi-use trail that would not include flammable materials or any structures for human occupation. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Analysis

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. Pollutants of concern during construction include sediment, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. Each of these pollutants on its own or in combination with other pollutants can have a detrimental effect on water quality. During construction activities, excavated soil would be exposed, and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion and sedimentation compared to existing conditions. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (such as paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked during construction. Any of these pollutants have the potential to be transported via storm water runoff into receiving waters.

During construction, the total disturbed surface area would be approximately 1.3 acres. Because the proposed project disturbs greater than 1 acre of soil, the proposed project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWG and 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002) (Construction General Permit), as specified in Compliance Measure WQ-1.

Under the Construction General Permit, the Construction Contractor would be required to prepare a SWPPP and implement construction BMPs detailed in the SWPPP during construction activities. Construction BMPs would include, but not be limited to, erosion and sediment control, designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on site, and good housekeeping practices to prevent spills, leaks, and discharge of construction debris and waste into receiving waters. Specific Construction BMPs would include fiber rolls, hydroseed, silt fences, and biofilter bags and inserts to reduce pollutants of concern in storm water runoff. Adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 would ensure that construction of the project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

During operation, anticipated pollutants of concern associated with a multi-use trail include sediments, trash and debris, and pathogens (bacteria/virus). The proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surface of 0.37 acre. An increase in impervious surface would increase the volume of runoff during a storm, thereby increasing pollutant loading to receiving waters. In addition, runoff and increased sedimentation in storm water runoff could increase erosion. Bicyclists, pedestrians and pets utilizing the trail would be a potential source of trash and pathogens (e.g., fecal matter).

As specified in Compliance Measure WQ-2, the proposed project would include vegetated bioretention swales to treat storm water runoff, promote infiltration, and convey stormwater flow. The pollutants of concern from operation of the multi-use trail would be directly addressed through the implementation of vegetated bioretention swales. Therefore, adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-2 would ensure that implementation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
Compliance Measure WQ-1: The proposed project shall comply with the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit) Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWG and 2012-0006-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002, or any other subsequent permit. The proposed project shall comply with the Construction General Permit by preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to address all construction-related activities, equipment, and materials that have the potential to impact water quality for the appropriate risk level. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall identify the sources of pollutants that may affect the quality of storm water and include Best Management Practices to control the pollutants. These include, but are not limited to, temporary sediment control, temporary soil stabilization, concrete waste management, street sweeping and vacuuming, wind erosion control, and other non-storm water Best Management Practices.

Compliance Measure WQ-2: During final design, the City of Richmond (City) shall incorporate vegetated bioretention swales to target pollutants of concern from operation of the proposed project. The City shall ensure that the vegetated bioretention swales are properly designed and maintained through project operation.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Depth to groundwater in the project area typically occurs between 8 to 11 ft below ground surface (bgs). Grading and temporary excavations would extend approximately 1 ft bgs for the trail alignment and approximately 2 ft bgs for the fence posts. Therefore, it is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered during construction. Grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can decrease infiltration during construction. However, construction activities would be temporary, and the reduction in infiltration would not be substantial. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

Implementation of the proposed project would increase impervious surface area by 0.37 acre. This nominal increase in impervious surface would not substantially decrease infiltration and would not substantially change groundwater levels underneath the project site. Furthermore, the proposed project would not require groundwater extraction. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur during operation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. During construction activities, soil would be exposed and disturbed, and drainage patterns would be temporarily altered during grading and other
construction activities, resulting in an increased potential for soil erosion and siltation compared to existing conditions. Additionally, during a storm event, soil erosion could occur at an accelerated rate. As discussed above in Response IX a), the Construction General Permit requires preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs including fiber rolls, hydroseed, silt fences, and biofilter bags and inserts to reduce impacts to water quality during construction, including those impacts associated with soil erosion and siltation. Therefore, adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 would ensure that construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic.

