

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE TRIBAL DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO PROJECT FINAL EIR

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the City of Richmond (City), acting as Lead Agencies, have initiated the preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) to address the environmental effects of taking approximately 266 acres into federal trust to serve as the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians of the Guidiville Rancheria (Tribe) restored reservation land base, approval of a gaming management contract, and the approval of a mixed-use development to serve as the Tribe's economic base (Proposed Project). These actions would take place in the same general time frame as approvals made by the City, including all actions and approvals described within the November 9, 2004 Land Disposition Agreement (LDA; Draft EIS/EIR Appendix C, available online at <http://www.pointmolateeis-eir.com/>) and execution of the Municipal Services Agreement (MSA) (Exhibit E of LDA within **Appendix C**). Provisions of the LDA and MSA are detailed in **Section 2.0**. It is anticipated that this document will also be used by the State of California for possible future actions including a San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development consistency determination, approval of a state lands lease and permit for the proposed ferry terminal, and potentially as a basis for a Tribal Environmental Impact Report for compact compliance.

Since the Draft EIS/EIR was completed and circulated for public review and comment, the City and BIA determined that due to their differing internal procedures and timelines, the environmental review process should be completed separately. For that reason, this document is a Final EIR completed under CEQA and independent of the NEPA process. A separate Final EIS is being prepared by BIA. Because the Draft EIS/EIR had been prepared to comply with both statutes, the substance of the document meets all CEQA standards. In some instances, the Draft EIS/EIR contained information and analysis for purposes of compliance with NEPA, particularly with respect to socioeconomic benefits and impacts. Where appropriate, this Final EIR notes the different legal requirements. In many instances, however, for ease of reference and to make the Draft EIS/EIR and Final EIR documents consistent, this document includes references to NEPA and some analysis and discussion that was originally included for NEPA purposes. Discussion of such NEPA matters is provided for informational purposes only.

The foreseeable consequence of the above cited actions will be the establishment of a restored reservation and associated facilities for the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians and development of a mixed-use tribal

destination resort and casino complex within the former Naval Fuel Depot at Point Molate. The impacts of development alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), the Total Parkland Alternative (Alternative E), ~~and the No-Action Alternative (Alternative F), and the “Preserve Building 6” development alternative~~ (Alternative B1), which has been added in response to comments submitted during the comment period, are analyzed within this Final EIR. The project site is located within the former Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate in the City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, California.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose and need of the Lead Agency (BIA) in considering the Proposed Project is to strengthen the Tribal Government and improve the socioeconomic status of the Tribe by providing land that can sustain a stable economic base. Pursuant to a court approved stipulation in the *Scotts Valley et al. v. United States* decision of September 6, 1991 (NO.C-86-3660-VRW), the Tribe is entitled to a land base to replace lands wrongfully terminated.

Absent a land base to attract economic development projects to benefit the Tribal Government and its members, the Tribe has no available tools or mechanisms to build a sustainable Tribal economy. Approval of the Proposed Project would provide a land base for Tribal members and establish a Tribal Headquarters from which its Tribal Government can operate. The Tribal Government will use revenues from business developed on the project site to fund a variety of social, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, and health and welfare services to improve the quality of life of Tribal members, and to provide capital for other economic development and investment opportunities to sustain the Tribal Government. The casino and other businesses will provide employment opportunities for Tribal members and many local non-Tribal residents.

The Proposed Project serves the needs of the BIA by advancing the agency’s “Self Determination” policy of promoting the Tribe’s self-governance capability. It serves the needs of the Tribe by promoting meaningful opportunities for economic development and self-sufficiency of the Tribe and its members, as well as satisfying some of the provisions of the *Scotts Valley et al. v. United States* stipulated settlement agreement with the Federal Government.

The project objectives of the local Lead Agency (City of Richmond or City), for purposes of CEQA requirements, are to implement a reuse for the project site that: 1) is consistent with the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) processes, as well as the applicable conveyance legislation, and Navy Record of Decision (ROD) for the transfer of the former Naval facility; 2) promotes employment and economic development within the City and Contra Costa County; 3) provides long-term income to the City for operation of governmental programs; 4) provides enhanced public recreational facilities and opportunities within the City and improved access to the shoreline; 5) balances economic development with preservation of open space and important historic resources; 6) facilitates the early environmental clean-

up of Point Molate; 7) enhances regional public transportation facilities; 8) is consistent with the recommendations outlined by the Blue Ribbon Advisory Board, as codified in the Point Molate Base Reuse Plan (Brady and Associates, 1997); 9) is consistent with the recommendations of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB); 10) protects natural resources; and 11) satisfies the City's obligations pursuant to the stipulations of the LDA.

ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

This document describes and analyzes four development alternatives, a Total Parkland Alternative, and a No-Action Alternative. The development alternatives (A – D and B1) meet the Purpose and Need described above, although to varying degrees. Note that Alternatives A, B, ~~and C~~, and B1 require the transfer of land back to the United States to be held in trust status for the benefit of the Tribe and approval of a management contract by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), whereas Alternatives D – F do not.

The Non-Gaming/Non-Trust Acquisition with Mixed Use Development Alternative (Alternative D) proposes the development of residential and commercial uses on the project site; however, the project site would be owned by the Tribe and its development partner Upstream Point Molate LLC (Upstream) and would remain in fee status (not placed into federal trust). A 35-acre shoreline park, developed as part of Alternatives A – D and B1, would include a 50-foot shoreline band that would remain the property of the City and leased to the Tribe. The City would retain title to the submerged land within San Francisco Bay. Under the Total Parkland Alternative (Alternative E), the City would retain title to the project site and development would be limited to stabilizing the historic buildings located on-site and infrastructure improvements necessary to provide basic amenities such as public restrooms. Under Alternative F, no action would be taken and the project site would be maintained in its current care-taker status with limited public access.

ES.3.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED MIXED-USE TRIBAL DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO PROJECT

The Proposed Action under Alternative A includes approval of the Tribe's application for the fee-to-trust acquisition, approval of land leases by the BIA, and approval of a development and management contract by the NIGC. The foreseeable consequence of these actions would be the development of a Tribal government center, cultural/religious facilities, and a mixed-use resort casino complex with numerous amenities, parkland, a ferry transportation terminal, and open space within the approximately 413-acre project site.

Alternative A consists of the development of a destination resort that includes two hotels totaling 1,075 rooms, 170,000 square feet of business, conference and entertainment facilities, an approximately 240,000 square foot casino (~124,000 square feet of gaming floor), 54 luxury accommodation cottages

and casitas, a 300,000 square foot retail shopping center, public plazas, pedestrian/bicycle trails, a shoreline park, a segment of the Bay Trail, a Tribal park, Tribal government offices and cultural/religious facilities, restoration of 34 of the buildings located within the Winehaven National Register Historic District, two parking garages, and transportation facilities including a public ferry terminal.

The development of a destination resort on the project site would meet the purpose and needs of the City and the BIA, as identified in **Section ES.2**. The Proposed Project would promote job growth and economic development, provide a long-term revenue stream to the City, increase recreational opportunities and shoreline access in the City, preserve open space as well as natural and cultural resources, allow for early environmental clean-up of the former Naval Fuel Depot, enhance regional transportation facilities, and provide a use that is consistent with existing guiding documents. Moreover, the revenue generated by the operation of the components of Alternative A would provide the Tribe with the economic foundation to allow for the development and growth of multiple Tribal government, administrative, operational, social, and educational programs for Tribal members.

ES.3.2 ALTERNATIVE B – TRIBAL MIXED-USE DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO PROJECT WITH RESIDENTIAL COMPONENT

Alternative B is ~~identical~~ similar to Alternative A with respect to development of mixed-use destination resort and casino complex, including the construction of the ferry terminal, the Bay Trail, public plazas, the 35-acre shoreline park, Tribal facilities, parking facilities, retail and dining amenities, and interior shuttle facilities. The retail village would be reduced to 250,000 square feet under Alternative B (compared to 300,000 under Alternative A), with up to 50,000 square feet transferred to small-scale retail and community services in the southern residential area. Alternative B differs also from that of Alternative A in that a ~~325-acre~~ residential neighborhood is proposed for the southwestern portion of the project site, ~~which would not be taken into trust. The residential area would not be taken into federal trust; it would instead be owned by the Tribe and Upstream and remain under the jurisdiction of the City.~~ The 35-acre parcel would be developed with 340 housing units, with varying residential dwelling types including multi-unit buildings and attached townhomes with three to four bedrooms, ranging in size from 1,700 to 2,600 square feet. A portion of the proposed housing would be available for the Tribe under a Tribal Housing Program to be developed by the Tribe. It is not proposed at this time that this portion or the remainder of the 32 acre area would be taken into trust. For the purposes of environmental analysis it is assumed that the 32 acre residential area would remain a fee-simple parcel. The residential component would be served by small-scale retail and community services conducive to a neighborhood setting, which may include a community center and small retail uses such as a coffee shop, small market, small professional offices, boutiques, convenience stores, barber shop, and/or restaurants. The total space allocated to the small-scale retail and community services would be up to 50,000 square feet.

ES.3.7 ALTERNATIVE B1 – “PRESERVE BUILDING 6” TRIBAL MIXED-USE DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO PROJECT WITH RESIDENTIAL COMPONENT

During the public comment period described in Section 1.0 of Volume I of this Final EIR, a number of commenters expressed concern that Building No. 6, a contributing structure to the Winehaven National Register Historic District, would be demolished under Alternatives A – D. As discussed in Section 3.0 of Volume I of this Final EIR, the commercial reuse of Building No. 6 was found to be infeasible during the course of developing alternatives because of the severe constraints that preservation of Building No. 6 would pose on the economic viability of reuse. In response to the level of concern expressed by commenters, an additional study was undertaken following release of the Draft EIS/EIR to further evaluate the economic and practical limitations associated with preserving the building. The supplemental assessment (Lionakis Beaumont Design Group, 2009; **Appendix DD**) echoed the findings of previous structural and architectural assessments of the building in their conclusions. They state, “Despite the fact that the building is associated with the Winehaven Historic District, it has extremely limited architectural merit. While the recommendations presented herein would provide for adaptive reuse of the building, it is our opinion that the costs associated with the rehabilitation would far exceed its finished value (Lionakis, 2009:1; **Appendix DD**).” Despite the questionable feasibility of the retention of Building No. 6 within a development alternative, Alternative B1 was added to the Final EIR in response to comments.

The square footage of each project component under Alternative B1 is identical to Alternative B. As with Alternative B, Alternative B1 includes the development of a mixed-use destination resort and casino complex, including the construction of the ferry terminal, the Bay Trail, public plazas, the 35-acre shoreline park, Tribal facilities, parking facilities, retail and dining amenities, and interior shuttle facilities. The layout of project components under Alternative B1 have been reconfigured preserve Building 6. Under Alternative B1, Building 6 would be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 68) and re-used as a retail and restaurant complex, while the Winehaven building would be re-used as a performance center. As with Alternatives A through D, Building 17 would be relocated on-site. Similar to Alternative B, development of the residential portion of Alternative B1 would contain 340 housing units, with varying residential dwelling sizes and types. A portion of the proposed housing would be available for the tribal members under a Tribal Housing Program to be developed by the Tribe. The construction footprint of Alternative B1 is similar to B; however, its location south of the Winehaven Historic District would require additional grading of a hill near the point.

ES.3.3 ALTERNATIVE C – REDUCED INTENSITY MIXED-USE TRIBAL DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO

Alternative C differs from Alternative A in that the Point Hotel would not be constructed, the number of rooms in the casino hotel would be reduced to 400, parkland and open space would be increased to 236 acres, the conference and entertainment facilities would be reduced to 50,000 and 30,000 square feet, respectively, and the retail village would be reduced to 20,000 square feet. Similar to Alternatives A and B, construction of the ferry terminal, Bay Trail, public plazas, shoreline park, Tribal facilities, and interior site shuttle facilities would be incorporated into this alternative.

ES.3.4 ALTERNATIVE D – NON-GAMING/NON-TRUST ACQUISITION WITH MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Under Alternative D, none of the land would be taken into trust and the approval of a gaming management contract would not be required; the project site would be developed by the Tribe and Upstream with commercial mixed-use and market rate housing for sale or lease to private individuals and families. This alternative would include development of approximately 1,100 units of high, medium- and low-density housing located in five locations totaling approximately 70.5 acres. The five locations would be near the shoreline, upon the hillside, along the Bay, along the shoreline knoll, and in the southern area of the project site. Alternative D proposes restoration of 34 historic buildings located on-site, and a mixed-use development centered on the Winehaven National Register Historic District. The mixed-use development would include a 150-room hotel (approximately 100,000 square feet), an associated convention facility located adjacent to the renovated Winehaven building (approximately 150,000 square feet). The Winehaven building would house additional retail, restaurants, cafes and offices in a pedestrian village linking the Winehaven district to the shoreline park and ferry facilities.

ES.3.5 ALTERNATIVE E – TOTAL PARKLAND

Under Alternative E, the land would not be taken into federal trust, a reservation proclamation would not be requested, and a gaming management contract would not be needed. Under this alternative, the project site would be retained by the City and may be accessible by the public for use as a park, subject to the City allocating the necessary funds to make the project site suitable for the public. None of the buildings in the Winehaven Historic District would be demolished, relocated, or rehabilitated (although the existing edifices and structural components would be stabilized), and no new buildings would be constructed.

Under Alternative E, no federal discretionary approvals would be required. Development under the Total Parkland Alternative would be limited to infrastructure that is necessary to provide basic amenities such as public restrooms.

ES.3.6 ALTERNATIVE F – NO ACTION

Under the No-Action Alternative, the BIA would not approve a trust acquisition or reservation proclamation, the NIGC would not approve a gaming management contract, and the City would not sell or lease the land to the Tribe. The project site would remain undeveloped and the buildings located on-site would remain untouched (i.e. existing edifices and structural components would not be stabilized).

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

~~ES.4.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PREFERRED TRIBAL MIXED-USE DESTINATION RESORT AND CASINO PROJECT~~

The EIS/EIR scoping process provided an opportunity for the public and government agencies to provide input on the scope of the EIS/EIR. The scoping report was published in July 2005 and the 105-day Draft EIS/EIR -review and comment period began July 2009. The following is a summary of the common areas of controversy raised in the scoping process. The issue areas are discussed in the order in which they are addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR and Final EIR. The scoping report is provided in Draft EIS/EIR Appendix B, (available online at <http://www.pointmolateeis-eir.com>) and the response to public comments is provided in Volume I of this Final EIR.

Commenters requested that the EIS/EIR analyze the soils on-site to determine the suitability for construction and their infiltration, permeability, and expansive characteristics as well as potential for liquefaction. Commenters expressed concern over the Proposed Project's location related to seismic fault zones.

Due to the large amount of impervious surface and concentration of automobile traffic anticipated for the Proposed Project, many commenters expressed concern over potential erosion and water quality impacts to the San Francisco Bay.

Issues related to wastewater volumes and disposal were raised by some commenters. Other commenters questioned whether the existing sewage treatment plant was adequate to handle proposed volumes and discharge requirements on the plant.

Concerns related to potential air quality impacts of the Proposed Project related to vehicle emissions were articulated by some commenters, while others inquired how the Proposed Project would meet the requirements of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for maintaining National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

With respect to biological resources, some commenters voiced concern over possible impacts to eel grass, upland areas and certain plant species. Other commenters were concerned with impacts to migratory birds related to night lighting.

Some commenters noted the presence of archeological sites on the property and provided details concerning their significance and characteristics. Other commenters discussed the historical and architectural significance of the Winehaven National Register Historic District. During the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR a number of commenters expressed concern that Building No. 6, a contributing element of the Winehaven Historic District, would be demolished under Alternatives A – D.

Issues related to perceived social impacts including problem or pathological gambling, bankruptcies, foreclosures, spousal and child abuse, drug trafficking and other crimes, and alcoholism were raised.

Commenters requested that the EIS/EIR fully evaluate the wide range of tax-associated impacts the Proposed Project may have on local government services associated with the Proposed Project. Some commenters voiced a perception that the proposed facilities would create primarily minimum wage jobs that would potentially impact the community. Others suggested that the development would compete with local small businesses and requested that the EIS/EIR evaluate the impact to local businesses.

Some local citizens requested that the EIS/EIR include a study of existing housing options in the area and whether the availability of housing will accommodate the increased demand on housing from additional employees.

Commenters expressed concern over the existing socioeconomic status of the subject area and the impact that a casino would potentially have. Many of these comments focused on the increased demand for social services resulting from the perceived increase in social problems such as alcoholism, drug abuse, bankruptcy or spousal abuse stemming from casino gambling.

Social justice issues were raised during the scoping period, including whether the Proposed Project would be located in a predominantly minority or low-income area. Some commenters stated that the EIS/EIR should consider procedural inequity and geographical inequity and recommended that such issues be addressed through a proactive outreach and communication program.

Concern with transportation-related impacts was communicated in a number of comments received. Several individuals raised the issue of traffic congestion in the immediate area of the Proposed Project, as well as in the surrounding areas. Some commenters requested that a traffic study be performed that would include data related to trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and trip assignment. Some commenters indicated that the EIS/EIR should examine existing public transit routes and analyze the

demands to be placed on public resources. Other commenters indicated that opportunities for utilization of public transit should be maximized.

Issues related to land use were raised by several commenters who expressed concern over the Proposed Project's size. Some also noted that the Proposed Project was not consistent with the City General Plan and Point Molate Base Reuse Plan. Addressing potential impacts to parks was also raised by some members of the public. Other commenters were concerned that the change in civil jurisdiction with the trust acquisition would lead to the loss of public access to the shoreline.

The Proposed Project's proximity to the Chevron-Richmond Refinery was raised by some commenters who feared that large-scale disasters, including potential acts of terrorism at the refinery, made the Proposed Project an incompatible land use.

Public services were addressed by commenters who requested the EIS/EIR identify how local fire protection and emergency medical services would handle the demand of the proposed facility. Commenters requested that the EIS/EIR analyze specifically how additional traffic would impact fire and emergency response services and whether the increased demand would result in longer response times. Some commenters requested that the EIS/EIR analyze the nature and possible impact of various large-scale emergencies (disaster management) that could affect the integrity of the proposed facility, as well as the potential need for mutual aid during such emergencies or disasters.

Issues related to crime and law enforcement were raised by some commenters, many of whom requested that the EIS/EIR address any potential impacts to these areas. Commenters expressed concern that operation of the proposed facility would introduce or exacerbate existing criminal activity and that current levels of law enforcement would not be adequate to contain and monitor such activity. Commenters also requested that the EIS/EIR identify jurisdictional authority for investigation of crimes occurring on or near the project site, as well as estimate the increase in criminal prosecutions as a result of the Proposed Project by type of crime. Some commenters requested the EIS/EIR address impacts to other aspects of the criminal justice system including the District Attorney's office and jail facilities.

Comments received during the scoping process indicated that noise impacts from traffic, construction, and operation should be evaluated consistent with federal regulations. Some commenters questioned whether the lands proposed for trust acquisition were located near a major noise source such as an airport, railroad, or highway.

The project site's past use as a Naval Fuel Depot and residual environmental impacts related to hazardous materials was raised by many commenters. Commenters were concerned about the potential for early transfer of the property from the Navy to the City and the possibility that cleanup activities would be

unduly delayed or insufficiently completed if this were to occur. The Regional Water Quality Control Board expressed concern that it could lose cleanup authority in the event that the early transfer is initiated.

The aesthetic character of the project site was addressed by commenters who were concerned about impacts to the viewshed from surrounding areas as well as from the Bay itself. Commenters requested that lighting plans and illuminated signage plans for the Proposed Project be identified, including potential for light pollution, intensity, and area of impact and duration.

The potential for cumulatively considerable impacts was raised by some commenters who requested that the EIS/EIR analyze project impacts in combination with other foreseeable projects in the vicinity. For cumulative impacts to air quality, noise, traffic, crime, and utilities, commenters suggested that the analysis should consider long-term impacts, as well as the immediate future.

Concerning mitigation measures proposed for the project, some commenters requested that such measures be specifically identified for each of the impact areas and that if more than one mitigation measure is considered, all should be identified.

An issue unrelated to the EIS/EIR was raised by some commenters who questioned whether the lands proposed for trust acquisition were within areas historically occupied by the Tribe and whether this was relevant to decisions on a determination of reservation status and the applicability of portions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

ES.5 SUMMARY MATRIX

The potential adverse and beneficial impacts, as well as mitigation measures, relevant to each alternative are presented in **Table ES-1**. Mitigation measures identified in the design process have been incorporated into the project description. In addition, measures have been identified within the Final EIR to mitigate specific impacts identified during the preparation of the EIS/EIR. Mitigation measures have been identified where feasible to address specific impacts regardless of whether they are considered “significant.” A detailed discussion of environmental consequences and mitigation measures related to each alternative is included in **Sections 4.0 and 5.0** of the Final EIR.

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.1 Alternative A				
4.2.1	Development of Alternative A has the potential to result in soil erosion and loss of topsoil on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 1-1 To eliminate potential impacts resulting from excessive erosion and loss of topsoil, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (General Permit) would be complied with, including implementation of appropriate erosion control measures. Compliance with the General Permit requires developing a site specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall identify the location of temporary erosion control features necessary to direct and filter stormwater runoff during construction activities. Temporary erosion control features used during construction may include, but are not limited to, silt fences, fiber rolls, erosion control blankets, temporary sediment basins, and rock bag dams. The SWPPP shall also include Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would reduce the transportation of pollutants off-site. Compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance, or functional equivalent, would also require a SWPPP. In addition to a SWPPP, the Grading Ordinance requires a grading and drainage study to be developed for each alternative to which an Erosion Control Plan (ECP) would be incorporated. The ECP would have to be approved by the City for construction on fee lands. The ECP would identify permanent erosion control BMPs and permanent project features that would limit erosion and sediment-laden stormwater from leaving the site. The location of permanent erosion control features such as sediment/grease traps, vegetated drainage swales, and riprap shall be identified within the ECP. The ECP would also specify compliance standards, procedural requirements, regulatory compliance requirements, and implementation timeframe requirements. The ECP shall be implemented during the construction and operation of each alternative.</p> <p>MM 1-2 To prevent the loss of life or property as a result of development on unstable or expansive soils the following measures shall be implemented. Prior to construction of any new buildings or parking structures, a registered geologist shall prepare a final geotechnical report that provides design-grade specifications for structural engineering of all new construction and retrofitting of historic buildings. The geologist shall employ geotechnical/soils laboratory testing according to standard engineering practices and the California Building Code (CBC). The geotechnical report shall provide design specifications and engineering standards to address any expansive or</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>unstable soils. Recommendations made as a result of these investigations to protect new structures and reduce impacts from geological hazards shall be incorporated into project design and verified through implementation of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. These measures are anticipated to include requirements to construct foundations designed to resist movements of expansive soils and removal of unstable soils and replacement with suitable fill or engineered materials. Based on the geotechnical study (Appendix I), suitable fill material is available on-site to replace hazardous soils.</p> <p>MM 2-2 For project components located on fee lands (residential component of Alternatives B, B1, and all of Alternative D), the Tribe shall apply for a grading permit from the City for construction activities in compliance with Chapter 12.44 Excavation, Grading and Earthwork Construction of the City of Richmond (City) Municipal Code. Furthermore, the Tribe shall have an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared by a licensed civil engineer for lands that are to remain in fee status.</p> <p>For trust lands, the Tribe would adopt and implement a Grading Ordinance equivalent to the requirements of the City's grading permit (Chapter 12.44 Excavation, Grading and Earthwork Construction).</p> <p>Permanent erosion control and stormwater management features shall be consistent with relevant Bay Plan policies including, but not limited to, Policies 1 through 4 detailing design, construction, and long-term maintenance guidance.</p>		
4.2.2	Proposed components of Alternative A may be located on unstable soil that could result in on-site settlement of buildings or landslides. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2	PS	LTS
4.2.3	Proposed components of Alternative A may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.4	Alternative A could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudflows. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2 and MM 1-3 For project components located on fee lands (residential component of Alternatives B, B1 and all of Alternative D), all new structures shall be	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>designed in compliance with the 2007 CBC and 2008 City of Richmond (COR) Building Code (Article VI Chapter 6.04) such that risks to the health or safety of workers or members of the public are reduced. Specifically, Chapter 16 of the 2007 CBC and the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standard 7-05 Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures shall be adhered to. Chapter 16 of the 2007 CBC addresses structural design requirements for buildings and other structures (including hazardous materials storage facilities) that are consistent with rational analyses and well-established principles of mechanics. In this regard, the 2007 CBC design requirements shall apply to all new structures built on the project site. The Winehaven buildings and any other existing on-site historic buildings included under each alternative shall be retrofitted in compliance with the State Historical Building Code (Health and Safety Code 18950, et. seq. and California Code of Regulations Part 8 Title 24) to reduce the risk of collapse during strong seismic events.</p> <p>For trust lands, the Tribe shall adopt and implement a Building Code that is the functional equivalent of the most recent CBC (Chapter 16) as amended by the City of Richmond, COR Building Code (Article VI Chapter 6.04), and ASCE Standard 7-05. Appropriate building standards within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) shall be implemented for the rehabilitation and retrofitting of existing historic buildings.</p>		
4.2.5	Development of Alternative A would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.6	Development of Alternative A would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.2 Alternative B				
4.2.7	Development of Alternative B would result in increased potential for soil erosion on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-1, MM 1-2 and MM 2-2 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.2.8	Alternative B could potentially be located on unstable soil that could potentially result in settlement of buildings. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.9	Proposed components of Alternative B may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.10	Alternative B could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudflows. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2 and MM 1-3 .	PS	LTS
4.2.11	Development on the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.12	Development of Alternative B would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.3 Alternative C				
4.2.13	Development of Alternative C would result in the increase in potential for soil erosion on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-1 , MM 1-2 , and MM 2-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.14	Alternative C could be located on unstable soil that would potentially result in settlement of buildings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.15	Proposed components of Alternative C may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.2.16	Alternative C could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudflows. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2 and MM 1-3 .	PS	LTS
4.2.17	The proposed development under Alternative C would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.18	Development of Alternative C would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.4 Alternative D				
4.2.19	Alternative D could result in the increase in potential for soil erosion on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-1 , MM 1-2 , MM 2-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.20	Alternative D may be located on unstable soil that could result in on-site or off-site landslides, or settlement of buildings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.21	Proposed components of Alternative D may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.22	Alternative D could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudflows. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-3 .	PS	LTS
4.2.23	Alternative D would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.24	Development of Alternative D would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.5 Alternative E				
4.2.25	Alternative E would result in an increase in the potential for soil erosion on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-1 , MM 1-2 , and MM 2-2 .	PS	LTS
4.2.26	Alternative E would not be located on unstable soil that could result in on-site or off-site landslides, or settlement of buildings. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.27	Construction of the Bay Trail under Alternative E may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC). No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.28	Alternative E could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudslides. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-3 .	PS	LTS
4.2.29	Alternative E would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.30	Development of Alternative E would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.6 Alternative F				
4.2.31	Alternative F would not result in the potential for soil erosion on the proposed project site. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.32	Alternative F would not be located on unstable soil that could result in on-site or off-site landslides, or settlement of buildings. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.33	Alternative F would not be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.2.34	Alternative F would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudslides. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.35	Alternative F would not result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.36	Alternative F would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2 Geology and Soils				
4.2.7 Alternative B1				
4.2.36	Development of Alternative B1 would result in increased potential for soil erosion on the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-1, MM 1-2 and MM 2-2.	PS	LTS
4.2.37	Alternative B1 could potentially be located on unstable soil that could potentially result in settlement of buildings. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2.	PS	LTS
4.2.38	Proposed components of Alternative B1 may be located on soil that is considered expansive, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC), creating a substantial risk to life or property. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 1-2.	PS	LTS
4.2.39	Alternative B1 could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects; including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic activity and associated ground failure involving liquefaction or landslides/mudflows. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement MM 1-2 and MM 1-3.	PS	LTS
4.2.40	Development on the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.2.41	Development of Alternative B1 would not 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 would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.1 Alternative A				
4.3.1	Construction of Alternative A could result in the pollution of stormwater runoff, adversely impacting surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-2 and MM 2-1 In compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA), a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses water quality impacts associated with construction, remediation, and operation of the project. Water quality control measures identified in the SWPPP shall include, but not be limited to, the following list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing vegetation shall be retained where possible. To the extent feasible, grading activities shall be limited to the immediate area required for construction and remediation. b. Temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, fiber rolls, vegetated swales, a velocity dissipation structure, staked straw bales, temporary revegetation, rock bag dams, erosion control blankets, and sediment traps) shall be employed for disturbed areas during the wet season. c. No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months. d. Construction area entrances and exits shall be stabilized with crushed aggregate. e. Sediment shall be retained on-site by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures. f. A spill prevention and countermeasure plan shall be developed, which identifies proper storage, collection, and disposal measures for potential pollutants (such as fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) used on-site. g. Petroleum products shall be stored, handled, used, and disposed of properly in accordance with provisions of the Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 to 1387). h. During the wet season, construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals and quarried materials transported by barge (regardless of the season) shall be stored, covered, and isolated to prevent runoff losses and contamination of surface and groundwater. i. Fuel and vehicle maintenance areas shall be established away from all drainage courses and designed to control runoff. 	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Sanitary facilities shall be provided for construction workers. k. Disposal facilities shall be provided for soil wastes, including excess asphalt during construction and demolition. l. The Tribe shall require all workers be trained in the proper handling, use, cleanup, and disposal of all chemical materials used during construction activities and provide appropriate facilities to store and isolate contaminants. m. The Tribe shall require all contractors involved in the project be trained on the potential environmental damages resulting from soil erosion prior to development by conducting a pre-construction conference. Copies of the project's erosion control plan shall be distributed at this time. All construction bid packages, contracts, plans, and specifications shall contain language that requires adherence to the plan. n. Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize land disturbance during peak runoff periods. Soil conservation practices shall be completed during the fall or late winter to reduce erosion during spring runoff. o. Creating construction zones and grading only one area or part of a construction zone at a time shall minimize exposed areas. If possible during the wet season, grading on a particular zone shall be delayed until protective cover is restored on the previously graded zone. p. Utility installations and decommissioning shall be coordinated to limit the number of excavations. q. Preserving as much natural cover, topography, and drainage as possible shall protect disturbed soils from rainfall during construction. Trees and shrubs shall not be removed unnecessarily. r. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized as promptly as possible, especially on long or steep slopes. Recommended plant materials and mulches shall be used to establish protective ground cover. Vegetation such as fast-growing annual and perennial grasses shall be used to shield and bind the soil. Mulches and artificial binders shall be used until vegetation is established. Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment. The project shall use a preponderance of drought resistant species native to the Richmond area in the selection of vegetation, plants, mulches, or other plant material used in re-vegetation or soil stabilization. s. Surface water runoff shall be controlled by directing flowing 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>water away from critical areas and by reducing runoff velocity. Diversion structures such as terraces, dikes, and ditches shall collect and direct runoff water around vulnerable areas to prepared drainage outlets. Surface roughening, berms, check dams, hay bales, use of permeable paving surfaces or similar measures shall be used to reduce runoff velocity and erosion.</p> <p>t. Sediment shall be contained when conditions are too extreme for treatment by surface protection. Temporary sediment traps, filter fabric fences, inlet protectors, vegetative filters and buffers, or settling basins shall be used to detain runoff water long enough for sediment particles to settle out.</p> <p>u. Topsoil removed during construction shall be carefully stored and treated as an important resource. Berms shall be placed around topsoil stockpiles to prevent runoff during storm events.</p> <p>v. Encountered groundwater shall be removed from trenches and excavations in such a manner as to reduce potential contact with construction materials, construction personnel, and surface waters and shall be disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility such as a WWTP in accordance with the requirements of the NPDES permit.</p> <p>MM 2-3 The Tribe shall develop a design-grade Stormwater Control Plan in compliance with the City's Municipal Code 12.22.050, required during submission for the permit to construct for project components on fee and trust lands. The Code requires the Stormwater Control Plan to include the provisions outlined within the most current version of Contra Costa County's Stormwater Quality C.3 Guidelines (C.3 Guidelines). The Stormwater Control Plan shall include final design specifications as required and therefore will be developed at the time the application for development is made. The Stormwater Control Plan shall include all the provisions of the most current C.3 Guidelines.</p>		
4.3.1a	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the development of the project site for construction and environmental remediation could necessitate dewatering in areas of shallow groundwater. Dewatering activities could lead to contamination of surface waters during disposal. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3.2	Development of Alternative A would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.3	Operation of Alternative A would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that could increase surface water runoff. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.3.4	Implementation of Alternative A would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.5	Operation of Alternative A would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.6	Operation of Alternative A would introduce an additional source of pollutants to surface water and groundwater. This would be a less-than-significant impact for grading and construction and a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation and landscape irrigation with gray water.	<p>MM 2-4 The Tribe shall develop a Demolition and Containment Plan to reduce the potential for contamination of the Bay from the covering/removal of the petroleum conveyance pipeline during pier renovation. The plan shall include provisions for control of potential releases of piping, piping materials, and pipe contents into the San Francisco Bay. The plan shall also include capture and associated disposal provisions of any residual petroleum products or any other substances that may be released from the pipeline during demolition activity.</p> <p>MM 2-5 The Tribe shall adopt standards equivalent to the California Plumbing code for gray water recycling. The standards would apply to subsurface application procedures for landscape irrigation with gray water to protect water quality. Gray water shall be monitored for water quality to determine adequacy for subsurface irrigation use. The gray water system shall be plumbed to allow for diversion to the sewerage conveyance system in the event of unacceptable gray water quality or system failure.</p>	LTS	LTS
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.2 Alternative B				
4.3.7	Construction of Alternative B could result in the pollution of stormwater runoff, adversely impacting surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 , and MM 2-3 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3.7a	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the development of the project site for construction and environmental remediation could necessitate dewatering in areas of shallow groundwater. Dewatering activities could lead to contamination of surface waters during disposal. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1	PS	LTS
4.3.8	Development of Alternative B would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted	NI	NI
4.3.9	Operation of Alternative B would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that could increase surface water runoff. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.3.10	Implementation of Alternative B would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.11	Operation of Alternative B would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.12	Operation of Alternative B would introduce an additional source of pollutants to surface water and groundwater. This would be a less-than-significant impact for grading and construction and a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation and landscape irrigation with gray water.	Implement MM 2-4 and MM 2-5	PS	LTS
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.3 Alternative C				
4.3.13	Construction of Alternative C could result in the pollution of stormwater runoff, adversely impact surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 and MM 2-3 .	PS	LTS
4.3.13a	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the development of the project site for construction and environmental remediation could necessitate dewatering in areas of shallow groundwater. Dewatering activities could lead to contamination of surface waters during disposal. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1	PS	LTS
4.3.14	Development of Alternative C would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3.15	Operation of Alternative C would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that could increase surface water runoff. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.3.16	Implementation of Alternative C would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.17	Operation of Alternative C would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.18	Operation of Alternative C would alter the existing on-site drainage pattern in a manner that would introduce an additional source of pollutants to surface water and groundwater. This would be a less-than-significant impact for grading and construction and a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation and landscape irrigation with gray water.	Implement MM 2-4 and MM 2-5	PS	LTS
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.4 Alternative D				
4.3.19	Construction of Alternative D could result in the pollution of stormwater runoff, adversely impact surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 and MM 2-3 .	PS	LTS
4.3.19a	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the development of the project site for construction and environmental remediation could necessitate dewatering in areas of shallow groundwater. Dewatering activities could lead to contamination of surface waters during disposal. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1	PS	LTS
4.3.20	Development of Alternative D would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.21	Operation of Alternative D would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that could increase surface water runoff, potentially resulting in flooding. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.13.22	Development of Alternative D would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.23	Operation of Alternative D would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.24	Operation of Alternative D would alter the existing on-site drainage pattern in a manner that would introduce an additional source of pollutants to surface water and groundwater. This would be a less-than-significant impact for grading and construction and a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation.	Implement MM 2-4	PS	LTS
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.5 Alternative E				
4.3.25	Development of Alternative E would not introduce new avenues of pollution from construction or operation. However, renovation of the pier may result in significant impacts to the Bay. This would result in a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation.	Implement MM 2-4	PS	NI
4.3.25a	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the installation of park features such as sewerage pipelines for public restroom facilities would not require permitted dewatering. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted	NI	NI
4.3.26	Operation of Alternative E would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.27	Development of Alternative E would not alter the existing drainage pattern and therefore would not result in flooding. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.28	Development of Alternative E would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact to existing settings would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.6 Alternative F				
4.3.29	Implementation of Alternative F would not introduce new avenues of stormwater pollution. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3.30	Implementation of Alternative F would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.31	Implementation of Alternative F would not alter the existing drainage pattern and therefore would not result in flooding. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.32	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.33	Implementation of Alternative F would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact to existing settings would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.3.7 Alternative B1				
4.3.34	Construction of Alternative B1 could result in the pollution of stormwater runoff, adversely impacting surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1, MM 2-2, and MM 2-3.	PS	LTS
4.3.35	Trenching and excavation activities associated with the development of the site for construction could necessitate dewatering in areas of shallow groundwater. Dewatering activities could lead to contamination of surface waters during disposal. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1	PS	LTS
4.3.36	Development of Alternative B1 would not deplete groundwater or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume. No impact would occur.	None warranted	NI	NI
4.3.37	Operation of Alternative B1 would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that could increase surface water runoff. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.3.38	Implementation of Alternative B1 would not place structures within a floodplain and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.3.39	Operation of Alternative B1 would not result in inundation by seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.3.40	Operation of Alternative B1 would introduce an additional source of pollutants to surface water and groundwater. This would be a less-than-significant impact for grading and construction and a potentially significant impact associated with the pier renovation and landscape irrigation with gray water.	Implement MM 2-4 and MM 2-5 .	PS	LTS
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.1 Alternative A				
4.4.1	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative A would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>Construction Emissions</p> <p>MM 3-1 Water all active construction and remediation areas at least three times daily during dry weather.</p> <p>MM 3-2 Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, excavated soil from remedial activities, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard</p> <p>MM 3-3 Pave or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</p> <p>MM 3-4 Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.</p> <p>MM 3-5 Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.</p> <p>MM 3-6 Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizes to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).</p> <p>MM 3-7 Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</p> <p>MM 3-8 Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.</p> <p>MM 3-9 Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		runoff to public roadways.		
		MM 3-10 Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.		
		MM 3-11 Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.		
		MM 3-12 Install windbreaks, or plant trees/vegetative windbreaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.		
		MM 3-13 Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.		
		MM 3-14 Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.		
		MM 3-15 Heavy, diesel-powered equipment idling shall be limited to two minutes.		
		MM 3-16 The Tribe shall implement the following measures to reduce criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Heavy duty construction equipment shall be equipped with a diesel particulate matter filter and a diesel oxidation catalyst. b. The Tribe shall fully fund a program to encourage and facilitate the use of 'carpools' by construction workers, including providing off-site locations for construction workers to park their vehicles and meet to carpool. c. The Tribe shall use heavy duty construction equipment that meets the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Off-Road Compression-Ignition (Diesel) Engines and Equipment certification standard and CARB's Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Regulation standards. 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		d. The Tribe shall provide a storage area for recyclables and green waste during construction.		
		Operational Emissions		
		MM 3-16		
		The Tribe shall fully fund a program to encourage and facilitate the use of 'carpools' by construction workers.		
		MM 3-17		
		Implementation of the following mitigation measures would further reduce criteria pollutants by 6.5 percent under the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, 1999 (Appendix W).		
		a. The Tribe shall coordinate with regional ridesharing organizations, provide employee and customer access to guaranteed ride home programs, and fully fund measures such as carpool/vanpool subsidies and preferential parking for carpools and vanpools. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce criteria pollutants by two percent (BAAQMD, 1999).		
		b. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund the following on-site transit use incentives for employees: construct transit facilities such as bus turnouts, bus bulbs, benches, bus shelters, and landscaping at transit stops. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants by one percent (BAAQMD, 1999).		
		c. The Tribe shall design and locate buildings for easy access to public transportation. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce projects emissions by 0.5 percent (BAAQMD, 1999).		
		d. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund shuttle service to transit stations/multimodal centers. Project-operated shuttle buses will be required to run at least two times per hour and on-time. Because the resort is proposed to be open 24 hours per day (Alternatives A, B, C, and B1), shuttle buses that provide service to public transit stops (e.g., the Tewksbury Turnaround) shall run at night and on weekends when those carriers provide service (e.g., shuttle buses shall serve the Richmond Intermodal Station when trains are running). Shuttle bus schedules will mesh with those of AC		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Transit, BART, Golden Gate Transit, and other public transit providers, who will be incentivized to provide safe, frequent, and reliable service on schedules and at locations compatible with the resort shuttle buses. The Tribe shall continue consultation and coordination with the regional public transit providers in the final planning and implementation phases of project development. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants by two percent (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>e. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund sidewalks and/or paths, connected to adjacent land uses, transit stops, and/or community-wide network. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>f. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund showers and lockers for employees bicycling or walking to work. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>g. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund adequate and secure short-term bicycle parking for retail customers and other non-commute trips. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>h. The Tribe shall provide and fully fund safe, attractive pedestrian access from project to transit stops and adjacent developments. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>i. The Tribe will provide and fully fund secure, weather-protected bicycle parking for employees. This BAAQMD mitigation measure would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants by one percent (BAAQMD, 1999).</p> <p>MM 3-18 Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce criteria pollutants from Alternatives A and C by 17 percent and Alternatives B, D, and B1 by 23 percent under the Sacramento Municipal Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD) Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions, 2007 (Appendix W). The SMAQMD provides reduction percentages for mitigation measures, which quantify reductions for criteria pollutants. These proposed mitigation measures are standard project mitigation measures that are applicable in most air districts.</p>		