The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians, which may result in a minor alteration to the existing drainage pattern of the project site. The proposed project would increase impervious surface area by 0.37 acre. This nominal increase in impervious surface area is not anticipated to substantially increase the volume of runoff during a storm event, leading to changes in downstream erosion and siltation patterns. However, vegetated bioretention swales would be implemented as part of the proposed project to reduce the volume and rate of runoff from the project site and to treat pollutants of concern, including sediment, as specified in Compliance Measure WQ-2. Currently, storm water runoff from the southern end of the project site flows from east to west through an existing culvert underneath Goodrick Avenue and eventually outfalls to the ocean. The drainage culvert is located south of Elmar Court. Storm water runoff north of Elmar Court flows north through an existing culvert and eventually outfalls to the ocean north of the project site. The proposed project would excavate and replace the existing culvert near the southern end of the project site; however, the existing drainage pattern would be maintained. Storm water would continue to flow from east to west and to the north, eventually draining to the Bay. Therefore, because the existing drainage pattern would be maintained and because the proposed project includes the implementation of vegetated bioretention swales as specified in Compliance Measure WQ-2, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities would temporarily alter on-site drainage patterns and compact soil, which can increase the volume and velocity of storm water runoff. However, construction activities would be temporary, and the increase in runoff would not be substantial. As discussed in Response IX a) above, the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP to identify construction BMPs to be implemented as part of the proposed project to reduce impacts to water quality during construction, including those impacts associated with flooding. Therefore, adherence to Compliance Measure WQ-1 would ensure that construction activities would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently increase impervious surface area by approximately 0.37 acre. This nominal increase in impervious surface area is not anticipated to substantially increase the volume of runoff from the project site compared to existing conditions. The proposed drainage improvements would maintain the existing drainage pattern
of storm water runoff flowing east to west, and to the north, eventually to the Bay. Therefore, because the existing drainage pattern would be maintained, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

e) 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.** Refer to Responses IX a), c), and d) above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response IX a), above.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**No Impact.** The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project does not include a housing component. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no mitigation is required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06013C0226G (September 30, 2015), the project site is located within the 100-year flood hazard area (Zone AH). Zone AH is an area that is subject to 100-year flooding, with an average depth ranging from 1 to 3 feet. Along the eastern side of Goodrick Avenue, FEMA establishes the base flood elevation to be 11 feet. The proposed project would construct an asphalt bicycle and pedestrian trail along Goodrick Avenue within the public right-of-way. The proposed trail would be elevated at the southern end of the alignment and would slope downward to match the existing grade. The proposed project would include drainage improvements to maintain the existing drainage pattern. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not include any structures that would impede or redirect flows compared to existing conditions. Impacts related to this topic would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding of as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Dam failure is defined as the structural collapse of a dam that releases the water stored in a reservoir behind the dam. A dam failure is usually the result of the age of the structure, inadequate spillway capacity, or structural damage caused by an earthquake or flood. According to the Public Safety and Noise Element of the City General
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15 The base flood elevation is the level that floodwater will rise during a storm event.
Plan, the City could experience potential flooding from dam failure at the San Pablo Dam. The project site is located approximately 6 miles northwest of the San Pablo Dam and is within the dam inundation zone. However, the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) completed the San Pablo Dam Seismic Upgrade Project in 2010, thereby reducing the risk of dam failure.\(^{16}\)

The proposed project would construct a mile multi-use trail for bicyclists and pedestrians. No habitable structures would be constructed as part of the proposed project. While construction of the proposed trail would increase use of the area, such use would be intermittent and temporary. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

\(j\) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Seiching is a phenomenon that occurs when seismic ground shaking induces standing waves (seiches) inside water retention facilities such as reservoirs and water tanks. Such waves can cause retention structures to fail and flood downstream properties. The project site is located within the San Pablo Dam inundation zone and could experience potential flooding from a seiche at the San Pablo Dam. As discussed above, the dam has recently been retrofitted. In addition, the proposed project would not construct any habitable structures. Therefore, the risk associated with possible seiche waves is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

Tsunami are generated wave trains generally caused by tectonic displacement of the seafloor associated with shallow earthquakes, seafloor landslides, rock falls, and exploding volcanic islands. According to the City’s General Plan, Map 12.5, Tsunami Inundation Area, the project site is not located within a tsunami inundation area. Therefore, the risk associated with tsunami is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