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Tribe shall plant trees near structures. Trees near structures act as insulators from weather thereby decreasing energy requirements. A one percent reduction in criteria pollutant would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. b. Alternatives B, D, and B1 provide residential clustering, which preserves forest/woodland resources, while preserving and restoring open space. A five percent reduction in criteria pollutant would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure/design feature. c. The Tribe shall ensure the use of solar, low-emission, central, or tank less water heaters and install wall insulation and use energy efficient appliances in the residences, hotel, and casino that shall exceed Title 24 requirements. A one percent reduction in criteria pollutant would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. d. The Tribe shall implement Smart Land Use strategies including: mixed-use development, which would reduce vehicle trips and promote efficient delivery of services and goods, and would include travel demand management measures. A four percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. e. The Tribe shall, in cooperation with the City of Richmond, coordinate traffic lights at controlled intersections so that traffic passes more efficiently through congested areas. A three percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. f. The Tribe shall encourage the use of public transit systems by enhancing safety and cleanliness at transit stops. In cooperation with the City of Richmond, the Tribe shall provide new transit stops along Western Drive as needed, to be maintained by the Tribe. A one percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. g. The Proposed Project would be located within one-half mile of an existing/planned Class I or Class II bike lane. A one percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. h. The project design would contain (either on-site or off-site) three of the following within one-quarter mile: residential development (Alternatives B, D, and B1), retail development, park, open space, and office. A three percent 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this design feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Tribe shall provide a complimentary electric lawnmower to each residential buyer (Alternative B, D, and B1 only). A one percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. j. Project design shall not incorporate fireplaces or wood burning stoves. A one percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure. k. The Tribe shall provide an on-site, renewable energy system by installing a solar array capable of producing at least 1.5 megawatts of power. A two percent reduction in criteria pollutants would occur with the implementation of this mitigation measure/design feature. 		
		<p>MM 3-19 One or more of the following measures shall be implemented within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) prior to the beginning of construction of the Proposed Project in an effort to reduce nitrogen oxides (NOX), reactive organic gases (ROG), particulate matter 2.5 micron in size (PM2.5) emissions to less than 10 tons per year (tpy), and particulate matter 10 micron in size (PM10) emissions to less than 15 tpy, and GHG emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pave or resurface unpaved or “poor” roadway(s) (as defined in the <i>Pavement Management Program Report</i>, City of Richmond, 2008), which have a minimum daily vehicle count of 100 vehicles. b. Purchase low emission buses to replace aging buses used in the City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, and/or regional school districts. c. Purchase new hybrid vehicles to replace the City of Richmond’s aging fleet. d. Purchase Emission Reduction Credits that are available from sources within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). e. Contribute a fair share percentage to the synchronization of traffic signals within the City of Richmond. f. Contribute to a program to retrofit residential fireplaces that do not meet USEPA certification standards within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. g. Fund low emission engine upgrades for ferry vessels 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		h. Purchase Criteria and GHG emissions credits in the amount specified in Tables 5-1A, 5-1B, and 5-2.		
		<p>MM 3-20 The Tribe shall fund and implement travel demand management (TDM) measures. Measures shall include, but may not be limited to, the following:</p>		
		a. Designation of an on-site TDM coordinator.		
		b. The Tribe shall participate in the EPA's Best Workplaces for Commuters Program (http://www.bestworkplaces.org/index.htm).		
		c. The Tribe shall provide transit passes (free or subsidized) and transit schedule information to employees.		
		d. The Tribe shall provide a curbside covered and lighted passenger waiting area on-site.		
		e. The Tribe shall provide ample covered bicycle parking at commercial areas and parks.		
		f. Buses serving the project site shall be equipped with bicycle racks.		
		g. The Tribe shall consider bicycle and pedestrian circulation in the design of intersections and turning movements, and adequate sidewalk facilities, striped crosswalks, and pedestrian countdown signals.		
		h. The Tribe shall assist in funding the improvements necessary to connect the Bay Trail south of I-580 to the proposed segment north of the freeway.		
		i. A free or reduced parking fee and preferentially located parking spaces shall be provided for carpools (three or more passengers) or vanpools at the project site to encourage ridesharing.		
		j. The Tribe shall sponsor charter buses from various destinations around the Bay Area.		
		k. The Tribe shall provide and fund a shuttle between the		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>project site and one or more transit hubs in the local area.</p> <p>I. The Tribe shall encourage patrons to use public transit by providing coupons (for food, beverage, entertainment, etc.) or other incentives to patrons who arrive via public transit.</p> <p>MM 3-21 Buses and other commercial diesel-fueled vehicles shall comply with the California Air Resource Board's (CARB) Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, Article 1, Chapter 10, Section 2485), which requires that the driver of any diesel bus shall not idle for more than five minutes at any location, except in the case of passenger boarding where a ten minute limit is imposed, or when passengers are onboard. Furthermore, the Tribe shall provide a "Drivers Lounge" for bus and truck drivers to discourage idling.</p> <p>MM 3-22 The Tribe shall work with AC Transit to expand its current service and contribute funds and supplement operating expenses to implement the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus and/or shuttle schedules tied to the timing of employee shifts; and • New routes to serve employee population centers around the project site. <p>MM 3-23 In coordination with the regional transportation agencies, such as AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) rail, the Tribe shall provide funding for the following to support regularly-scheduled community transit or shuttle service to and from the nearest mutually-acceptable major transit node:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Transit shelter benches, b. Street lighting, c. Route signs and display, and d. Bus turnouts. <p>MM 3-24 The Tribe shall maintain all company vehicles to manufacturer's</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		specifications.		
		<p>MM 3-25 The Tribe shall implement and fund the following mitigation measures used in the URBEMIS air quality modeling program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe shall provide building energy savings 20 percent beyond Title 24 requirements. • The Tribe shall use 20 percent electric landscape maintenance equipment. • The Tribe shall use low VOC emitting architectural coatings on commercial and residential buildings. 		
4.4.2	Demolition activities during the construction phase of the proposed development under Alternative A have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.4.3	Operation under Alternative A has the potential to concentrate pollutants and create odors indoors. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 3-45 The Tribe shall ensure that ventilation of air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions.</p> <p>MM 3-46 To limit public exposure to environmental tobacco smoke, the Tribe shall provide non-smoking areas, or “smoke-free zones” in the casino gaming area.</p> <p>MM 3-47 Signage shall be prominently displayed alerting patrons and employees of areas that permit smoking, noting that environmental tobacco smoke has been found to be deleterious to health, and noting the availability of a brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure environmental tobacco smoke.</p> <p>MM 3-48 A brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke shall be made available to casino patrons in common areas that permit smoking.</p> <p>MM 3-49 Prospective employees shall be informed, prior to their hire that indoor smoking is permitted in portions of the buildings where they may be employed.</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM 3-50 Prospective employees shall be given a brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke.</p> <p>MM 3-51 The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. Non-smoking areas shall be located upwind (relative to the direction of building exhaust flow) from those areas that permit smoking.</p> <p>MM 3-52 The Tribe shall ensure that outdoor air entering the building is protected from contamination from local outdoor sources and from building exhausts and sanitation vents.</p> <p>MM 3-53 The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance.</p>		
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.2 Alternative B				
4.4.4	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative B would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-1 through MM 3-25	PS	LTS
4.4.5	Demolition activities during construction phase of the proposed development under Alternative B have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.4.6	Operation under Alternative B has the potential to concentrate pollutants and create odors indoors. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-45 through MM 3-53 .	PS	LTS
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.3 Alternative C				
4.4.7	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative C would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-1 through MM 3-25	PS	LTS
4.4.8	Demolition activities during construction phase of the proposed development under Alternative C have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.4.9	Operation under Alternative C has the potential to concentrate pollutants and create odors indoors. This is a potentially significant impact.	MM 3-45 through MM 3-53 .	PS	LTS
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.4 Alternative D				
4.4.10	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative D would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-1 through MM 3-25 .	PS	LTS
4.4.11	Demolition activities during construction phase of the proposed development under Alternative D have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.5 Alternative E				
4.4.12	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative E would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a less-than-significant impact	Implement MM 3-15 , MM 3-16 , MM 3-18 , MM 3-21 , and MM 3-33 .	LTS	LTS
4.4.13	Renovation activities under Alternative E have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.6 Alternative F				
4.4.14	Under Alternative F no construction or operation; therefore no criteria pollutants would be emitted. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.4.15	Alternative F does not propose demolition activities; therefore, no release of friable asbestos materials would occur. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.4 Air Quality				
4.4.7 Alternative B1				
4.4.16	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative B1 would result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and DPM emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-1 through MM 3-25	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.4.17	Demolition activities during the construction phase of the proposed development under Alternative B1 have the potential to release friable asbestos materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.4.18	Operation under Alternative B1 has the potential to concentrate pollutants and create odors indoors. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 3-45 through MM 3-53 .	PS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.1 Alternative A				
4.5.1	Development of Alternative A has the potential to impact 0.637 acres of annual grassland habitat and 2.443 acres of coastal scrub habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 4-1 Habitat mitigation shall be accomplished by a combined 2:1 replacement/restoration ratio, when appropriate. Replacement/restoration at this ratio is appropriate mitigation for annual grassland and coastal scrub habitats. For every acre of habitat impacted (e.g., coastal scrub), an acre of equivalent habitat type (e.g., coastal scrub) on-site shall be placed into an open space preserve that includes a permanent conservation easement protecting the total area of open space in perpetuity. Open space preserves shall be fenced with post and cable fencing to deter trespassing within the preserves. Boundary signs shall also be installed at appropriately spaced intervals along the perimeter of the preserves to delineate the boundaries of the preserves and discourage trespassing. The boundary signs shall read "Protected Habitat, No Trespassing." In addition to open space preservation, not less than a 1:1 ratio shall be restored (i.e., converted) into the equivalent impacted habitat type. The non-native, on-site habitats (e.g., eucalyptus woodland, invasive scrub, and/or landscape plantings) on-site shall be the habitat areas used for restoration. Once the habitat restoration is achieved, post and cable fencing and boundary signs shall be installed (as mentioned above), along the perimeters of all the restoration areas to discourage trespassing. Table 5-3 below summarizes the mitigation replacement/restoration ratios required for native habitat mitigation when appropriate.</p> <p>MM 4-2 The on-site, mixed riparian habitat shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible. Each alternative shall be amended and reconfigured to the maximum extent feasible such that avoidance of the on-site, mixed riparian habitat is accomplished.</p> <p>MM 4-3</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Setbacks at a minimum of 50 feet shall be established (i.e., staked) around all areas of mixed riparian habitat unless the soils, slope, hydrology, vegetation and runoff potential of adjacent construction areas dictate that a greater buffer distance is required. Prior to the onset of development activities, high visibility fencing shall be installed to delineate the riparian setbacks. A qualified biologist shall be present during development activities that ensue within the vicinity of the fenced riparian setbacks. The qualified biologist shall act as a construction monitor to ensure the fencing remains intact and that construction activities do not penetrate these avoidance buffers. Future development shall not occur within the riparian setbacks once established.</p> <p>MM 4-4 The footprints of Alternatives B, D, and B1 include potential impacts to mixed riparian habitat. Alternatives B, D, and B1 shall be reconfigured to avoid this impact. If complete avoidance of mixed riparian habitat is not feasible and/or the project design cannot be reconfigured to avoid the mixed riparian habitat areas on-site, a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (Fish & Game Code Section 1600 et seq.) shall be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and habitat replacement ratios defined within the permit conditions shall be implemented for development on fee lands. Typical section 1600-permit mitigation occurs at a 3:1 ratio (acres created versus impacted), though individual permit conditions may vary.</p> <p>MM 4-5 The beach strand habitat on-site shall be completely avoided to the maximum extent feasible. Replacement/restoration is not appropriate for this habitat type due to its inherent intrinsic value, role as habitat for plant and wildlife species (including special-status species), increasing threats by development, and its currently limited distribution within the region. Under the current project description, total avoidance of beach strand habitat is accomplished. To assure avoidance and avoid impacts to the beach strand habitat on-site (and Bay Conservation and Development Commission [BCDC] jurisdictional areas), the existing roadways shall be used to the degree feasible. Improvement of the existing roadways may be implemented as necessary, but no new roadways shall be built in the vicinity of the beach strand habitat on-site.</p> <p>MM 4-6 Setbacks shall be established (i.e., staked) around all areas of beach</p>		

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>strand habitat within the footprint and vicinity of project development. Setback distances for areas of beach strand habitats shall be approved through consultation with BCDC taking into account the soils, slope, hydrology, vegetative cover and runoff potential of areas adjacent to beach strand habitat where construction will occur. Prior to the onset of development activities, high visibility fencing shall be installed to delineate the beach strand setbacks. A qualified biologist shall be present during any and all development activities that ensue within the vicinity of the fenced beach strand setbacks. A qualified biologist shall act as a construction monitor to ensure the fencing remains intact and that construction activities do not penetrate these setback buffers. If complete avoidance is not feasible, consultation with BCDC would need to be initiated. Any impacts to beach strand habitat would require explicit approval by BCDC and conditions for such impacts would be specified within a permit, if applicable</p> <p>MM 4-7 The tidal marsh habitat on-site shall be completely avoided. While the final amount of setback will be determined by the jurisdictional agency, a minimum setback of 50 feet is recommended around the tidal marsh habitat on-site as a means of preventing any impacts to it from development. The 50-foot setback buffer shall be approved by the BCDC through consultation taking into account the soils, slope, hydrology, vegetative cover and runoff potential of areas adjacent to beach strand habitat where construction will occur. The exact width of the tidal marsh setback shall likely be a specified condition of the BCDC permit(s). The location of the Bay Trail in each of the alternatives should be amended and reconfigured, if necessary, such that the minimum 50-foot tidal marsh setback is accommodated and maintained. Prior to the onset of development activities, high visibility fencing shall be installed to delineate the tidal marsh setback. A qualified biologist shall be present during any and all development activities that ensue within the vicinity of the fenced tidal marsh setback. The qualified biologist shall act as a construction monitor to ensure the fencing remains intact and that construction activities do not penetrate this setback buffer.</p> <p>MM 4-8 The eelgrass bed habitat on-site shall be completely avoided during construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Specifically, ferries servicing the retrofitted pier shall not come within 1,000 feet of the eel grass bed habitat. Based on the current project description, total avoidance of eelgrass bed habitat is accomplished because only</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the existing pier shall be utilized and the total surface area of the pier shall not be increased. Improvement of the existing pier may be implemented as necessary, but no new piers and/or structures shall be built in the vicinity of the eelgrass bed habitat on-site. All activities associated with the pier reuse shall be approved by the BCDC through consultation, and specific parameters associated with the pier reuse will likely be specified conditions of the BCDC permit(s). Aggregate materials scheduled for processing on-site would be transferred from designated crushing locations to barges docked at the end of the pier using a conveyor belt system. Sufficient dust control of crushed materials would be achieved prior to transport along the conveyor system using approved dust control BMPs. To reassure that all material transported along the conveyor has a low risk of being discharged into the Bay by wind erosion or any other causes, complete enclosure of the conveyor belt system will prohibit any loose aggregate, soils or dust from entering the Bay during these transport operations. All ferry and barge routes will be limited to the deepwater shipping channel when not moored at the pier and velocities shall be reduced as ferries approach the pier to reduce waking. Ferry and barge speeds shall be limited to 10 knots or less within 750 feet of the pier. In addition, ferry traffic will not route from the terminal landward towards the shoreline and the mooring of private boats would not be allowed on the pier. Appropriate signage and/or a buoy system will be implemented to properly inform marine traffic of the sensitive eelgrass habitats and to help keep any misguided vessels away from these habitats. To assess the impacts of the ferry service on eelgrass on and directly adjacent to the project area, eelgrass surveys will be conducted for the project site immediately prior to and annually for three years following the implementation of the proposed ferry service, as recommended in a letter by NMFS dated September 15, 2010 and required by the BIA in a letter dated October 4, 2010 (Appendix FF). The surveys shall be done in accordance with a NMFS approved monitoring plan; the monitoring plan (including the location of a control site) shall be submitted to the NMFS prior to construction. Surveys of eelgrass distribution and density in both the project area and at a suitable control site shall be performed during the eelgrass growing season. Results of the pre- and post- ferry service surveys shall be provided to NMFS Santa Rosa office staff within 60 days of completion. If NMFS determines the project actions have adversely impacted eelgrass in or adjacent to the project area based on pre- and post- work distribution and density surveys, the BIA shall provide NMFS with an eelgrass mitigation plan within 60 days of completion of the final post-ferry survey. The mitigation plan shall include success</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		criteria that are approved by the NMFS.		
		<p>MM 4-9 To assure that the suggested habitat mitigation is implemented and achieved, a comprehensive Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) for the site shall be prepared by a qualified and regionally affiliated vegetation ecologist/restoration specialist. The VMP shall be divided into five components: Open Space Habitat Preserves, Open Space Restoration Preserves, Invasive Plant Species Management, Parkland Management, and Wildfire Prevention. For each of the five components, the VMP shall outline the specific goals of mitigation, describe detailed logistics and instructions for implementation of the specified goals, determine appropriate monitoring regimes and reporting requirements, establish success criteria, and devise an adaptive management strategy to ensure the goals of mitigation are achieved in perpetuity. The detailed composition of native grasses, forbs and shrubs used for restoration and replacement of impacted habitats shall be detailed in the VMP. All native plant species that occur on-site will be harvested for seeds, to the extent feasible, and used for re-establishment in these newly created habitats. The direct transplanting of individual native species or clusters of native species may also occur depending on the area of impact and the native species composition in the impact area. Areas selected for mitigation will be fully evaluated in the VMP, and to the maximum extent feasible, will be consistent in slope, aspect, soil type, and elevation when compared to the impacted habitat. In addition, native grass hydroseed mixes will be used for the re-vegetation of all disturbed slopes onsite consistent with the requirements set forth in the NPDES permit and SWPPP document.</p>		
4.5.2	Development of Alternative A has the potential to impact 0.727 acre of wetlands. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 4-10 The proposed development shall avoid filling of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. to prevent impacts to these features entirely, if feasible. Each alternative shall be amended and reconfigured, if necessary, such that avoidance of wetlands and/or waters of the U.S. is accomplished to the maximum extent feasible. Setbacks of 50 feet shall be established around each of the wetland features within the vicinity of project development unless the soils, slope, hydrology, vegetation and runoff potential depict that a greater buffer distance is required. Setbacks would consist of the installation of high visibility fencing prior to the onset of any development activities. A qualified biologist shall be present during any and all construction activities that</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>ensue within the vicinity of the wetland/other waters avoidance buffer zones. The qualified biologist shall act as a construction monitor to make sure the fencing remains intact and that construction activities do not penetrate the wetland avoidance buffer areas.</p> <p>MM 4-11 If complete avoidance of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. is not possible and impacts to these features cannot be avoided, authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required. A Section 404 CWA permit shall be obtained from the USACE and wetland/other waters replacement ratios defined within the permit conditions shall be implemented. Typical 404-permit mitigation occurs at a ratio of 1:1 acres created versus impacted and 2:1 acres restored versus impacted, though individual permit conditions may vary. A CWA Section 401 water quality certification permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is also required. In addition, a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600-permit) from the CDFG is required for impacts to streams, lakes, and riparian habitats on fee lands. Typical 1600-permit mitigation occurs at a 3:1 ratio of acres created versus impacted, though individual permit conditions may vary</p> <p>MM 4-12 Wetland mitigation shall be accomplished through the creation of seasonal wetlands within open space preserves, which shall be established on-site at agency-approved locations. Ephemeral drainage mitigation shall be accomplished through the restoration of existing on-site streams, which were previously channeled (i.e., piped) underground as part of prior site developments. A detailed mitigation and monitoring plan shall be designed that includes all the necessary details regarding the location and size of the proposed wetlands/ephemeral drainages and open space preserves, monitoring stipulations, reporting requirements, responsibilities, and performance success criteria. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall meet the stipulated requirements of and be written in accordance with the 401, 404, and 1600 permits, if applicable.</p>		
4.5.3	Development of Alternative A would not impact special-status plant species. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.5.4	Development of Alternative A would not impact special-status fish species. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.5.5	Development of Alternative A could impact nesting birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 4-15 Special-status and/or migratory bird and raptor species have potential to nest within the project site. Generally, the nesting season extends from February through September with peak activity taking place from March through June. If any construction activities (e.g., tree and/or vegetation removal, grading) are scheduled to occur during the nesting season, pre-construction bird surveys shall be conducted. Pre-construction surveys for any nesting bird species shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist throughout all regions of the site and vicinity, which are within 500 feet of any proposed construction activity (including thorough coverage of the pier). The surveys shall occur no more than 14 days prior to the scheduled onset of construction activities. If construction is delayed or halted for more than 14 days, another pre-construction survey for nesting bird species shall be conducted. If no nesting birds are detected during the pre-construction surveys no additional surveys are required.</p> <p>MM 4-16 If special-status nesting bird species are observed within 500 feet of construction areas during the surveys, consultation shall be initiated with the CDFG and/or the USFWS. Through consultation, an appropriate course of action, acceptable setbacks, and a suitable monitoring plan shall be determined. If non-special-status nesting birds are observed during the surveys, an appropriate setback shall be determined based on the species, the location of the nest(s), and other pertinent biological attributes. Avoidance setbacks shall be established around all active nest locations via stakes and high visibility fencing. Typical setbacks are 250 feet for bird species and 500 feet for raptor species. The nesting bird setbacks shall be completely avoided during the duration of construction activities and the fencing must remain intact. The fencing may be removed when a qualified wildlife biologist confirms that the nest(s) is no longer occupied and all fledglings have left.</p> <p>MM 4-17 If impacts (i.e., take) to federal or state threatened or endangered bird species are unavoidable, an incidental take permit from the USFWS/CDFG would be required. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, or collect any threatened or endangered bird species. Harm may also include significant habitat modification.</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM 4-18 Outdoor lighting known to attract shorebirds and migratory birds (e.g., advertising lighting, lights on signs, spotlights, floodlights, etc.) shall not be used. All lighting fixtures associated with the development of the proposed project shall be designed to ensure maximum efficiency, eliminate direct upward light, reduce spill (i.e., light that spills beyond the intended areas to be lit, but that is not projected directly upward), be deliberately directed downward, be intentionally directed away from marshes and beaches, and optimize useful light. In addition, motion-sensitive lighting, lower intensity lights, and appropriately programmed timed lights shall be used to the maximum extent feasible. Nighttime lighting shall also be reduced to the maximum extent feasible including turning off lights from the hours of 11 pm to 7 am, unless they are essential for security purposes and are properly designed and installed to reduce light spillage. Lights that must be used during these designated nighttime hours shall be dimmed in order to reduce the intensity of light projected by the project. The proposed project should adhere to the Bird-Friendly Development Guidelines sponsored by the Fatal Light Awareness Program (FLAP, 2008).</p> <p>MM 4-19 The facility shall implement practical measures to deter and/or minimize disturbance by common scavenging mammals (e.g., raccoons, opossums, feral cats, and skunks) which could potentially agitate, disrupt, or otherwise frighten bird species that may be present within the project site. Such measures shall include but are not limited to daily collection and removal of trash generated by the facility, the use of sealed and secure trash dumpsters and bins throughout the facility, and fencing around trash collection areas.</p>		
4.5.6	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative A could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.7	Development of Alternative A has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 4-20 A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within all potentially suitable bat habitats (i.e., buildings which would be modified or demolished, the pier, and the eucalyptus woodland) that occur within the site and vicinity of any proposed construction activities. If no bats and/or evidence of bats (i.e., guano) are detected during the pre-construction surveys, no additional surveys are required.</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		MM 4-21 If bats and/or evidence of bats are detected during the pre-construction surveys, a qualified bat biologist (i.e., specialist) shall facilitate bat evacuation and removal. This typically entails the installation of exclusionary (e.g., mist) nets around occupied habitats while the bats are away from their roosts. The netted habitats shall be monitored frequently at appropriate times and intervals to assure that all the bats have left the roosts and that no bats re-enter during the entire duration of all development activities. The qualified bat biologist shall determine the specific logistics and details regarding bat removal within the larger historic buildings on-site, after he or she has fully assessed the site. When construction activities are completed, the exclusionary nets shall be removed.		
4.5.8	Development of Alternative A would not significantly impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.2 Alternative B				
4.5.9	Development of Alternative B has the potential to impact 7.056 acres of annual grassland habitat, 10.433 acres of coastal scrub habitat, and 1.796 acres of mixed riparian habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.10	Development of Alternative B has the potential to impact 1.842 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.152 acre of seasonal drainage; both are considered waters of the U.S. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-10 through 4-12 .	PS	LTS
4.5.11	Development of Alternative B would impact Suisun marsh aster. This would be a significant impact.	MM 4-13 Alternatives B, D, and B1 shall avoid the on-site population of Suisun Marsh aster to prevent impacts to this special-status plant, if feasible. If feasible, these alternatives shall be amended and reconfigured such that avoidance of the Suisun Marsh aster population and its habitat on-site is accomplished. Setbacks of 50 feet shall be established around the total area where the population occurs via high visibility fencing prior to the onset of development activities. A qualified botanist shall be present during any and all construction activities that ensue within the vicinity of the Suisun Marsh aster setback. The qualified botanist shall act as a construction monitor to ensure the fencing remains intact and that construction activities do not penetrate	SI	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>this setback.</p> <p>MM 4-14 If complete avoidance of the Suisun Marsh aster population is not possible and impacts to this species are unavoidable, consultation shall be initiated with the CDFG (for Alternatives B, D, and B1). Upon CDFG approval, the impacted individual plants shall be transplanted out of their existing locations and into an equivalent and suitable wetland feature(s) that occurs within an established on-site open space preserve. A qualified botanist shall determine the exact transplanting locations and shall supervise all of the transplanting activities. Transplanting activities shall occur during the fall months, prior to the onset of heavy rains and inundation of seasonal wetland features to minimize transplant stress to the plants and assure transplant success. Transplanting activities shall not occur in the spring, summer, or winter months, unless prior approval from the CDFG is obtained.</p>		
4.5.12	Development of Alternative B could impact special-status fish species. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.13	Development of Alternative B could impact nesting birds. This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	SI	LTS
4.5.14	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative B could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.15	Development of Alternative B has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-20 and MM 4-21 .	PS	LTS
4.5.16	Development of Alternative B would not impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.3 Alternative C				
4.5.17	Development of Alternative C has the potential to impact 0.485 acre of annual grassland habitat and 1.022 acres of coastal scrub habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.18	Development of Alternative C has the potential to impact 0.683 acre of jurisdictional seasonal wetlands. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-10 through MM 4-12 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.5.19	Development of Alternative C would not impact special-status plant species. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.5.20	Development of Alternative C could impact special-status fish species. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5.21	Development of Alternative C could impact nesting birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.22	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative C could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.23	Development of Alternative C has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-20 through MM 4-21 .	PS	LTS
4.5.24	Development of Alternative C would not impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.4 Alternative D				
4.5.25	Development of Alternative D has potential to impact 7.849 acres of annual grassland, 13.001 acres of coastal scrub, and 1.899 acres of mixed riparian habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.26	Development of Alternative D has the potential to impact 1.641 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.152 acre of other waters of the U.S. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-10 through MM 4-12 .	PS	LTS
4.5.27	Development of Alternative D would impact Suisun marsh aster. This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 4-13 and MM 4-14 .	SI	LTS
4.5.28	Development of Alternative D could impact special-status fish species. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5.29	Development of Alternative D could impact nesting birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.30	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative D could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.5.31	Development of Alternative D has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-20 and MM 4-21 .	PS	LTS
4.5.32	Development of Alternative D would not impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.5 Alternative E				
4.5.33	Development of Alternative E has potential to impact 0.042 acre of annual grassland and 0.111 acre of coastal scrub. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.34	Development of Alternative E has the potential to impact 0.044 acre of wetlands. This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 4-10 .	SI	LTS
4.5.35	Development of Alternative E would not impact special-status plant species. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.5.36	Development of Alternative E could impact special-status fish species. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.37	Development of Alternative E could impact nesting birds. This would be a significant potentially impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.38	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative E could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through 4-19 .	PS	LTS
4.5.39	Development of Alternative E has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-20 and MM 4-21 .	PS	LTS
4.5.40	Development of Alternative E would not impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.6 Alternative F				
4.5.41	Alternative F may potentially impact the on-site native habitat types due to the presence of invasive scrub habitats that are currently established within the project site and would be likely to expand their distributions. This would be a potentially significant impact.	None proposed.	PS	SI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.5.42	Alternative F would not impact wetlands and other waters of the U.S. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.5.43	Alternative F would impact the Suisun Marsh aster. This is a significant impact.	None proposed.	SI	SI
4.5.44	Alternative F would not impact special-status fish species. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.5.45	Alternative F would not impact nesting bird species. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.5.46	Alternative F would not impact special-status mammal species. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.5.47	Alternative F would not impact other sensitive species considered by the City's General Plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.5 Biological Resources				
4.5.7 Alternative B1				
4.5.48	Development of Alternative B1 has the potential to impact 7.21 acres of annual grassland habitat, 11.97 acres of coastal scrub habitat, and 1.8 acres of mixed riparian habitat. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.49	Development of Alternative B1 has the potential to impact 1.94 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.64 acre of seasonal drainage; both are considered waters of the U.S. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-10 through MM 4-12 .	PS	LTS
4.5.50	Development of Alternative B1 would impact Suisun marsh aster. This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 4-13 and MM 4-14 .	SI	LTS
4.5.51	Development of Alternative B1 could impact special-status fish species. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-8 and MM 4-9 .	PS	LTS
4.5.52	Development of Alternative B1 could impact nesting birds. This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	SI	LTS
4.5.53	Permanent lighting associated with the development of Alternative B1 could impact shorebirds and migratory birds. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-15 through MM 4-19 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.5.54	Development of Alternative B1 has the potential to impact special-status bats. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 4-20 and MM 4-21 .	PS	LTS
4.5.55	Development of Alternative B1 would not impact other species that the City considers sensitive. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-1 through MM 4-9 .	LTS	LTS
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.1 Alternative A				
4.6.1	Construction of Alternative A would result in physical destruction of a contributing element (Building No. 6) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a significant impact.	<p>MM 5-1 For Alternatives A, B, C, D and B1, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) shall be developed that addresses impacts from construction of the project and that provides for long-term treatment and maintenance of historic properties/historical resources located within the project site.</p> <p>The PA shall be developed cooperatively by the City of Richmond, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Tribe, Bureau of Indian Affairs (for Alternatives A – C and B1), and other invited signatories. The agreement shall specify the means by which the significant impacts resulting from the project would be eliminated or reduced. The agreement would apply to the known historic properties/resources within the project site, including the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H), the historic archaeological site (CA-CCO-506H), and the off-site prehistoric archaeological site (CA-CCO-284). While site CA-CCO-283 does not qualify as a historic property/resource, it will be afforded consideration under the PA due to the presence of a limited amount of human bone within the deposit.</p> <p>Provisions of the PA concerning the Winehaven National Register Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) shall address the following:</p> <p>The Tribe shall develop comprehensive Design Guidelines to comply with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> that will govern the rehabilitation of all retained buildings within the Historic District as well as new construction near or within the historic core of the District. The Design Guidelines should incorporate the Preservation regulations of the City of Richmond. Prior to implementation, such guidelines shall be reviewed by the City of Richmond's Historic Preservation Advisory Committee (HPAC). Recommended provisions of the Design Guidelines include the following:</p>	SI	SU

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Winehaven Building (Building #1) carries distinctive decorative detailing that provides a unique texture and design for the building that depends partly upon its basic construction materials. Use of the appropriate materials and design detail in the rehabilitated Winehaven building, as well as all new construction in proximity to it, is critical to the retention of its character-defining image. b. Shoreline development in front of the main Winehaven Building could obscure the building, existing elements of the District, or detract from its character. This activity could occur just outside the District and still affect its setting. This potential impact should be avoided through sensitive placement and appropriate design of new construction. c. All retained contributing elements of the Historic District shall be rehabilitated in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Design Guidelines for the Project that include preservation regulations of the City of Richmond. This will reduce negative impacts of alteration to less than significant. d. Prior to demolition or alteration of any contributing buildings within the Historic District, the 1995 Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation shall be updated. The timbers and wood floors in Building 6 shall be reclaimed for reuse in architectural features of Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1. e. Any new public entrances added to Building #1 shall be designed to be compatible with the character of the building. f. Any attachments to the existing historic buildings should be minimal and reversible. This includes additions, canopies, and exterior lighting. g. Existing windows within Buildings #1, 10, and 13 should be repaired and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Any replacements must match the original windows. Installation of any new windows should be kept to a minimum and should be the same material, size and design character as existing windows. h. Metal sheet hood moldings over the paired windows on the west elevation and the three story portion of the Building #1 should be repaired and replaced. The original material should be retained wherever possible. Where it is missing, new hood moldings should be recreated to match the original. i. New construction south of Building #1 shall be cognizant of 		

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the existing scale, massing, and height of Building #1. The height of new construction shall be stepped-up gradually from the north side of new construction toward the south, with the lower side near Building #1.</p> <p>j. Damaged or deteriorated brickwork throughout Buildings #1, 10, and 13 should be repaired or replaced to match the existing brickwork.</p> <p>k. Any work involving the relocation of utilities, water, sewer or electrical facilities should avoid impacts to the visual character of the existing Historic District and its buildings. Installation of any utility features in visually prominent sites within the District or adjacent to its buildings shall be avoided.</p> <p>l. Building # 17 shall be relocated to an appropriate location within the Historic District in consultation with a qualified architectural historian.</p> <p>m. The two additions flanking the central (original) portion of the fire station (Building #63) shall be removed. These additions are not original and are not in keeping with the construction of the original building.</p> <p>n. Retain open space, or the impression of space, between Building #1 and any new construction south of Building #1. Allow the Powerhouse and hillside to be viewed through space.</p> <p>o. Reconfiguration of Western Drive should de-emphasize the physical division of the east and western portions of the district. Use landscaping to help minimize the visual division.</p> <p>p. Landscaping within the Historic District should remain compatible with the original image of the complex. Historic photographs can be used as a guide.</p> <p>q. Limit the height of any new amenities on the west side of Building #1. New elements shall be oriented away from this area to avoid obscuring the view of the building.</p> <p>r. Incorporate design elements into the new construction that serve the same purpose of architectural detail on the four Teutonic influenced buildings and carry-over existing themes in scale and texture.</p> <p>The PA shall also provide for development of a Treatment Plan to address potential impacts to archaeological sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO-284, and CA-CCO-506H. Recommended mitigation includes the following:</p>		

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>a. All project components and ground disturbance to be constructed in proximity to CA-CCO-506H shall be sited in a manner consistent with the recommendations of Volume II of the cultural resources investigation (Appendix Y) so as to avoid any construction or operational impacts to the resource;</p> <p>b. The core area of site CA-CCO-283, as described in Volume II of the cultural resources investigation (Appendix Y), shall be avoided by all ground disturbing activity;</p> <p>c. Site CA-CCO-284 shall be avoided by ground disturbing activities. Avoidance will be achieved by adhering to recommendations provided in Volume II of the cultural resources investigation (Appendix Y).</p> <p>d. Construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist during construction work involving ground disturbance in the vicinity of the sites;</p> <p>e. Long-term protection of the sites by capping, fencing, or other means to prevent unauthorized or inadvertent intrusion.</p> <p>The PA shall provide for the development of a cultural interpretive center highlighting the long history of Point Molate and the surrounding community. The interpretive center shall be housed at one of the historic buildings within the Winehaven National Register District and shall include exhibits highlighting the history of native peoples, Winehaven, and the role of Point Molate and Richmond in World War II. The former shrimp camp that was located at Point Molate shall be recognized, memorialized, and interpreted throughout the project site in a manner that would not subject it to looting of in situ archaeological remains.</p>		
4.6.2	Construction of Alternative A would result in removal of a contributing element (Building No. 17) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	SI	LTS
4.6.3	Construction of Alternative A would result in alterations to contributing elements of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.6.4	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative A would introduce visual elements, in the form of new construction, within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) that could diminish the integrity of the property's character-defining features. This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	SI	SU
4.6.5	Alternative A has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO-284, and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction activities that may include, but not be limited to, the creation of stormwater retention basins, landscaping, grading, utility trenches, and road work. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.6.6	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative A has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 5-2. The following requirements shall be included in contract specifications for construction activities associated with the Proposed Project, regardless of the alternative selected:</p> <p>In the event that any prehistoric, historic, or paleontological resource are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the resource shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate, shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the qualified professional, then appropriate agency and project representatives and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. All significant cultural or paleontological materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist or paleontologist according to current professional standards.</p> <p>If human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work shall stop within 50 feet of the find and the Contra Costa County Coroner and the Tribe shall be contacted immediately. If the discovery of human remains is made on federal trust land, the BIA archaeologist shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall identify the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall work with the Tribe and/or BIA, as appropriate, to develop a plan for re-interment of the human remains and any associated artifacts. No additional work shall take place within the immediate vicinity of the find until the</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		identified actions have been implemented.		
4.6.7	Construction of project components proposed under Alternative A has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.2 Alternative B				
4.6.8	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B would result in physical destruction of a contributing element (Building No. 6) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	SU
4.6.9	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B would result in removal of a contributing element (Building No. 17) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	LTS
4.6.10	Construction of Alternative B would result in alterations to contributing elements of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.6.11	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B would introduce visual elements, in the form of new construction, within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) that could diminish the integrity of the property's character-defining features. This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	SI	SU
4.6.12	Alternative B has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO-284, and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction activities that may include, but not be limited to, the creation of stormwater retention basins, landscaping, grading, utility trenches, and road work. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.6.13	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.6.14	Construction of project components proposed under Alternative B has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2	PS	LTS
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.3 Alternative C				
4.6.15	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative C would result in physical destruction of a contributing element (Building No. 6) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	SU
4.6.16	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative C would result in removal of a contributing element (Building No. 17) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	LTS
4.6.17	Construction of Alternative C would result in alterations to contributing elements of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	PS	LTS
4.6.18	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative C would introduce visual elements, in the form of new construction, within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) that could diminish the integrity of the property's character-defining features. This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	SU
4.6.19	Alternative C has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO-284, and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction activities that may include, but not be limited to, the creation of stormwater retention basins, landscaping, grading, utility trenches, and road work. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.6.20	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative C has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6.21	Construction of project components proposed under Alternative C has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6 Cultural Resources				