Mudslides and flows are described as a shallower type of slope failure, usually affecting the upper soil mantle or weathered bedrock underlying natural slopes and triggered by surface or shallow subsurface saturation. Mudflows typically occur in mountainous or hilly terrain. The topography of the project site is flat with no active landslides in the project area. Therefore, the risk associated with possible mudflows and mudslides is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, and zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature (such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (such as a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an existing community, or between a community and outlying areas. The trail alignment would be located along the east side of Goodrick Avenue within the public right-of-way and would extend from Richmond Parkway to the new 1.5 mile segment of the Bay Trail. The proposed project would not restrict travelers on Richmond Parkway or Goodrick Avenue. The proposed project would encourage non-motorized transportation and would be a segment of a continuous Bay Trail extending from Albany to the Point Pinole Shoreline to the cities of Richmond and San Pablo. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. The plans, policies, and regulations applicable to the proposed project include the City of Richmond General Plan (2012), the North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan (1993), the City of Richmond Zoning Map (2016), and the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan (2011) are the primary land use plans containing policies and regulations applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would be located within public right-of-way along Goodrick Avenue.

The project site is designated Low Intensity/Light Industrial in the City General Plan and is zoned ILL (Industrial Limited Light) in the City Zoning Map. The proposed project is included on Map 4.1, Planned Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements in the City’s General Plan as a
planned Class I Bicycle Route, and under Policy CR1.6 Comprehensive Network of Multi-use Trails. The proposed project is identified in the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan as a proposed Class I bicycle route from Richmond Parkway to the water front. In addition, the proposed project is identified in the Richmond Pedestrian Master Plan (2011).

The proposed project is in direct support of relevant plans and policies, which contain goals and policies in support of bicycle and pedestrian trails, and specific plans of the Bay Trail gap closure. Additional relevant policies relate to the protection of natural resources, water quality, cultural resources, visual resources, air quality, and public safety from natural and human-caused hazards, provision of public services, noise and traffic. Many of the project impacts related to these topics are less than significant or are limited to the short-term construction phase of the proposed project as described in the relevant sections of this IS/MND. With implementation of the mitigation measures contained in this IS/MND, the proposed project is consistent with all of the relevant regulations and policies contained in these documents. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans apply to the project site. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur, and no mitigation is required.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

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?

No Impact. Minerals are any naturally occurring chemical element or compound, or groups of elements and compounds, formed from inorganic processes and organic substances including, but not limited to, coal, peat and oil-bearing rock, sand, and gravel. Mineral production in the City has been largely limited to sand, gravel and rock. Two quarries are located within the City: the Canal Boulevard quarry and the Point Molate quarry. The Canal Boulevard quarry has been closed and remediated and the Point Molate quarry is focused on recycling and handling operations rather than extraction. No new quarry operations in the City are anticipated in the future. Therefore, no known mineral resources are within the project site, and no evidence exists indicating that there could be mineral resources in the project vicinity. No impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. Refer to Response XI a), above.

---

XII. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XII. NOISE. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The primary existing noise sources in the vicinity of the project site include vehicle traffic, including cars, trucks, buses and motorcycles, and noise from the outdoor shooting range which is located on the west side of Goodrick Avenue. Short-term noise associated with construction and long-term noise associated with operation is described below.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts. Construction of the proposed project would generate short-term and intermittent noise from the use of construction equipment and vehicles during the estimated six month construction period. The City’s Community Noise Ordinance (Section 9.52 of the City’s Municipal Code) has established maximum noise levels at sensitive receptors for mobile construction equipment and for stationary construction equipment. For mobile construction equipment, the maximum noise levels for nonscheduled, intermittent, and short
The project site is surrounded by pasture land to the east, vacant graded parcels and an outdoor shooting range to the west, vacant land and the San Pablo Bay to the north, and transportation facilities and industrial uses to the south. The closest noise sensitive receptors are residential uses located approximately 0.6 mile to the southeast and northeast of the project site. Due to the distance from noise sensitive receptors, construction activities at the project site would not exceed the maximum noise levels established by the City’s Community Noise Ordinance. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 requires that construction equipment be properly maintained and include mufflers and other sound control equipment to minimize construction-related noise impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would be limited to weekday hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and weekends and legal holidays between 9 a.m. and 9 p.m., consistent with the City’s Community Noise Ordinance. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-1, construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:** The construction contractor shall ensure that all equipment is properly maintained and operated during the construction period. Additionally, the construction contractor shall ensure that all equipment has sound-control devices that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment shall have an un-muffled exhaust.
Long-Term Operational Impacts. The primary purpose of the proposed project is to provide a new multi-use trail connection between the existing Bay Trail and a new proposed segment. The trail alignment would be located along the east side of Goodrick Avenue and would not accommodate vehicular traffic. Pedestrians and bicyclists using the trail may be talking and thus generate noise; however, these noise sources would not be loud enough to disturb surrounding land uses in the project vicinity and would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards in the local general plan or noise ordinance, and no mitigation is required.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would not result in excessive ground borne vibration or noise levels. Relatively minor vibrations from the use of trucks or other equipment may occur during construction activities such as grading or excavation. However, this ground borne condition from such equipment would be relatively minor, intermittent, short-term, and restricted to daytime hours. Noise sensitive receptors are not located in the immediate vicinity of the construction area. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