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.6.4 Alternative D				
4.6.22	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative D would result in physical destruction to a contributing element (Building No. 6) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	SI	SU
4.6.23	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative D would result in physical destruction to a contributing element (Building No. 63) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a significant impact.	MM 5-3 The footprint of the northern residential component shall be modified to avoid demolition of Building #63 within the Winehaven Historic District (Alternative D only).	SI	LTS
4.6.24	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative D would result in removal of a contributing element (Building No. 17) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-1 .	SI	LTS
4.6.25	Construction of Alternative D would result in alterations to contributing elements of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-1 .	PS	LTS
4.6.26	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative D would introduce visual elements, in the form of new construction, within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) that could diminish the integrity of the property's character-defining features. This is a significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-1 .	SI	SU
4.6.27	Alternative D has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO284, and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction activities that may include, but not be limited to, the creation of stormwater retention basins, landscaping, grading, utility trenches, and road work. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-1 .	PS	LTS
4.6.28	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative D has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6.29	Construction of project components proposed under Alternative D has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM. 5-2 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.5 Alternative E				
4.6.30	Alternative E would not result in the neglect of structures located within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.6.31	No new construction within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) is proposed under Alternative E. No new visual elements would be introduced. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.6.32	Alternative E has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283 and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the limited park amenities. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	PS	LTS
4.6.33	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative E has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6.34	Construction of the Bay Trail proposed under Alternative E has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.6 Alternative F				
4.6.35	Alternative F may result in the neglect of structures located within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a potentially significant impact.	None proposed.	PS	SU
4.6 Cultural Resources				
4.6.7 Alternative B1				
4.6.36	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B1 would result in removal of a contributing element (Building No. 17) of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	SI	LTS
4.6.37	Construction of Alternative B1 would result in alterations to contributing elements of the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H). This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.6.38	Construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B1 would introduce visual elements, in the form of new construction, within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H) that could diminish the integrity of the property's character-defining features. This is a significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.6.39	Alternative B1 has the potential to physically damage or destroy sites CA-CCO-283, CA-CCO-284, and CA-CCO-506H through ground-disturbing work associated with construction activities that may include, but not be limited to, the creation of stormwater retention basins, landscaping, grading, utility trenches, and road work. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 .	PS	LTS
4.6.40	Ground-disturbing work associated with construction of the project components proposed under Alternative B1 has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources and human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2	PS	LTS
4.6.41	Construction of project components proposed under Alternative B1 has the potential to destroy unknown, unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-2	PS	LTS
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.1 Alternative A				
4.7.1	Implementation of Alternative A would generate substantial economic activity in the regional economy from expenditures on goods and services associated with construction and operation of the project. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.2	Implementation of Alternative A would generate substantial employment opportunities and wages in the regional economy from construction and operational activities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.3	Operation of Alternative A would generate an increase in demand for existing vacant housing from employees relocating to the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.4	Implementation of Alternative A would result in a variety of fiscal impacts, which collectively would result in substantial revenues for federal, state, and County governments. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.5	Alternative A would provide another opportunity for gambling to pathological and problem gamblers, which is expected to increase the rate of pathological and problem gamblers within ten miles of the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 6-1 The Tribe shall provide compensation to an organization that provides services for problem and pathological gamblers within ten miles of the project site for two new licensed counselors. Through the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Tribe and Contra Costa County, the County agrees to provide these additional professionals for gambling addiction prevention and treatment. Compensation to the County for costs related to these professionals is detailed in Section 4.7 and the IGA. The Tribe and County shall further engage in consultation every two years and assess the needs for counselors, based on the discussion of problem and pathological gambling treatment in Section 4.7. The Tribe shall also provide non-monetary support to the California Council on Problem Gambling, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Conducts responsible gambling workshops for Casino employees; •Staffs a 24 hour/day, 7 days/week “Problem Gambling Help Line” with live professional counselors who can provide first contact crisis intervention; •Trains and certifies California Certified Gambling Counselors; •Provides information on cost accessible programs for those with compulsive gambling problems; and •Maintains a “Speakers Bureau” of volunteers to help educate children and adults at schools and community service forums <p>MM 6-2 The Tribe shall adopt a policy statement on problem gambling. The Tribe shall provide training to all appropriate employees regarding the identification of intoxicated patrons gambling; shall adopt procedures to prohibit intoxicated persons from gambling at the gaming establishment; and shall provide information to intoxicated gambling patrons regarding the dangers of intoxicated gambling, and available counseling and treatment resources.</p> <p>Additionally, the Tribe shall take special measures to prevent underage gambling including, at a minimum: (a) appropriate signage, detailing the age limit and possible penalties, shall be posted at all Casino entrance points; (b) Casino floor personnel shall be instructed</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>to contact Casino Security when they suspect that a minor is gambling; and (c) Casino Security shall escort the minor from the Casino, and contact the appropriate law enforcement officials when warranted.</p> <p>MM 6-3 The Tribe shall respectfully and confidentially provide the customer with written information that includes a list of professional gambling treatment programs and self-help groups. The Tribe shall provide information to its guests through signage, pamphlets, and an Internet website that describe the symptoms of problem gambling. Informational brochures shall be available throughout the Casino that discuss how a person knows that he or she has a gambling problem and the ramifications of such a problem in terms of family, friends and social obligations. The brochures shall provide a hotline number that is available to call 24 hours each day, including the Council on Compulsive Gambling of California's 24-hour free and confidential Helpline, which offers problem gamblers and their families' information and referral to self-help and professional services. All appropriate Casino employees shall receive training in the identification of problem gambling. Employees shall offer customers information about available problem gambling resources when signs of problem gambling are evident.</p> <p>Within three months of the Project start date the Tribe shall adopt a comprehensive Responsible Gambling Program ("Program") to support the development of awareness and prevention programs for problem and underage gambling at the gaming establishment. The Manager shall provide a copy of the Program to the County Health Officer for review and comment, and shall consider all comments received, and shall strive to improve the Program on a continuing basis. County and Tribe shall each designate a representative for coordination of the County's Pathological Gambling Treatment Program with the Tribe's Responsible Gambling Program. Within three months of the Project start date, the two representatives shall meet to review opportunities for coordinating and for reviewing the effectiveness of the County's and the Tribe's programs. Additional meetings shall be scheduled quarterly or as determined by the representatives, for the purpose of ongoing coordination and continual improvement of the programs.</p> <p>MM 6-4 The Tribe shall maintain a Self-Exclusion Policy whereby patrons may</p>		

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		request a halt to casino promotional mailings, check cashing privileges, and player club privileges. A patron may also request to be physically excluded from the gaming establishment. Procedures shall be established that allow problem gamblers to assume the responsibility of excluding themselves from any form of gambling at the gaming establishment. These procedures shall outline the steps involved in the initiation of a Self-Exclusion Form, and provide for the processing and retention of the Self-Exclusion Form, patron's return and patron's reinstatement process. Additionally, the Tribe shall maintain an Involuntary Exclusion Policy whereby a patron may be involuntarily subjected to the same provisions associated with the Self-Exclusion Policy, for purposes of preventing the patron's problem gambling.		
4.7.6	Alternative A would introduce a large number of new people into the community, which could then result in an increase in criminal incidents. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.7	Alternative A would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 3-1 through 3-19 , MM 6-1 through MM 6-4 , and MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 (as described below under Transportation/Circulation)	LTS	LTS
4.7.8	Alternative A would result in a variety of impacts to the competitive gaming market. The overall amount of revenue available in the competitive gaming market would increase, and a portion of revenue for Alternative A would be diverted from existing tribal casinos. No existing casino is anticipated to experience a substantial decline in revenue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.9	Alternative A would improve the economic status of the Tribe from revenue generated at the gaming facility, new employment opportunities, and increased wages. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.2 Alternative B				
4.7.10	Implementation of Alternative B would generate substantial economic activity into the regional economy from expenditures on goods and services associated with construction and operation of the project. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.11	Implementation of Alternative B would generate substantial employment opportunities and wages in the regional economy from construction and operational activities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.12	Alternative B would develop new housing, and operation of Alternative B would generate an increase in demand for existing vacant housing from employees relocating to the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.13	Implementation of Alternative B would result in a variety of fiscal impacts, which collectively would result in substantial revenues for federal, state, and County governments. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.14	Alternative B would provide another opportunity for gambling to pathological and problem gamblers, which is expected to increase the rate of pathological and problem gamblers within ten miles of the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 6-1 through MM 6-4 .	PS	LTS
4.7.15	Alternative B would introduce a large number of new people into the community, which would be expected to result in an increase in criminal incidents. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.16	Alternative B would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 .	LTS	LTS
4.7.17	Alternative B would result in a variety of impacts to the competitive gaming market. The overall amount of revenue available in the competitive gaming market would increase, and a portion of revenue for Alternative B would be diverted from existing tribal casinos. No existing casino is anticipated to experience a substantial decline in revenue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.18	Alternative B would improve the economic status of the Tribe from revenue generated at the gaming facility, new employment opportunities, increased wages, and new housing opportunities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice
4.7.3 Alternative C

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.19	Implementation of Alternative C would generate substantial economic output into the regional economy from expenditures on goods and services associated with construction and operation of the project. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.20	Implementation of Alternative C would generate substantial employment opportunities and wages in the regional economy from investment in construction and operational activities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.21	Operation of Alternative C would generate an increase in demand for existing vacant housing from employees relocating to the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.22	Implementation of Alternative C would result in a variety of fiscal impacts, which collectively would result in substantial revenues for the federal, state, and County governments. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.23	Alternative C would provide another opportunity for gambling to pathological and problem gamblers, which is expected to increase the rate of pathological and problem gamblers within ten miles of the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 6-1 through MM 6-4 .	PS	LTS
4.7.24	Alternative C would introduce a large number of new people into the community, which would be expected to result in an increase in criminal incidents. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.25	Alternative C would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 .	LTS	LTS
4.7.26	Alternative C would result in a variety of impacts to the competitive gaming market. The overall amount of revenue available in the competitive gaming market would increase, and a portion of revenue for Alternative C would be diverted from existing tribal casinos. No existing casino is anticipated to experience a substantial decline in revenue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.27	Alternative C would improve the economic status of the Tribe from revenue generated at the gaming facility, new employment opportunities, and increased wages. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.4 Alternative D				
4.7.28	Implementation of Alternative D would generate substantial economic output into the regional economy from expenditures on goods and services associated with construction and operation of the project. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.29	Implementation of Alternative D would generate substantial employment opportunities and wages in the regional economy from investment in construction and operation activities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.30	Alternative D would develop new housing, and operation of Alternative D would generate an increase in demand for existing vacant housing from employees relocating to the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.31	Implementation of Alternative D would result in a variety of fiscal impacts, which collectively would result in substantial revenues for the federal, state, and County governments. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.32	Alternative D would not affect the rate of pathological and problem gamblers in the population. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.33	Alternative D would introduce new people into the community, which would be expected to result in an increase in criminal incidents. However, the increase is not expected to be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.34	Alternative D would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 .	LTS	LTS
4.7.35	Alternative D would not result in impacts to Native American Tribes. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.36	Alternative D would improve the economic status of the Tribe from revenue generated by development of the project and new housing opportunities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.5 Alternative E				
4.7.37	Operation of Alternative E would generate minimal new economic output to businesses in the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.38	Operation of Alternative E would generate minimal new employment opportunities at the project site. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.39	Implementation of Alternative E would not create new housing or demand for existing vacant housing. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.40	Implementation of Alternative E would result in minimal new tax revenues from new spending at local business; however, this would be offset by costs incurred by the City to maintain the project site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.41	Alternative E would not affect the rate of pathological and problem gamblers in the population. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.42	Alternative E would not alter the existing rate of crime in the area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.43	Alternative E would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.44	Alternative E would not result in impacts to Native American Tribes. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.6 Alternative F				
4.7.45	Implementation of Alternative F would not generate any new economic output to businesses in the County. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.46	Implementation of Alternative F would not generate new employment opportunities or wages at businesses in the County. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.47	Implementation of Alternative F would not create new housing or demand for existing vacant housing. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.48	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in fiscal impacts, except the City would be required to expend existing resources to assume management and maintenance of the property. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.49	Alternative F would not affect the rate of pathological and problem gamblers in the population. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.50	Alternative F would not alter the existing rate of crime in the area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7.51	Alternative F would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.52	Alternative F would not result in impacts to Native American Tribes. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.7 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice				
4.7.7 Alternative B1				
4.7.53	Implementation of Alternative B1 would generate substantial economic activity into the regional economy from expenditures on goods and services associated with construction and operation of the project. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.54	Implementation of Alternative B1 would generate substantial employment opportunities and wages in the regional economy from construction and operational activities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.55	Alternative B1 would develop new housing, and operation of Alternative B1 would generate an increase in demand for existing vacant housing from employees relocating to the County. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.7.56	Implementation of Alternative B1 would result in a variety of fiscal impacts, which collectively would result in substantial revenues for federal, state, and County governments. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.7.57	Alternative B1 would provide another opportunity for gambling to pathological and problem gamblers, which is expected to increase the rate of pathological and problem gamblers within ten miles of the project site. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 6-1 through MM 6-4 .	PS	LTS
4.7.58	Alternative B1 would introduce a large number of new people into the community, which would be expected to result in an increase in criminal incidents. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.59	Alternative B1 would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 .	LTS	LTS
4.7.60	Alternative B1 would result in a variety of impacts to the competitive gaming market. The overall amount of revenue available in the competitive gaming market would increase, and a portion of revenue for Alternative B1 would be diverted from existing tribal casinos. No existing casino is anticipated to experience a substantial decline in revenue. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.7.61	Alternative B1 would improve the economic status of the Tribe from revenue generated at the gaming facility, new employment opportunities, increased wages, and new housing opportunities. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.1 Alternative A				
4.8.1	Construction traffic under Alternative A has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 7-1 The Tribe shall provide the City of Richmond (City) and Contra Costa County with a Soil Disposal Plan one month prior the beginning of construction for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1. The Soil Disposal Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil haul truck routes • Soil disposal sites • Barge route • Traffic safety mitigation • Road and right-of-way deterioration restoration funding • Limits on times haul trucks and barges can operate. 	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A two week notice shall be given to residents of the San Pablo Peninsula regarding any temporary blockage on Western Drive. • The Tribe shall determine alternate construction and operational access routes during times of roadway construction in the vicinity of the project site. 		
		<p>MM 7-2 The Tribe shall coordinate all construction activities that would affect traffic flow on Western Drive with local emergency service providers at least one month in advance of construction. Emergency service providers shall be notified of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. All roads shall remain passable to emergency service vehicles at all times. Western Drive shall remain passable to through traffic 24 hours a day, seven days a week to provide access to and from other land uses located on the San Pablo Peninsula. In the event that portions of Western Drive must be closed temporarily, reasonable detours shall be provided such that access to the San Pablo Yacht Harbor and other adjacent land uses is not restricted. This mitigation measure applies to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1.</p>		
		<p>MM 7-3 The Tribe shall develop and provide the City and the California Department of Transportation with a Construction Coordination Plan. Elements of the plan would include, but would not be limited to: routes, hours of operation, and sequencing. This mitigation measure applies to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1.</p>		
4.8.2	Operational traffic under Alternative A has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 7-4 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-5, to re-stripe the eastbound approach of Richmond Parkway to provide a shared right through lane, where there is currently an exclusive right turn lane, would achieve a LOS D at the intersection of Richmond Parkway and Blume Drive/WB I-80 On/Off Ramps under all alternative conditions.</p> <p>MM 7-5 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-5, to the widening and signalization improvements at the intersection of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Andersen Drive proposed in the City of San Rafael's General Plan 2020 Circulation Element, page 173, Exhibit 2, <i>Major Planned Circulation Improvements for the</i></p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><i>intersection at Sir Francis Drake Blvd and Andersen Drive.</i></p> <p>MM 7-6 Implement Mitigation Measures 3-16, 3-18, and 3-20. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Project by providing accessible public transit.</p> <p>MM 7-7 The Tribe shall work with AC Transit and other regional transit providers to expand service, tie bus schedules to the timing of employee shifts, and provide new routes to serve employee population centers. The Tribe shall contribute the necessary funds to supplement AC Transit operating expenses to achieve the expanded services.</p> <p>The Tribe shall develop a Transit Plan that serves as a mechanism to implement the broad range of mitigation measures (Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.7), improvement measures, and project design components concerning transportation issues. The Transit Plan shall be developed in consultation with regional transit providers, the City of Richmond, and the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Council (WCCTAC).</p> <p>MM 7-24 The Tribe shall be required to pay the Traffic Impact Fees established by the City of Larkspur. The fee is currently established at \$3,399 per PM peak hour trip increase (CC Resolution No. 39/92) Alternative A would add 100 PM peak hour trips, Alternative B and B1 would add 114 PM peak hour trips, Alternative C would add 63 PM peak hour trips, and Alternative D would add 61 PM peak hour trips to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in the City of Larkspur. Because the Larkspur General Plan Policy M states that "Sir Francis Drake Boulevard shall not be widened to allow additional through traffic lanes", the Traffic Impact Fees would be utilized to reduce trips in the area through transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements. Current plans for the area include improvements associated with the Central Marin Ferry Connection Project and the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) Train Project. Transportation Impact Fees may also be appropriated to improve bus transit and shuttle service systems proposed for the SMART Train Project (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1).</p> <p>MM 7-25 In the course of widening and improving Western Drive (applicable to</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1), a left-hand turn pocket shall be provided to the entrance to the Caltrans maintenance yard located between the Richmond – San Rafael Bridge toll plaza and Western Drive.</p> <p>IM 7-19 The Tribe shall fund the City for signage directing patrons to the Proposed Project along the primary travel corridors. In addition, the Tribe shall provide funding to place street lights and underpass lighting along direct paths to the Proposed Projects from I-580 (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, and B1).</p> <p>IM 7-20 In conjunction with the widening and other improvements proposed for Western Drive (refer to Section 2.0), bicycle lanes in the roadway shall be provided from the project site to the existing trail under I-580 if the Bay Trail segment between the Point Molate and I-580 is not functional by the time the Proposed Project becomes operational. In addition, a sidewalk will be provided along Western Drive for the length of the Point Molate property, regardless of functionality of the Bay Trail at the time the Project becomes operable (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1).</p> <p>IM 7-21 The Tribe shall fully fund widening Standard Avenue to add an additional eastbound through lane on Standard Avenue at Castro Street (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1).</p> <p>IM 7-22 The Tribe shall fully fund widening the westbound approach to I-580 on Castro Street from Tewksbury Avenue to the I-580 westbound on-ramp to provide an additional exclusive lane for the I-580 westbound on-ramp (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1).</p> <p>IM 7-13 The Tribe shall fully fund improvements to the Tewksbury Avenue bus turnaround. These improvements shall include: constructing bus shelters, improve bus benches, landscaping, and lighting (applicable to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1).</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.3	Construction traffic under Alternative A has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.4	Operational traffic under Alternative A has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadway segments within the study area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.5	Construction traffic under Alternative A has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3	PS	LTS
4.8.6	Operational traffic under Alternative A would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.7	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative A would provide adequate parking. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.8	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative A would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.9	Operation of ferry service, under Alternative A, has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic in the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.8.10	Implementation of Alternative A has the potential to increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.11	Implementation of Alternative A would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.12	Implementation of Alternative A has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

4.8 Transportation
4.8.2 Alternative B

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.13	Construction traffic under Alternative B has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.14	Operational traffic under Alternative B has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 , MM 7-24 and MM 7-25 , and IM 7-19 through IM 7-23 . Additionally implement: IM 7-18 Housing on the project site (applicable only to Alternatives B, D, and B1) will be served with a free on-site shuttle system (fully funded by the Tribe) to BART, the Winehaven entertainment district, and the ferry pier.	PS	LTS
4.8.15	Construction traffic under Alternative B has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.16	Operational traffic under Alternative B has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.17	Construction traffic under Alternative B has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.18	Operational traffic under Alternative B has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.19	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative B would provide adequate parking. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.20	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative B would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.21	Operation of ferry service, under Alternative B, has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic within the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.22	Implementation of Alternative B has the potential to increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.23	Implementation of Alternative B would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.24	Implementation of Alternative B has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.3 Alternative C				
4.8.25	Construction traffic under Alternative C has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3	PS	LTS
4.8.26	Operational traffic under Alternative C has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 , MM 7-24 , and MM 7-25 and IM 7-19 through IM 7-23 .	PS	LTS
4.8.27	Construction traffic under Alternative C has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.28	Operational traffic under Alternative C has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.29	Construction traffic under Alternative C has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.30	Operational traffic under Alternative C would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.31	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative C would provide adequate parking. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.32	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative C would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.33	Operation of ferry service, under Alternative C, has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic in the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.8.34	Implementation of Alternative C has the potential to increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.35	Implementation of Alternative C would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.36	Implementation of Alternative C has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.4 Alternative D				
4.8.37	Construction traffic under Alternative D has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.38	Operational traffic under Alternative D has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 , MM 7-24 , and MM7-25 , and IM 7-18 and 7-23 .	PS	LTS
4.8.39	Construction traffic under Alternative D has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.40	Operational traffic under Alternative D has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.41	Construction traffic under Alternative D has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.42	Operational traffic under Alternative D would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.43	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative D would provide adequate parking. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.44	Construction and operation traffic under Alternative D would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.45	Operation of ferry service under Alternative D has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic in the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.8.46	Implementation of Alternative D has the potential to increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.47	Implementation of Alternative D would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.48	Implementation of Alternative D has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.5 Alternative E				
4.8.49	Development of Alternative E would introduce limited new traffic to the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.50	Construction traffic under Alternative E would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 7-2 and 7-3	LTS	LTS
4.8.51	Operational traffic under Alternative E would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.52	Adequate parking would be available for the construction and operational traffic under Alternative E. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.53	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative E would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.54	Implementation of Alternative E has the potential to slightly increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.55	Implementation of Alternative E would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the project study area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.56	Implementation of Alternative E has the potential to slightly increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.6 Alternative F				
4.8.57	Alternative F would not introduce new traffic to the study area. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.8.58	Alternative F would not introduce restrictions on alternative transportation uses. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.8.59	Alternative F would not introduce new riders to the regional transportation system. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.8 Transportation				
4.8.7 Alternative B1				
4.8.60	Construction traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.61	Operational traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic load of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-4 through MM 7-7 , MM 7-24 and MM 7-25 , and IM 7-18 through IM 7-23 .	PS	LTS
4.8.62	Construction traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.8.63	Operational traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to increase the existing traffic load of roadways within the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.64	Construction traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 7-1 through MM 7-3 .	PS	LTS
4.8.65	Operational traffic under Alternative B1 has the potential to result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.66	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative B1 would provide adequate parking. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.67	Construction and operational traffic under Alternative B1 would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.68	Operation of ferry service, under Alternative B1, has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic within the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.8.69	Implementation of Alternative B1 has the potential to increase riders on local rail and bus services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.70	Implementation of Alternative B1 would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses along roadways in the study area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.8.71	Implementation of Alternative B1 has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.1 Alternative A				
4.9.1	The proposed development under Alternative A would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.2	The proposed development under Alternative A would conflict with some applicable City General Plan land use policies and zoning designations adopted for the project site. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.9.3	Alternative A would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.4	The proposed development under Alternative A would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.2 Alternative B				
4.9.5	The proposed development under Alternative B would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.6	The proposed development under Alternative B would conflict with applicable City General Plan land use policies related to housing development and with existing land use and zoning designations for the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement IM 8-1 The Tribe shall place a community warning sirens at appropriate locations on the project site. IM 8-2 Approximately one-third of housing units will be set aside in a Tribe-subsidized affordable housing program for tribal members. MM 8-3 For the proposed residential development, the Tribe shall coordinate with the City of Richmond Housing and Community Development Division to include an affordable housing component or pay an in-lieu fee to the City.	PS	LTS
4.9.7	Alternative B would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.8	Proposed development under Alternative B would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.3 Alternative C				
4.9.9	The proposed development under Alternative C would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.9.10	The proposed development under Alternative C would conflict with applicable City General Plan land use policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. However, this is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.11	Alternative C would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.12	The proposed development under Alternative C would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.4 Alternative D				
4.9.13	The proposed development under Alternative D would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.14	The proposed development under Alternative D would conflict with two applicable City General Plan land use policies related to housing development and would conflict with existing land use and zoning designations for the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement IM 8-1, 8-2, and MM 8-3.	PS	LTS
4.9.15	Alternative D would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.16	Proposed development under Alternative D would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.5 Alternative E				
4.9.17	Alternative E would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.18	Alternative E would conflict with applicable existing City General Plan and BCDC Bay Plan land use policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.9.19	Alternative E would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.20	Alternative E would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.6 Alternative F				
4.9.21	Alternative F would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.22	Alternative F would conflict with applicable City General Plan and BCDC Bay Plan land use policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None proposed.	LTS	LTS
4.9.23	Alternative F would be compatible with surrounding land uses. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.24	Alternative F would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9 Land Use				
4.9.7 Alternative B1				
4.9.5	The proposed development under Alternative B1 would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.9.6	The proposed development under Alternative B1 would conflict with applicable City General Plan land use policies related to housing development and with existing land use and zoning designations for the project site. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement IM 8-1, 8-2, and MM 8-3.	PS	LTS
4.9.7	Alternative B1 would not result in a physical change in the environment that would be substantially incompatible with existing land uses. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.9.8	Proposed development under Alternative B1 would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10 Utilities and Public Services				

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.1 Alternative A				
4.10.1	Development of Alternative A would result in an increased demand on the regional water supply. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 9-1 The Tribe shall incorporate the following water conservation measures into development and operation of the selected project alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Tribe shall comply with the Model Water Efficient landscape Ordinance, AB 325 (or the functional equivalent for Tribal trust land), including the development of a landscape documentation package including all the required provisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Water Conservation Concept Statement ii. Calculation of Maximum Applied Water Allowance iii. Calculation of the Estimated Applied Water Use iv. Calculation of the Estimated Total Water Use v. Landscape Design Plan vi. Irrigation Design Plan vii. Irrigation Schedules viii. Maintenance Schedule ix. Landscape Irrigation Audit Schedule x. Grading Design Plan xi. Soil Analysis xii. Certificate of Substantial Completion. b. The landscape architecture plan shall include the use of native, drought tolerant plants to reduce irrigation demands. c. The Tribe will comply with Section 31, Water Efficiency Requirements, of the Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers. The Water Efficiency Requirements that shall be implemented include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inclusion of high efficiency toilets and low flow shower heads and faucets. ii. Landscaping plans shall be submitted to EBMUD. iii. No more than 20 percent of landscaping shall be non-native plants, these plants shall be grouped and irrigated separately and efficiently. iv. Irrigation systems shall avoid overspray and runoff and shall be operated at no more than 80 percent of the reference evapotranspiration. v. Irrigation controllers shall be automatic and self-adjusting to account for changes in the weather. 	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. A dedicated irrigation meter shall be installed on the system. vii. Commercial refrigeration shall be air-cooled, or closed looped if water cooled. viii. Ice-machines shall be air-cooled or use no more than 25 gallons of water per 100 pounds of ice and be equipped with a recirculating cooling unit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. The Tribe shall limit the washing of bedding, towels, and linens from hotel activities to once after each guest's checkout, unless otherwise requested by the guest. e. All landscaping plans shall be reviewed and adjusted seasonally based on temperature and rainfall in order to minimize water use. 		
4.10.2	Development of Alternative A would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities, but would result in the need for upgrades to the water system delivery infrastructure. This would be a potentially significant impact.	MM 9-2 The Tribe shall incorporate the provisions of the East Bay Municipal Utility District's (EBMUD) application process for water service and pay its corresponding fair share contribution for required upgrades to the off-site EBMUD distribution system.	PS	LTS
4.10.3	Development of Alternative A would result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services. This would be a potentially significant impact.	MM 9-3 The Tribe shall apply to connect to the Richmond Municipal Sewer District (RMSD) for conveyance and treatment of wastewater generated at the project site. In accordance with the application procedure, the Tribe shall pay its fair share for improvements, if necessary, consistent with typical commercial requests for service, to fund upgrades to the conveyance system to reduce existing rates of infiltration and inflow to such an extent as to provide adequate conveyance and treatment capacity for the selected alternative's peak day wastewater generation rate.	PS	LTS
4.10.4	Implementation of Alternative A would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.5	Construction and operation of Alternative A would result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. This impact would be less than significant.	IM 9-4 Construction waste shall be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable building materials from the solid waste stream. To the extent feasible, existing asphalt and concrete shall be processed and reused on-site. To the extent	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		practical, environmentally preferable materials shall be used in construction.		
4.10.6	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative A would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This is a less-than-significant impact.	<p>IM 9-5 The Tribe shall adopt a Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) that addresses recycling and solid waste reduction on the project site. The measures adopted under this plan shall be applied to the design of the hotel, casino and event center facilities, as well as the daily operations and waste disposal of the project. These measures shall include, but would not be limited to, the installation of a trash compactor for cardboard and paper products, recycling bins in each hotel room (unless housecleaners can more efficiently separate recyclables from trash during room cleaning) and next to every trash bin throughout the facilities, and an annual waste stream analysis. Regulations within the SWMP shall call for the diversion away from the waste stream of 50 percent of waste produced at the project.</p> <p>IM 9-6 Trash containers shall be emptied daily. Dumpsters shall be located in an enclosed area with concrete floors, which slope to drains that connect to the facility's sanitary sewer system. Dumpsters shall be equipped with roofs and metal doors and shall be emptied and trash shall be removed from the site daily. The enclosed dumpster area shall be hosed down daily and all excess refuse shall be removed from the area. Trash shall be picked up from parking lots, grassy swales, and park area daily.</p>	LTS	LTS
4.10.7	Alternative A would result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services. This impact would be less than significant.	<p>IM 9-22 The Tribe shall purchase and install onsite fuel cells, providing a source of clean alternative energy to the Proposed Project.</p>	LTS	LTS
4.10.8	Alternative A could result in the need for new or expanded fire stations or medical facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 9-7 The Tribe shall use fire resistant construction materials for the larger buildings and equip all enclosed buildings with automatic sprinkler systems. The automatic sprinkler systems shall be designed to meet or exceed the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards governing the different occupancies associated with the project structures.</p> <p>MM 9-8 Twenty-four hour surveillance shall be implemented to afford timely detection and early intervention of any fires.</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM 9-9 Through the use of modern construction and fire engineering techniques, the Tribe shall include built-in automatic systems designed to contain any fire to the room of origin.</p> <p>MM 9-10 Through the use of modern fire engineering technology, the Tribe shall create and maintain a facility equipped with the latest early detection systems to insure an initial response to any fire alarm (automatic, local, or report) within three minutes. This would rely on automatic sprinkler systems in the occupied areas and smoke detection devices in the areas of the facility that are normally unoccupied, such as storerooms and mechanical areas.</p> <p>MM 9-11 Pursuant to Article 5 Section 5.1(b) of the MSA, the Tribe shall contract with the City at the City's actual cost, to provide services such as building, engineering and public works plan-checking and inspections with respect to all improvements on the Property (see page E-7 of Appendix C).</p> <p>MM 9-12 The Tribe shall adopt a Fire Ordinance that is the functional equivalent of the City's Municipal Code 8.16.40.</p> <p>IM 9-13 Pursuant to Article 2 Section 2.3(a) of the MSA, the Tribe has agreed to provide a fire station on-site without charge and to maintain the office space in good working condition. To meet this obligation, the Tribe shall provide the City of Richmond with a Combined Emergency Service Center to facilitate adequate Fire Department response times on-site. The Combined Emergency Service Center, which would be located on the ground floor of the primary parking garage and shared with the Richmond Police Department, shall be approximately 7,500 sq. ft. (including vehicle space) and would have the following amenities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire Department - 4 sleeping rooms, living room, showers, gym, restrooms, fueling station (diesel), double apparatus bay, and shall be first priority for back-up electrical generators. • Provide for one (1) fire captain and three (3) firefighter positions per shift on a 24-hour per day basis to meet the burdens undertaken by the Fire Department to serve the project site. 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.9	Alternative A could result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for a new or expanded police station, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 9-14 The Tribe shall provide on-site security for casino operations to reduce and prevent criminal and civil incidents.</p> <p>MM 9-15 The Tribe shall adopt a “Responsible Alcoholic Beverage Policy” that would include, but not be limited to, requesting identification of patrons and refusing service to those who have had enough to drink. This policy shall be discussed with the Richmond Police Department.</p> <p>MM 9-16 All security guards shall carry two-way radios to respond to emergency related calls and to provide backup. This would aid in the prevention of criminal activity within gaming facilities.</p> <p>MM 9-17 Areas surrounding the gaming facilities shall have “No Loitering” signs in place, be well lit, and be patrolled regularly to aid in the prevention of illegal loitering and loitering behavior that could potentially lead to other criminal acts.</p> <p>MM 9-18 All parking areas shall be well lit and monitored by parking staff and/or roving security guards at all times during operation to aid in the prevention of auto theft and other related criminal activity.</p> <p>IM 9-19 Pursuant to Article 2 Section 2.1 of the MSA, the Tribe has agreed to provide office space to the Police Department on-site without charge and to maintain the office space in good working condition. To meet this obligation, the Tribe shall provide the City of Richmond with a Combined Emergency Service Center to facilitate adequate Police Department response times on-site. This improvement measure would also apply to Alternative D, which is not covered by the MSA. The Combined Emergency Service Center, which would be shared with the Richmond Fire Department, shall be approximately 7,500 sq. ft. (including vehicle space) and would have the following amenities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Department - interview room, reception area, office space (up to 3 offices), combined meeting/break room, storage space, and restrooms. 	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>IM 9-20 Pursuant to Schedule 2.2 of the MSA, the Tribe agrees to fund nine new Police Department staff positions and associated equipment in order to provide police services on-site under Alternatives A, B, C, and B1. The Tribe shall fund an additional two new Uniformed Patrol Beat police officer positions (total of 11 new staff positions).</p> <p>IM 9-21 Pursuant to Article 12 Section 2.1 of the MSA, the Tribe and the City shall meet on a quarterly basis to consider issues related to implementation of, amendments to, or concerns with, the MSA. As part of this process, Tribe and City shall periodically review the adequacy of police staffing on-site. Evaluation of the adequacy of police staffing shall consider objective criteria, including the number of calls responded to by the Richmond Police Department, response times, and the City's target officer-to-citizen ratio. The Tribe shall hire additional Tribal police or compensate the City to hire additional staff should the need arise.</p>		
4.10.10	Alternative A would not result in the need for new or expanded schools in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. This would be a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.11	Alternative A would include the creation of new on-site park and recreational facilities, which would not substantially deteriorate existing recreational or regional parks. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.11a	Without the enforcement of building, fire safety, and other codes, Alternative A could result in the deterioration of the public health and safety of employees and patrons of the proposed facilities. A potentially significant impact would occur.	<p>MM 9-23 For trust lands, the Tribe shall adopt a Tribal Ordinance related to the maintenance of health and safety of retail food facilities, public swimming pools/spas, well drilling, well abandonment, soil borings, and disposal of medical waste that is the functional equivalent of the applicable sections of the Contra Costa County Code of Ordinances.</p> <p>MM 9-24 For lands held in fee title, the project proponent shall abide by all applicable sections of the Contra Costa County Code of Ordinances related to health and safety measures of retail food facilities, public swimming pools/spas, well drilling, well abandonment, soil borings, and disposal of medical waste.</p>	PS	LTS

4.10 Utilities and Public Services

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.2 Alternative B				
4.10.12	Development of Alternative B would result in an increased demand on the regional water supply, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.13	Development of Alternative B would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities, but would result in the need for upgrades to the water system delivery infrastructure. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-2 .	PS	LTS
4.10.14	Development of Alternative B would result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-3 .	PS	LTS
4.10.15	Implementation of Alternative B would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.16	Construction and operation of Alternative B would result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-4 and IM 9-5 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.17	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative B would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-5 and IM 9-6 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.18	Alternative B would result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-22 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.19	Alternative B could result in the need for new or expanded fire stations or medical facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-7 through MM 9-12 , and IM 9-13 .	PS	LTS
4.10.20	Alternative B could result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded police stations, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-14 through MM 9-18 , and IM 9-19 through IM-21 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.21	Alternative B could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. However, this impact is less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.22	Alternative B would include the creation of new on-site park and recreational facilities, which would not substantially deteriorate existing recreational or regional parks. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.22a	Without the enforcement of building, fire safety, and other codes, Alternative B could result in the deterioration of the public health and safety of employees and patrons. A potentially significant impact would occur.	Implement MM 9-23 and MM 9-24 .	PS	LTS
4.10 Utilities and Public Services				
4.10.3 Alternative C				
4.10.23	Development of Alternative C would result in an increased demand on the regional water supply, although to a lesser extent than Alternative A. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.24	Development of Alternative C would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities, but would result in the need for upgrades to the water system delivery infrastructure. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-2 .	PS	LTS
4.10.25	Development of Alternative C would result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-3 .	PS	LTS
4.10.26	Implementation of Alternative C would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.27	Construction and operation of Alternative C would result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-4 through IM 9-6 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.28	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative C would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-5 and IM 9-6 .	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.29	Alternative C would result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services, although to a lesser extent than Alternative A. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement MM 9-22 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.30	Alternative C could result in the need for new or expanded fire stations or medical facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-7 through MM 9-12 , and IM 9-13 .	PS	LTS
4.10.31	Alternative C could result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded police stations, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-14 through MM 9-18 and IM 9-22 through IM 9-21 .	PS	LTS
4.10.32	Alternative C would not result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. This is a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.33	Alternative C would include the creation of new on-site park and recreation facilities, which would not substantially deteriorate existing recreational or regional parks in the area. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.33a	Without the enforcement of building, fire safety, and other codes, Alternative C could result in the deterioration of the public health and safety of employees and patrons. A potentially significant impact would occur.	Implement MM 9-23 and MM 9-24 .	PS	LTS
4.10 Utilities and Public Services				
4.10.4 Alternative D				
4.10.34	Development of Alternative D would result in an increased demand on the regional water supply. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-1 .	PS	LTS
4.10.35	Development of Alternative D would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities, but would result in the need for upgrades to the water system delivery infrastructure. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-2 .	PS	LTS
4.10.36	Development of Alternative D would result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-3 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.37	Implementation of Alternative D would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.38	Construction and operation of Alternative D would result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-4 through IM 9-6 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.39	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative D would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-5 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.40	Alternative D would result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services, to a greater extent than Alternative A. However, this would be a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.41	Alternative D could result in the need for new or expanded fire stations and medical facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 9-7 through 9-10	LTS	LTS
4.10.42	Alternative D could result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded police stations, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-18	PS	LTS
4.10.43	Alternative D could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This is a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.44	Alternative D would include the creation of new park and recreational facilities, which would not substantially deteriorate existing recreational or regional parks in the area. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.44a	Alternative D would not result in the deterioration of the public health and safety of employees and patrons. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted	LTS	LTS