Operation of a non-motorized transportation facility would not generate or expose persons to ground borne vibration or ground borne noise, and no mitigation is required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. The trail alignment is located on the east side of Goodrick Avenue. The primary existing noise sources in the vicinity of the project site include vehicle traffic, including cars, trucks, buses and motorcycles, and noise from the outdoor shooting range, located on the west side of Goodrick Avenue. The proposed project includes the construction of a multi-use trail for use by bicycles and pedestrians. Pedestrians and bicyclists using the trail may be talking and thus generate noise; however, these noise sources would not generate a substantial increase in ambient noise levels above those already within the project area. Therefore, no impacts related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. No sensitive receptors are located within the vicinity of the project site. Construction of the proposed project would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. However, construction activities associated with the proposed project are relatively minor, temporary in nature and noise would cease following completion of project construction. Any potential noise impacts would be minimized through implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-1, which requires the application of mufflers on construction equipment. Therefore,
implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 would reduce potential noise impacts during construction to less than significant levels.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport to the project site is the Buchanan Field Airport, located approximately 17 miles to the east of the project site. Due to the distance from the Buchanan Field Airport, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Brookside Hospital Heliport- 17CA is located approximately 2.2 miles to the southeast of the project site, and is not a significant source of noise at the project site. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.
## XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is a multi-use trail that would provide a trail connection between the existing Bay Trail and a new trail segment north of the project site. The proposed project would not provide additional vehicle access or additional major infrastructure. The proposed project would not result in new housing, commercial or industrial space. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

**b)** Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** No housing currently exists at the project site and no residential properties would be acquired for the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

**c)** Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** As described in XIII b), implementation of the proposed project would not displace any residents necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.
### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

- 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Impacted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact Analysis

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

**i) Fire protection?**

**No Impact.** The City of Richmond Fire Department provides fire protection and life safety services to the City. Seven fire stations are located throughout the City. The closest fire station to the project site is Station 68, located approximately 2.5 miles east of the project site by way of surface streets.

The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project does not include the construction of structures that would increase the population in the area or that would generate a higher demand for fire services. The multi-use trail would be designed in accordance with all applicable standards allowing for emergency access. Additionally, the proposed project would improve safety conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians by providing a designated trail. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impact fire protection services, and no mitigation is required.
ii) Police protection?

No Impact. The Richmond Police Department (RPD) provides police protection services to the approximately 102,000 residents within the City. The project site is located in the northern police sector, in Beat 8. The RPD’s headquarters is located approximately 6.5 miles to the south of the project site by way of surface streets.

The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project does not include the construction of structures that would increase the population in the area or that would generate a higher demand for police services. Additionally, the proposed project would improve safety conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians by providing a designated trail. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impact police protection services, and no mitigation is required.

iii) Schools?

No Impact. The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project does not include the construction of new residential units that would generate additional population in the area. The proposed project does not include any changes to existing school facilities, nor would the proposed project increase demand for school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to school facilities, and no mitigation is required.

iv) Parks?

No Impact. The proposed trail would be located within existing Goodrick Avenue public right-of-way. Implementation of the proposed project would not induce population growth that would generate an increased demand for recreational facilities, including parks. The proposed project is a linear recreational facility and would require low maintenance costs. In addition, the proposed project would not require the construction of additional recreational facilities within the City. Therefore, it is not anticipated that recreational facilities, including parks, within the City would be affected by project implementation, and no mitigation is required.

v) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project would not induce population growth that would generate an increased demand for public facilities such as libraries and hospitals. Therefore, no impacts to public facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required.
XV. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XV. RECREATION. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

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 proposed trail connection would serve the recreational needs of residents and users in the City and in the region by providing a connection between the existing Bay Trail along Richmond Parkway and a new trail segment north of the project site. The proposed project would be a segment of a continuous Bay Trail extending from Albany to the Point Pinole Shoreline within the cities of Richmond and San Pablo. Implementation of the proposed project would likely increase the use of existing multi-use trails. However, it is not anticipated that such an increase in use would result in a physical deterioration of existing trail facilities. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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 with Mitigation. The proposed project includes the construction of a multi-use trail. The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of any other recreational facilities. Implementation of the mitigation measures contained in this Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) would ensure that this recreational facility would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Attach explanation and information sources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Impact Analysis

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

No Impact. The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for bicycles and pedestrians. The proposed project is consistent with land use plans, ordinances, and policies of the City’s General Plan (2012), the North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan (1993), the City Municipal Code (2010), and the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan (2011). The proposed project is included on Map 4.1, Planned Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements in the City’s General Plan as a
planned Class I Bicycle Route, and under Policy CR1.6 Comprehensive Network of Multi-use Trails. The proposed project is identified in the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan as a proposed Class I bicycle route from Richmond Parkway to the waterfront. The proposed project is a non-motorized transportation facility that would not impede existing transportation facilities (i.e., Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway) in the form of lane or capacity reduction. Furthermore, the proposed project would provide a paved multi-use trail that would accommodate commuters, residents, and recreational uses and would potentially reduce motorized vehicle trips in the project area. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No Impact. As stated in Response XVI a) above, the proposed project is consistent with applicable plans, policies, and ordinances for the City. Additionally, as a non-motorized transportation facility that would potentially reduce motorized vehicle trips in the project area, the proposed project would not conflict with the Contra Costa County Congestion Management Plan (2013), and no mitigation is required.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The nearest airport to the project site is the Oakland International Airport, located approximately 20 miles south of the project site. The proposed project would construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians, connecting the existing Class I Bay Trail along Richmond Parkway to the new 1.5 segment of the Bay Trail. Without the development of the proposed project, bicycle and pedestrian traffic would be required to travel along the shoulder of Goodrick Avenue. Implementation of the proposed project would improve bicycle and pedestrian safety in the area. The proposed project would be designed consistent with the Class I Bay Trail design standards and would not include any hazardous design features or incompatible uses. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require traffic controls as necessary for the proposed improvements. Temporary traffic controls during construction could incrementally increase emergency response times within the vicinity of the project site. Mitigation Measure TR-1 requires the preparation of a
TMP during final design to address impacts to local circulation during construction, including emergency access. The TMP would include notices in local media, temporary signage, and advance notice to local emergency service providers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. Therefore, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, construction-related impacts to emergency access would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure TR-1**: During final design, the Construction Contractor shall submit a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to the City of Richmond (City) Director of Public Works, or appropriate designee, for review and approval. During construction, the City shall require the Construction Contractor to adhere to all requirements of the TMP. The TMP shall include the following:

- Installation of temporary signage in the immediate vicinity;
- Notices of construction work in local media; and
- Advance notice to the public and local emergency service providers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities.

Operation of the multi-use trail would not create any obstructions to emergency access. Trail improvements would widen the Goodrick Avenue shoulders at the northern end of the project site, which would potentially provide extra width for emergency service providers. After project completion, emergency access within the vicinity of the project site would be similar or improved compared to existing conditions; therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in adequate emergency access, and no mitigation is required.

**f) Conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

**No Impact.** As a non-motorized, alternative transportation facility, the proposed project is consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation in the City, including the City’s General Plan and the Richmond Bicycle Master Plan. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (Attach explanation and information sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

No Impact. The proposed project is a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project would not generate wastewater and would not be subject to the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB, and no mitigation is required.