4.10 Utilities and Public Services
4.10.5 Alternative E

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.45	Development of Alternative E would not result in an increased demand on the regional water supply. No impact would occur .	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.46	Development of Alternative E would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities. No impact would occur..	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.47	Development of Alternative E would not result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.48	Development of Alternative E would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.49	Alternative E would not result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.50	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative E would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.51	Alternative E would not result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.52	Alternative E would not result in the need for new or fire stations or medical facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.53	Alternative E would not result in the need for new or expanded police stations to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.54	Alternative E would not result in the need for new or expanded schools in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.55	Alternative E includes the creation of new on-site park and recreational facilities. A beneficial impact would occur.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.55a	Alternative E would not result in the demand for increased public health and safety services. A less than significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10 Utilities and Public Services				
4.10.6 Alternative F				
4.10.56	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in an increased demand on the regional water supply. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.57	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.58	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.59	Implementation of Alternative F would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.60	Alternative F would not result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.61	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative F would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.62	Alternative F would not result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.63	Alternative F would not result in the need for new or expanded fire stations or medical facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.64	Alternative F would not result the need for new or expanded police stations, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.65	Alternative F would not result in the need for new or expanded schools, to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.66	Alternative F would not result in the need for new or expanded parks and recreation facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.66a	Alternative F would not result in the demand for increased public health and safety services. A less than significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10 Utilities and Public Services				
4.10.7 Alternative B1				
4.10.67	Development of Alternative B1 would result in an increased demand on the regional water supply, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.68	Development of Alternative B1 would not result in expansion of existing water treatment facilities, but would result in the need for upgrades to the water system delivery infrastructure. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-2 .	PS	LTS
4.10.69	Development of Alternative B1 would result in an increased demand on wastewater collection and treatment services, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-3 .	PS	LTS
4.10.70	Implementation of Alternative B1 would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board or the USEPA. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.10.71	Construction and operation of Alternative B1 would result in additional demand for solid waste disposal. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-4 and IM 9-5 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.72	Solid waste from the construction and operation of Alternative B1 would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-5 and IM 9-6 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.73	Alternative B1 would result in additional demand for energy and telecommunications services, to a greater extent than Alternative A. This would be a less than significant impact.	Implement IM 9-22 .	LTS	LTS
4.10.74	Alternative B1 could result in the need for new or expanded fire stations or medical facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-7 through MM 9-12 , and IM 9-13 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.10.75	Alternative B1 could result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded police stations, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would be a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 9-14 through MM 9-18 , and IM 9-19 through IM-21 .	PS	LTS
4.10.76	Alternative B1 could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. However, this impact is less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.77	Alternative B1 would include the creation of new on-site park and recreational facilities, which would not substantially deteriorate existing recreational or regional parks. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.10.78	Without the enforcement of building, fire safety, and other codes, Alternative B1 could result in the deterioration of the public health and safety of employees and patrons. A potentially significant impact would occur.	Implement MM 9-23 and MM 9-24 .	PS	LTS
4.11 Noise				
4.11.1 Alternative A				
4.11.1	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative A could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	<p>IM 10-1 Engine-powered construction equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers and enclosures, as supplied by the manufacturer. Such construction equipment shall be maintained in good condition.</p> <p>IM 10-2 Any engine-powered construction equipment located adjacent to residential uses for more than 5 days shall be shielded from those uses by temporary barriers.</p>	LTS	LTS
4.11.2	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative A could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a potentially significant impact.	<p>MM 10-3 The Tribe shall implement noise control measures, which may include, but not be limited to, compliance with Title 24 of the California Administrative Code (CCR Title 24) indoor noise standards, construction of berms, setbacks of residences approximately 275 feet from the centerline of Western Drive, or include structural design features to reduce inside noise levels, where feasible. The resort facilities will include at least one music/concert/banquet hall that is built to minimize the release of sound from within the hall. Noise control measures shall be incorporated into the project design, where feasible.</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p>MM 10-4 The project applicant shall incorporate site-specific features in the design of residential developments on the project site that reduces noise exposure at outdoor activity areas (e.g., private balconies and common outdoor activity areas), if feasible. For instance, outdoor activity areas that are part of a multifamily residential development could be located such that the building(s) serve as a sound barrier to the nearest predominant noise source. However, balconies should not be prohibited on the basis of noise exposure so long as applicable interior noise standards are achieved and so long as an outdoor activity area that satisfies the exterior noise standards is available to the residents.</p> <p>MM 10-5 Refuse dumpsters and commercial loading and unloading areas shall be located as far as reasonably possible from existing off-site sensitive receptors, as well as from common outdoor activity areas of proposed residential buildings. Refuse containers shall also be located such that buildings shield nearby residential land uses from noise generated by loading dock and garbage collection activities.</p>				
4.11 Noise				
4.11.2 Alternative B				
4.11.3	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative B could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement IM 10-1 and IM 10-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.11.4	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative B could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 10-3 through 10-5 .	PS	LTS
4.11.5	Noise from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative B could result in increased ambient noise level at on-site residential noise receptors. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.11 Noise				
4.11.3 Alternative C				
4.11.6	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative C could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement IM 10-1 and IM 10-2 .	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.11.7	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative C could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 10-3 through 10-5 .	PS	LTS
4.11 Noise				
4.11.4 Alternative D				
4.11.8	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative D could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement IM 10-1 and IM 10-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.11.9	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative D could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 10-3 through 10-5 .	PS	LTS
4.11.10	Noise from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative B could result in increased ambient noise level at on-site residential noise receptors. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.11 Noise				
4.11.5 Alternative E				
4.11.11	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative E could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.11.12	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative E could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic and refuse handling. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.11 Noise				
4.11.6 Alternative F				
4.11.13	Alternative F would not result in a temporary increases in the ambient noise level, due to noise and vibration from construction activities. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.11.14	Alternative F would not result in a permanent increase in the ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.11 Noise				
4.11.7 Alternative B1				
4.11.15	Noise and vibration from construction activities of the proposed development under Alternative B1 could result in a temporary increased ambient noise level. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement IM 10-1 and IM 10-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.11.16	Noise and vibration from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative B1 could result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 10-3 through 10-5 .	PS	LTS
4.11.17	Noise from operational activities of the proposed development under Alternative B1 could result in increased ambient noise level at on-site residential noise receptors. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.1 Alternative A				
4.12.1	Alternative A would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	MM 11-1 To protect construction personnel from potential exposure to undiscovered hazardous materials, a site-specific hazardous materials inadvertent discovery plan (Plan) or an equivalent soil and groundwater management plan (SMP) that addresses inadvertent discovery of hazardous materials, shall be developed for the project prior to any grading or ground disturbing activities. The Plan shall define protocols to be implemented if suspected contamination is found during mass grading and excavation activities associated with site development. These protocols shall include identification of how soils and affected groundwater are to be managed and requiring hourly field measurements within active excavation areas during hillside UST excavation. Hourly field measurements shall also be required within active soil stockpile areas and confined spaces. The Plan shall be implemented by a professional engineer registered in the State of California and shall include hourly field measurements for undiscovered contaminants using a photo ionization detector (PID) for measuring volatile organic compounds (VOCs), confined space	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>monitor (oxygen, carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulfide, and lower explosive limit), and any other monitor deemed appropriate by the registered engineer. If deemed necessary by the engineer, soil samples shall be collected and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons in areas of suspected contamination. If suspected contamination is found during construction activities, all work shall stop in the immediate area and a safe zone for construction personnel shall be established. The extent of contamination shall be assessed to determine whether there is a significant health risk to construction personnel working on-site. The SMP would also include construction personnel safety protocols according to Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) guidelines to be implemented as part of the SMP. The Tribe shall ensure through contractual obligations that OSHA guidelines are followed during construction activity and any potential removal of affected soils.</p> <p>Construction and Remediation The following mitigation measures should be included as part of a site specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce the potential for hazardous materials releases during construction and remediation of Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any hazardous materials or fuels that would be stored temporarily for project construction and remediation shall be properly containerized to minimize the potential for release. b. The Tribe shall ensure, through the enforcement of contractual obligations, that all contractors prepare hazardous materials business plans and that they transport, store, and handle construction and remediation-related hazardous materials in a manner consistent with applicable regulations and guidelines. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to, transporting and storing materials in appropriate and approved containers, maintaining required clearances, and handling materials in accordance with the applicable federal, state, and/or local regulatory agency protocols. c. In compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA), a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses hazardous materials impacts associated with construction, remediation, and operation of the project. Hazardous materials control measures identified in the SWPPP shall include, but not be limited to, the following: 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A spill prevention and countermeasure plan shall be developed, which identifies proper storage, collection, and disposal measures for potential pollutants (such as fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) used on-site. • Petroleum products shall be stored, handled, used, and disposed of properly in accordance with provisions of the Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 to 1387). • During the wet season, construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals, and quarried materials transported by barge (regardless of the season) shall be stored, covered, and isolated to prevent runoff losses and contamination of surface and groundwater. • Fuel and vehicle maintenance areas shall be established away from all drainage courses and designed to control runoff. • Sanitary facilities shall be provided for construction workers. • Disposal facilities shall be provided for soil wastes, including excess asphalt during construction and demolition. • The Tribe shall require all workers be trained in the proper handling, use, cleanup, and disposal of all chemical materials used during construction activities and provide appropriate facilities to store and isolate contaminants. • Encountered groundwater shall be removed from trenches and excavations in such a manner as to reduce potential contact with construction materials, construction personnel, surface waters and shall be disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility such as a WWTP in accordance with the requirements of the NPDES permit. 		
		<p>Operation The following mitigation measures would reduce the potential for hazardous materials releases during operation of Alternatives A, B, C, D, E, and B1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Landscaping chemicals such as pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers would consistently be kept at the lowest volumes needed and in the least toxic amounts. Such products shall be applied in a manner that prevents contact with groundwater, streams, domestic water supply, or wetlands. This shall be achieved in conjunction with mitigation providing for the planting of native vegetation that requires less, or no, pesticides or herbicides. 		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.2	Alternative A has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 , and MM 3-1 through MM 3-13 , MM 11-1 and MM 11-2 A site specific emergency response plan (ERP) would be developed for the selected alternative. The Plan should identify measures to be employed for sheltering in-place and evacuation of the project site in the event of an ammonia or chemical release from the Chevron-Richmond Refinery. The ERP should identify protocols such as emergency evacuation routes in the case of an earthquake, wildfire, and chemical release. The ERP should include integration with the Contra Costa Health Service (CCHS) Community Warning System (CWS), and placement of warning sirens throughout the project site. The Plan should be developed in coordination with CCHS to ensure an adequate level of emergency preparedness for patrons visiting the project site.	PS	LTS
4.12.3	Alternative A would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.4	Alternative A is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore development of Alternative A would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.5	Development areas associated with Alternative A are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, development of Alternative A poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	MM 11-3 The responsible party (Discharger) shall continue ongoing remedial and clean up actions at the previously identified installation restoration (IR) sites, underground storage tanks (USTs), and all additional areas on the project site that are identified in SFRWQCB Site Cleanup Orders. The ongoing cleanup will be completed under the regulatory oversight of SFRWQCB). Under each land use alternative, clean up levels for the site will be such that potential significant risks to human health and the environment are not present. MM 11-4 Clean-up Levels: The site specific Fuel Product Action Levels (FPALs) do not address cleanup levels at or below the groundwater table. The establishment and approval of the cleanup of residual contamination below the groundwater table for all land use scenarios that are protective of human health and the environment will be	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		required through input from the SFRWQCB.		
		<p>MM 11-5 IR-01: Former Landfill Area: The responsible party shall continue groundwater, landfill, and oil/water separator (OWS) monitoring in accordance with the Post Closure Monitoring Plan (PCMC) (TTEMI, 2002b) and the Order. Ongoing groundwater monitoring and operation and maintenance (O&M) of the IR-01 groundwater containment extraction system would continue under the Final Post Closure Maintenance and Monitoring Plan (FPCMMP) and the Order. To limit potential health risk liability, access to IR-01 shall be restricted to groundskeepers and maintenance workers. Existing residential land use restrictions shall continue in order to prohibit disturbance of the soil cover. Monitoring of the functionality and effectiveness of the remedial system must be conducted every five years as documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) for the Disposal and Reuse of Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate (U.S. Navy, 2005). Any new information discovered during such reviews that could enhance the performance of groundwater containment extraction system shall be reviewed and approved through the SFRWQCB.</p>		
		<p>MM 11-6 Groundwater shall continue to be monitored to evaluate VOC concentrations. To reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels, impacted soils shall be remediated, if required by the SFRWQCB. Remediation is likely to include removal of soils to a depth of approximately 3 feet bgs in the areas adjacent to Building No. 87.</p>		
		<p>MM 11-7 IR-03 (Former Treatment Ponds Area): Affected soils in the areas of the former treatment ponds shall be remediated to remove mobile petroleum fractions in soils as required by the SFRWQCB. The responsible party would complete excavation and disposal of impacted soils to a depth mandated by the SFRWQCB. Excavation of shallower soils (less than 10 feet bgs) with containment concentrations exceeding industrial/commercial action levels will be disposed of off-site at one or more approved landfills. Remediation of the deeper contaminated soils (below 10 feet bgs) will include excavation and off-site disposal of soils that contain more mobile fractions of TPH from various areas within IR-03. One alternative for remediation would</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>include excavating a 10-foot-wide section of soils up gradient of the containment wall and replacing those soils with an adsorbent mix of silty sand and peat to capture any unexpected leachable petroleum that may have missed excavation. Upon removal of these affected soils and prior to site development, confirmation soil sampling in the area of use would be conducted.</p> <p>The Site Cleanup Requirements Order will provide for early implementation of the selected remedial action, followed by long-term monitoring of groundwater wells at the site. Regulatory closure would occur when the SFRWQCB issues a No Further Action statement for specific areas, while the responsible party would continue operation and maintenance (O&M) of the groundwater containment extraction system until the system is no longer required at which time the system would be decommissioned and removed upon SFRWQCB concurrence.</p> <p>Excavation of affected soils within the former treatment ponds area would be conducted according to a site specific SMP that would be approved by the SFRWQCB. Such a plan would define excavation protocols that would be implemented during removal of the affected soils. The SMP would provide guidance on the proper procedures for the handling and disposal of affected soils and safeguards to ensure human health risks remain less than significant according to approved OSHA guidelines. The Tribe shall ensure through contractual obligations that OSHA guidelines are followed during soil removal. SMP would also include field measurements for VOCs as stated in Mitigation Measure 11-1 above. If a residual human health risk is suspected, all work shall stop in the immediate area and a safe zone for construction personnel shall be established according to OSHA regulations.</p>		
		<p>MM 11-8 IR-04: Northern and Southern shoreline areas and Drum Lot 1: The responsible party shall continue ongoing groundwater monitoring under the base wide monitoring programs (BWMPs), as well as operation and maintenance (O & M) of the groundwater containment extraction system in the northern shoreline and Drum Lot 1 areas. Land use restrictions in the northern shoreline areas would ensure no use occurs that would create a potential human health risk. For the southern shoreline area, the source of free product at MW-10-23 and, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) impacts near former valve box VB-1, VB-2, and VB-3 shall be remediated to the extent required</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>by the SFRWQCB Order. Soils in the area of the former valve boxes that contain PAHs shall be removed to ensure no significant human health risks would occur under the planned redevelopment. Regulatory closure allowing unrestricted use would occur when the SFRWQCB issues a No Further Action statement. Land use restrictions for the shoreline areas shall be maintained unless otherwise allowed by the SFRWQCB.</p> <p>MM 11-9 IR-04: Drum Lot 2 and Building 87: The Site Cleanup Requirements Order will require removal of the source of TCE at Drum Lot 2. Soils that exceed target levels for dieldrin and bezo(a)pyrene adjacent to Building 87 would be excavated and removed from the project site as required by the SFRWQCB. A remedial alternative has not yet been selected; however, it is anticipated that source removal activities can be completed by excavation and temporary dewatering, followed by groundwater monitoring. Excavation is expected to eliminate significant exposure pathways that could lead to human health impacts. Existing land use restrictions shall remain in place until remediation has been accomplished to the satisfaction of the SFRWQCB. A site management plan would be developed and implemented in order to reduce future potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p> <p>MM 11-10 Underground Storage Tanks 2 -6, 8, 12-15, 18 and 19: Until land use restrictions allowing for unrestricted use and regulatory closure of underground storage tanks (USTs) 2 through 6, 8, 12 through 15, 18, and 19 are granted, land use restrictions and BWMP would continue to be maintained in compliance with SFRWQCB directives.</p> <p>MM 11-11 USTs 1 through 3, 5, 7, and 15: Prior to regulatory closure of the excavated hillside tanks, confirmation testing for lower molecular weight hydrocarbons should be completed to verify that there are no residual vapor intrusion issues. These areas are to be developed for the casino resort complex, northern residential component (Alternative D only), Tribal office, cultural dance house, ceremonial dance grounds, and resort hotel cabanas. If necessary, soil vapor extraction systems shall be installed to remove vapor phase constituents and ensure no human health impacts remain within the excavation areas.</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.6	Alternative A would not generate emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.7	Alternative A would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 4-9 , MM 1-3 and MM 11-13 Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws. MM 11-14 During construction, staging areas and areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.2 Alternative B				
4.12.8	Alternative B would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.9	Alternative B has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 , MM 3-1 through MM 3-13 , and MM 11-1 and 11-2 .	PS	LTS
4.12.10	Alternative B would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.11	Alternative B is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore development of Alternative B would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.12	Development areas associated with Alternative B are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, development of Alternative B poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 11-3 through 11-11 .	PS	LTS
4.12.13	Alternative B would not generate emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.14	Alternative B would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.3 Alternative C				
4.12.15	Alternative C would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.16	Alternative C has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 , MM 3-1 through MM 3-13 , and MM 11-1 and MM 11-2 .	PS	LTS
4.12.17	Alternative C would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.18	The development area associated with Alternative C is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, therefore implementation of Alternative C would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impacts would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.19	Development areas associated with Alternative C are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result development of Alternative C poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 11-3 through MM 11-11 .	PS	LTS
4.12.20	Alternative C would not generate emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.21	Alternative C would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.4 Alternative D				
4.12.22	Alternative D would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.23	Alternative D has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1 , MM 2-2 , MM 3-1 through MM 3-13 , and MM 11-1 and MM 11-2 .	PS	LTS
4.12.24	Alternative D would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.25	The development area associated with Alternative D is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore implementation of Alternative D would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.26	Development areas associated with Alternative D are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result development of Alternative D poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 11-3 through MM 11-11 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.27	Alternative D would not generate emissions or handle hazardous/acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.28	Alternative D would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.5 Alternative E				
4.12.29	Alternative E would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as a result, a less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.30	Alternative E has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1, MM 2-2, MM 3-1 through MM 3-13 , and MM 11-1 and MM 11-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.12.31	Alternative E would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.32	The project site associated with Alternative E is not located within a land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore implementation of Alternative E would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.33	Alternative E is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result development of Alternative E poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 11-3 and MM 11-5 .	LTS	LTS
4.12.34	Alternative E would not emit emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of and existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.35	Alternative E would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.6 Alternative F				
4.12.36	Alternative F would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.37	Alternative F does not have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.38	Alternative F would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.39	The project site associated with Alternative F is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, therefore implementation of Alternative F would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.40	The project site associated with Alternative F is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result Alternative F poses a potentially significant risk to human health or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.41	Alternative F would not emit emissions or handle hazardous/acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.42	Alternative F would not 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. No impacts would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.12.7 Alternative B1				
4.12.43	Alternative B1 would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.44	Alternative B1 has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 2-1, MM 2-2, MM 3-1 through MM 3-13, and MM 11-1 and 11-2.	PS	LTS
4.12.45	Alternative B1 would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.12.46	Alternative B1 is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore development of Alternative B1 would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As a result, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.47	Development areas associated with Alternative B1 are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result, development of Alternative B1 poses a potentially significant risk to human health and the environment. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 11-3 through MM 11-11.	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.12.48	Alternative B1 would not generate emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.12.49	Alternative B1 would not 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. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.1 Alternative A				
4.13.1	Alternative A could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 and MM 12-1 b. The project site shall be landscaped to soften the view of the facilities from off-site locations. c. Landscaping shall be designed to be compatible with existing vegetation on site and in surrounding areas.	PS	LTS
4.13.2	Alternative A would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.3	Alternative A could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 and MM 12-2 a. The new buildings shall be designed to be visually compatible with the existing buildings and in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for infill development in historic districts. b. Building materials and colors shall be chosen to enhance the aesthetics of the project site.	PS	LTS
4.13.4	Alternative A could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.	MM 12-3 a. Placement of floodlights on buildings and throughout the project site shall be designed so as not to cast light off-site. In order to minimize off-site impacts of light and glare, lighting shall adhere to the "full cutoff" standard developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA, 2001). b. Shielding, such as with a horizontal shroud, shall be used for all outdoor lighting so as to ensure it is downcast.	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		c. Timers shall be utilized so as to limit lighting to when necessary.		
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.2 Alternative B				
4.13.5	Alternative B could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	PS	LTS
4.13.6	Alternative B would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.7	Alternative B could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	PS	LTS
4.13.8	Alternative B could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	PS	LTS
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.3 Alternative C				
4.13.9	Alternative C could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	PS	LTS
4.13.10	Alternative C would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.11	Alternative C could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	PS	LTS
4.13.12	Alternative C could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.4 Alternative D				
4.13.13	Alternative D could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	PS	LTS
4.13.14	Alternative D would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.15	Alternative D could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	PS	LTS
4.13.16	Alternative D could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	PS	LTS
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.5 Alternative E				
4.13.17	Proposed development under Alternative E would retrofit existing buildings to eliminate deterioration of the Winehaven buildings and thus, would prevent a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista. This would be a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.13.18	Alternative E would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.19	Alternative E would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.20	Alternative E would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.6 Alternative F				
4.13.21	Alternative F could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	None proposed.	SI	SU
4.13.22	Alternative F would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.13.23	Alternative F could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a significant impact.	None proposed.	SI	SU
4.13.24	Alternative F would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13 Aesthetics				
4.13.7 Alternative B1				
4.13.25	Alternative B1 could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	PS	LTS
4.13.26	Alternative B1 would not substantially degrade scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.13.27	Alternative B1 could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	PS	LTS
4.13.28	Alternative B1 could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	PS	LTS
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts				
4.14.1	Economic output and employment opportunities resulting from the implementation of Alternative A would result in indirect growth-inducing impacts, including population growth, new housing, and commercial growth. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.2	Economic output and employment opportunities resulting from the implementation of Alternative B would result in indirect growth-inducing impacts, including population growth, new housing, and commercial growth. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.3	Economic output and employment opportunities resulting from the implementation of Alternative C would result in indirect growth-inducing impacts, including population growth, new housing, and commercial growth. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.4	Economic output from employment opportunities resulting from the implementation of Alternative D would result in indirect growth-inducing impacts, including population growth, new housing, and commercial growth. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.5	Implementation of Alternative E would not result in significant growth inducement. This would be a less-than-significant impact	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.6	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in growth inducement. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.2 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative A				
4.14.7	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.8	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.9	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at development sites, which could result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.10	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could result in increased erosion or siltation at development sites, which could impair surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.11	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could be located within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.12	Vehicle emissions resulting from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.13	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could result in impacts to native habitats. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.14	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could result in impacts to waters of the U.S. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.15	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could result in impacts to special-status species. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.16	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of historic and archaeological resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.17	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would result in new economic activity in the City and County, including economic output, employment, wages, and tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. This is considered a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.14.18	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would not result in a substantial increase in crime. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.19	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.20	Traffic from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would be dispersed throughout the City and County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.21	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would occur within appropriately zoned land. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.22	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative A would demand new water supply service. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.23	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative A would demand new wastewater treatment services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.24	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative A would demand new solid waste services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.25	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would not result in a substantial increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.26	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would require fire protection services, and new persons in the area from this induced development would require fire protection and emergency medical services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.27	New persons resulting from development induced by Alternative A would require law enforcement services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.28	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would increase demand for parks, but would not adversely affect the use and/or enjoyment of any particular park. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.29	Noise resulting from traffic generated by new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.30	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A could expose humans to hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.31	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative A would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.3 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative B				
4.14.32	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.33	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.34	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at development sites, which could result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.35	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could result in increased erosion or siltation at development sites, which could impair surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.36	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could be located within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.37	Vehicle emissions resulting from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.38	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could result in impacts to native habitats; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.39	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could result in impacts to waters of the U.S; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.40	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.41	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of historic and archaeological resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.42	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would result in new economic activity in the City and County, including economic output, employment, wages, and tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. This is considered a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.14.43	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would not result in a substantial increase in crime. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.44	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.45	Traffic from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would be dispersed throughout the City and County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.46	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would occur within appropriately zoned land. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.47	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B would demand new water supply service. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.48	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B would demand new wastewater treatment services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.49	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B would demand new solid waste services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.50	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would not result in a substantial increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.51	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would require fire protection services, and new persons in the area from this induced development would require fire protection and emergency medical services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.52	New persons resulting from development induced by Alternative B would require law enforcement services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.53	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would increase demand for parks, but would not adversely affect the use and/or enjoyment of any particular park. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.54	Noise resulting from traffic generated by new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.55	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B could expose humans to hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.56	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.4 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative C				
4.14.57	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.58	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.59	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at development sites, which could result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.60	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could result in increased erosion or siltation at development sites, which could impair surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.61	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could be located within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.62	Vehicle emissions resulting from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.63	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could result in impacts to native habitats. However, these impacts would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.64	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could result in impacts to waters of the U.S. However, these impacts would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.65	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could result in impacts to special-status species. However, these impacts would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.66	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of historic and archaeological resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.67	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would result in new economic activity in the City and County, including economic output, employment, wages, and tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. This is considered a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.14.68	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would not result in a substantial increase in crime. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.69	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.70	Traffic from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would be dispersed throughout the City and County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.71	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would occur within appropriately zoned land. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.72	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative C would demand new water supply service. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.73	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative C would demand new wastewater treatment services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.74	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative C would demand new solid waste services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.75	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would not result in a substantial increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.76	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would require fire protection services, and new persons in the area from this induced development would require fire protection and emergency medical services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.77	New persons resulting from development induced by Alternative C would require law enforcement services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.78	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would increase demand for parks, but would not adversely affect the use and/or enjoyment of any particular park. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.79	Noise resulting from traffic generated by new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.80	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C could expose humans to hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.81	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative C would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts
4.14.5 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative D