b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*
No Impact. Implementation of the proposed project includes the construction of a multi-use trail for use by bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposed project would not require water or wastewater treatment as no potable water and/or toilets would be provided as part of the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in construction of new water, wastewater treatment, or collection facilities or require the expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Currently, storm water runoff from the southern end of the project site flows from east to west through an existing culvert underneath Goodrick Avenue and eventually outfalls to the ocean. The drainage culvert is located south of Elmar Court. Storm water runoff north of Elmar Court flows north through an existing culvert and eventually outfalls to the ocean north of the project site. The proposed project would excavate and replace the existing culvert near the southern end of the project site; however, the existing drainage pattern would be maintained. Storm water would continue to flow from east to west and to the north, eventually draining to the Bay. As stated above, the proposed project would result in a small increase in impervious surface of approximately 0.37 acre. This nominal increase in impervious surface area is not anticipated to substantially increase the volume of runoff from the project site compared to existing conditions. Runoff from the project site would be accommodated by the drainage improvements and the existing drainage pattern would be maintained. The construction and operation of the new drainage facilities are part of the proposed project footprint that has been analyzed under each topical section for each impact threshold as part of this IS/MND. Therefore, no additional impacts would be associated with the drainage facilities other than those analyzed in this IS/MND. A less than significant impact would occur related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No Impact. Construction of the proposed project would require the use of a small amount of water on a temporary basis for activities such as fugitive dust control and cleanup activities. These uses would cease when construction of the proposed project is complete. Sufficient water supplies would be available to address the proposed project’s minimal water needs during construction. Therefore, there would be no need for new or expanded water entitlements, and no mitigation is required.

As discussed in Response XVII b) above, water would not be required during operation of the proposed project. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts associated with the need for new or expanded water entitlements, and no mitigation is required.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?
No Impact. The proposed project would construct a multi-use trail and does not include restrooms, or require wastewater facilities or wastewater treatment services. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the existing capacity of the sanitary sewer delivery system or the existing capacity of treatment facilities in the area. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would generate a small amount of solid waste. The majority of the construction waste would be dirt and paving materials, as well as waste generated by construction workers. The generation of construction waste would be temporary, would cease when construction is complete, and would not be substantial. Construction debris would be recycled and/or disposed of at Golden Bear Transfer Station or the West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill. The Golden Bear Transfer Station and the West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill are located on the same site and are approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site. These facilities have the capacity to handle the nominal amount of construction waste generated by the proposed project. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to this topic, and no mitigation is required.

Operation of the multi-use trail would not generate solid waste. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts to solid waste and landfill facilities, and no mitigation is required.

g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) changed the focus of solid waste management from landfill to diversion strategies such as source reduction, recycling, and composting. The purpose of the diversion strategies is to reduce dependence on landfills for solid waste disposal. AB 939 established mandatory diversion goals of 25 percent by 1995 and 50 percent by 2000, and to maintain the 50 percent diversion rate thereafter. The City is part of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (WCCIWMA) which was created after AB 939 was passed. WCCIWMA met the 50 percent diversion rate of wastes from landfills during construction and demolition activities in 2006 and continues to work to maintain this level of diversion, in compliance with AB 939.18 The proposed project would comply with existing and future statutes and regulations, including waste diversion programs mandated by federal, State, and City law. Therefore, no impact related to this topic would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

---

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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 with Mitigation. As described in this IS/MND, implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to adversely impact special-status animal species, wetlands, and previously undiscovered cultural/ archaeological resources and/or human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 and Compliance Measure BIO-1 in Section IV, Biological Resources and Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 in Section V, Cultural Resources would ensure that construction and operation of the proposed project would not: 1) degrade the quality of the environment; 2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; 3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; 4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; 5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or 6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City proposes to construct a new multi-use trail to connect the existing Bay Trail with a new trail segment north of the project site. All environmental impacts that could occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this IS/MND. Additionally, the impacts relevant to the proposed project are localized, confined to the immediate project area and individually limited. Two probable future development projects are proposed in the vicinity of the projects site along Goodrick Avenue and would include the construction of industrial warehouse buildings on the west side of Goodrick Avenue and industrial mixed-use buildings on the southwest corner of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway. Construction schedules of the proposed project and these two probable future projects could overlap. However, given that the potential project-related impacts are less than significant and limited, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable when evaluated with the impacts of the two probable future projects or any other current projects. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** This document evaluates the proposed project’s potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality, agricultural and forestry resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, traffic, and utilities and service systems. Based on the project description and the environmental analysis provided for each of these issue areas, implementation of the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings because all potentially significant impacts of the project can be mitigated to less than significant levels, and no additional mitigation is required to mitigate potential effects on human beings.
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