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.82	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.83	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.84	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at development sites, which could result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.85	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could result in increased erosion or siltation at development sites, which could impair surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.86	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could be located within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.87	Vehicle emissions resulting from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.88	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could result in impacts to native habitats. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.89	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could result in impacts to waters of the U.S. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.90	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could result in impacts to special-status species. These impacts would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.91	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of historic and archaeological resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.92	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would result in new economic activity in the City and County, including economic output, employment, wages, and tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. This is considered a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.14.93	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would not result in a substantial increase in crime. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.94	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.95	Traffic from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would be dispersed throughout the City and County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.96	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would occur within appropriately zoned land. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.97	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative D would demand new water supply service. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.98	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative D would demand new wastewater treatment services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.99	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative D would demand new solid waste services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.100	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would not result in a substantial increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.101	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would require fire protection services, and new persons in the area from this induced development would require fire protection and emergency medical services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.102	New persons resulting from development induced by Alternative D would require law enforcement services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.103	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would increase demand for parks, but would not adversely affect the use and/or enjoyment of any particular park. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.104	Noise resulting from traffic generated by new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.105	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D could expose humans to hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.106	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative D would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.6 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative E				
4.14.107	Implementation of Alternative E would not result in growth inducement. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.7 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative F				
4.14.108	Implementation of Alternative F would not result in growth inducement. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.8 Indirect Growth-Inducing Impacts of Alternative B1				
4.14.109	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.110	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.111	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at development sites, which could result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.112	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could result in increased erosion or siltation at development sites, which could impair surface water and shallow groundwater quality. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.113	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could be located within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.114	Vehicle emissions resulting from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.115	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could result in impacts to native habitats; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.116	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could result in impacts to waters of the U.S; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.117	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species; however, compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.118	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of historic and archaeological resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.119	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would result in new economic activity in the City and County, including economic output, employment, wages, and tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. This is considered a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.14.120	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would not result in a substantial increase in crime. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.121	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.122	Traffic from new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would be dispersed throughout the City and County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.123	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would occur within appropriately zoned land. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.124	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B1 would demand new water supply service. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.125	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B1 would demand new wastewater treatment services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.126	Each new housing unit and commercial establishment induced by Alternative B1 would demand new solid waste services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.127	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would not result in a substantial increase in demand for electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.128	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would require fire protection services, and new persons in the area from this induced development would require fire protection and emergency medical services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.129	New persons resulting from development induced by Alternative B1 would require law enforcement services. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.130	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would increase demand for parks, but would not adversely affect the use and/or enjoyment of any particular park. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.131	Noise resulting from traffic generated by new housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would not be substantial. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.132	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 could expose humans to hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.133	New housing and commercial development induced by Alternative B1 would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14 Indirect and Growth Inducing Impacts				
4.14.9 Impacts of Mitigation and Off-site Improvements				
4.14.134	Creation of seasonal wetlands within the project site along the south shoreline has the potential to physically damage or destroy the historic archaeological site CA-CCO-506H. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 and MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.14.135	Construction related to day-lighting existing stormwater culverts, grading to create streams, riparian corridors, and expanded seasonal wetlands, as well as revegetation have the potential to destroy unknown unique paleontological and geological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1	PS	LTS
4.14.136	Construction of the wetland mitigation area and day lighting of existing stormwater culverts, and implementation of the vegetation management plan mitigation could potentially result in adverse impacts to water quality and biological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	Implement MM 5-1 and MM 5-2 .	PS	LTS
4.14.137	Implementation of traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure improvements proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 may result in the loss of topsoil and soil erosion and may expose people and structures to the risk of loss, injury or death from seismic activity or expansive soils. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.138	Implementation of off-site traffic improvement mitigation for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 could increase coverage of impervious surfaces at the proposed improvement sites, which may result in increased surface water runoff and generate localized flooding or increase contaminants transported to receiving waters.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
	Off-site utility infrastructure improvements have the potential to affect water resources as trenching and other ground disturbing activities would be required. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.			
4.14.139	Vehicle emissions resulting from the implementation of traffic mitigation proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would be minimal, and would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.140	Implementation of off-site traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 could result in impacts to biological resources; however, these impacts would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.141	Implementation of the traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 has the potential to physically damage, destroy, or negatively impact the integrity of hitherto undiscovered archaeological and paleontological resources. This is a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.142	Implementation of off-site traffic mitigation proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would not result in disproportionately adverse impacts to any minority or low-income communities. A less-than-significant environmental justice impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.143	Implementation of traffic mitigation proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would result in a less-than-significant impacts to socioeconomic conditions.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.144	Implementation of traffic mitigation proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 may require acquisition of additional right-of-way. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.145	Implementation of off-site traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would not impact utilities and public services as the proposed construction activities would be temporary in nature and impacts to utility lines would be minimal. This would be a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.14.146	Noise resulting from the implementation of off-site traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would be minimal. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.147	Implementation of off-site traffic mitigation and utility infrastructure proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 could expose humans to hazardous materials. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.14.148	Implementation of off-site traffic mitigation proposed for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and B1 would occur on appropriately zoned land and would be consistent with the visual character of the area. This would be a less than significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15 Cumulative Impacts				
4.15.3 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative A				
4.15.1	Construction and operation of Alternative A would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts such as soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.2	Construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative A would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface and groundwater quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.3	Operation of planned development projects and Alternative A would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to flooding. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.4	Construction and operation of proposed development projects and Alternative A would not significantly impact floodplain management.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.5	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative A in the year 2025 would result in emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions above the established BAAQMD threshold. A potentially significant cumulative impact would occur.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-25 .	PS	LTS
4.15.6	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative A in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.7	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative A in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, which could be a potentially significant cumulative impact.	<p>Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-19</p> <p>MM 3-26 The Tribe shall purchase local building materials whenever feasible.</p> <p>MM 3-27 The Tribe shall ensure the albedo rating of rooftop materials is at least 30.</p> <p>MM 3-28 The Tribe shall use environmentally preferable materials to the extent practical for construction of facilities. The Tribe shall meet or exceed Green Building Council Standards for new and retrofit construction. Buildings shall be constructed and designed to meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or equivalent certification standard, except with respect to indoor smoking allowed in certain restricted areas.</p> <p>MM 3-29 The Tribe shall use low-flow appliances where feasible and utilize both potable and non-potable water to the extent practicable. The Tribe shall use a preponderance of drought resistant species native to the Richmond area in the selection of vegetation, plants, mulches, or other plant material used in site landscaping, with the exception of shoreline park areas, green walls and green roofs, and areas adjacent to the resort and residential buildings where non-native species may be utilized. These areas will use recycled, treated gray water as an irrigation source. "Save Water" signs shall be placed near water faucets throughout the development.</p> <p>MM 3-30 The Tribe shall institute and fund an on-site waste composting program.</p> <p>MM 3-31 The Tribe shall incorporate advanced lighting design, including daylighting, where feasible. Advanced lighting design and day lighting would reduce project related GHG emissions by reducing electrical energy usage.</p> <p>MM 3-32 The Tribe shall require the use of energy efficient lighting, which would reduce indirect GHG emissions. Where available, Energy Star</p>	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>equipment and appliances shall be used throughout the development. Using energy efficient lighting and Energy Star equipment and appliances would reduce the Project's energy usage, thus, reducing the projects indirect GHG emissions.</p> <p>MM 3-33 The Tribe shall use alternative-fueled (e.g., biodiesel and electric) construction and maintenance vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet.</p> <p>MM 3-34 The Tribe shall use at least 10 percent local building materials.</p> <p>MM 3-35 The Tribe shall recycle at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.</p> <p>IM 3-36 The Tribe shall plant trees and other carbon-sequestering vegetation on-site. The addition of photosynthesizing plants would reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2) because plants use CO2 for elemental carbon and energy production. Trees planted near buildings would result in additional benefits by providing shade to the buildings, reducing heat absorption and the need for air conditioning.</p> <p>IM 3-37 A Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) shall be adopted by the Tribe that addresses recycling and solid waste reduction on-site. The plan shall have at least a 50 percent diversion goal, which includes reduction, recycling, and reuse measures.</p> <p>IM 3-38 The Tribe shall install a living roof on the conference center. Living roofs reduce GHG emissions in two ways. First, a living roof would sequester carbon through the planting of vegetation. Second, a living roof reduces energy used for heating and cools the interior of a building.</p> <p>IM 3-39 The Tribe shall provide recycling bins in accessible areas on the project site. Retail establishments throughout the proposed development shall discourage the use of plastic bags by providing reusable cloth bags at a nominal fee as well as charging a small fee</p>		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>for the use of plastic bags. Additionally, restaurants within the resort shall offer menu items featuring regionally-produced and organic food. Recycling, use of reusable bags, and local sourcing of food products reduce GHG emissions from indirect energy use, landfills, and manufacturing of raw materials.</p> <p>IM 3-40 The Tribe shall use an energy-efficient key card building system, which turns off lights as guests leave their hotel rooms. The use of an energy-efficient key card building system would reduce project related GHG emissions by reducing electrical energy usage.</p> <p>IM 3-41 The Tribe shall fund a program or contribute to an existing program that would assist in weatherizing Richmond-area homes. Retrofitting area homes would reduce GHG emission by reducing energy usage.</p> <p>IM 3-42 The Tribe shall participate in the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) company's ClimateSmart program. The Climate Smart program allows the Tribe to contribute a set amount of money each month to PG&E's development of green energy. The program is based on energy usage and would reduce GHG emissions from indirect sources.</p> <p>IM 3-43 The Tribe shall implement Mitigation Measure 3-17 to further reduce GHG emission from project related sources.</p>		
4.15.8	Construction and operation of Alternative A would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.9	Construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative A would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.10	Operation of Alternative A along with other proposed developments would increase demand for businesses in the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County that provide goods and services and would increase the local area's reliance on economic activity from the travel, tourism, and leisure industry. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.11	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, increased traffic volumes from the operation of Alternative A in the year 2025 have the potential to substantially increase traffic volumes of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	<p>Implement MM 7-6, MM 7-7, MM 7-24, IM 19 and</p> <p>MM 7-8 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to add an additional exclusive left turn lane at the southbound approach of Richmond Parkway (Castro Street) at the intersection of Redwood Way /WB I-580 On/Off Ramps, providing two left turn lanes to achieve LOS D operations during the PM peak hour operations under all alternatives in the cumulative project condition.</p> <p>MM 7-9 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to re-stripe the eastbound approach of the I-580 EB Off Ramp to provide a shared left through lane, where there is currently an exclusive left turn lane, to achieve LOS B at the intersection of Marine Street and EB I-580 On/Off Ramps under all alternatives.</p> <p>MM 7-10 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to add additional southbound and northbound through lanes on Richmond Parkway at the intersection of Gertrude Avenue to achieve LOS B operations during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour for all alternatives.</p> <p>MM 7-11 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to re-stripe the southbound approach of Richmond Parkway at the intersection of Parr Boulevard to provide a shared right through lane where there is currently an exclusive right turn lane, to achieve LOS B operations during the AM peak hour under all alternatives in the cumulative project conditions; and to re-stripe the northbound approach of Richmond Parkway at the intersection of Parr Boulevard to provide a shared right through lane where there is currently an exclusive right turn lane to achieve LOS B operations during the PM peak hour under cumulative project conditions.</p> <p>MM 7-12 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to make the following reconfigurations and additions to mitigate operations of the Richmond Parkway and Blume Drive/WB I-80 On/Off ramps intersection to LOS D during the PM peak hour for all alternatives in the cumulative project condition;</p>	PS	SU

No Impact = NI

Less than Significant = LTS

Potentially Significant = PS

Significant = SI

Significant and Unavoidable = SU

Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The construction of an I-80 westbound on-ramp on the south side of Richmond Parkway; b. The restriping of the existing northbound through lane to provide an additional exclusive right-turn lane, and the furthest east existing right-turn lane becoming an on-ramp exclusive lane; c. The restriping of the existing eastbound left-turn lane as an exclusive through lane, and the through movement for the shared-through-right lane would become an on-ramp exclusive lane; and d. Restripe the existing southbound approach to provide two right-turns, through, and left-turn lanes using the existing width of the roadway. 		
		<p>MM 7-16 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to construct an additional eastbound through lane to achieve LOS D during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Richmond Parkway at Goodrick Avenue.</p>		
		<p>MM 7-17 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to convert the existing northbound right turn lane to a combined through-right lane to achieve LOS D at the intersection of Richmond Parkway at Pittsburg Avenue.</p>		
4.15.12	Traffic from the operation of Alternative A in the year 2025 would substantially increase traffic volumes of roadway segments within the study area. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	<p>MM 7-13 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to add approximately 1,600 feet of additional traffic lane on I-580 EB from the toll plaza to the Marine Street Off-Ramp. This would bring the total number of eastbound lanes to three and also add an additional Marine Street Off-Ramp lane, bringing the total number of off-ramp lanes to two. The roadway segment of I-580 at Marine Street Off-Ramp would achieve LOS D during the PM peak hour for all alternatives in the cumulative year.</p> <p>MM 7-14 The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to convert two more of the existing manual/Fastrak lanes to exclusive Fastrak lanes at the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge toll plaza.</p>	PS	SU
		MM 7-15		

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		The Tribe shall make a fair share contribution, as specified in Table 5-7, to add one travel lane for a total of three lanes in each direction by remarking the existing deck of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.		
4.15.13	Traffic from the operation of Alternative A in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.14	Operation of ferry service under Alternative A, in combination with other planned increases in ferry service in the future, has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic on roadways in the study area. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.15	Operation of Alternative A would not increase riders on local rail and bus services beyond capacity. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.16	Implementation of Alternative A in the cumulative year 2025 has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15	PS	SU
4.15.17	Alternative A would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning within the City of Richmond or the Western Sub-Area of Contra Costa County.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.18	The local utility provider, EBMUD has the capacity to meet the potable water demand with its service area. Therefore, regional development projects and Alternative A would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the regional water supply or water treatment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.19	The demand for wastewater treatment of City-wide development projects and Alternative A would result in increased demand on the Richmond Municipal Sewer District wastewater treatment plant and wastewater collection system. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.20	Regional increases in solid waste, with development of Alternative A, would result in increased demand on landfill capacity. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	Implement IM 9-4 and IM 9-5 .	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.21	Implementation of Alternative A in combination with other foreseeable projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.22	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, could increase demand for Fire Protection services or Emergency Medical services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.23	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, could increase demands on the City of Richmond Police Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.24	Alternative A would not result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.25	Alternative A and other regional developments could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated. However, this impact would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.26	Noise and vibration which would result from operational activities under Alternative A in combination with other development in the year 2025 would result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.27	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.28	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in significant hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.29	Alternative A, in combination with other growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.30	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact from the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.31	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.32	Alternative A in combination with other foreseeable projects would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.33	Alternative A would not a cumulatively considerable impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 12-2	LTS	LTS
4.15.34	Alternative A, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not create a cumulatively considerable source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a less-than-significant impact.	Implement MM 12-3	LTS	LTS
4.15 Cumulative Impacts				
4.15.4 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative B				
4.15.35	Construction and operation of Alternative B would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts such as soils or geology. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.36	Concurrent construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative B would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface and groundwater quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.37	Concurrent operation of planned development projects and Alternative B would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface water quality or flooding. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.38	Concurrent construction and operation of proposed development projects and Alternative B would not significantly impact floodplain management. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.39	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative B in the year 2025 would result in emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions above the established thresholds. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-25 .	PS	LTS
4.15.40	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative B in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.41	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative B in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas emissions. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-19 , MM 3-29 , through MM 3-35 , and IM 3-36 through IM 3-43 .	PS	LTS
4.15.42	Construction and operation of Alternative B would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.43	Construction of planned development projects and Alternative B would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.44	Operation of Alternative B along with other proposed developments would increase demand for businesses in the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County that provide goods and services and would increase the local area's reliance on economic activity from the travel, tourism, and leisure industry. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.45	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, increased traffic volumes from the operation of Alternative B in the year 2025 have the potential to substantially increase traffic volumes of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-6 through MM 7-12 , MM 7-16 , MM 7-17 , MM 7-24 , and IM 7-18 and IM 7-19 .	PS	SU
4.15.46	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B in the year 2025 would substantially increase traffic volumes of roadways segments within the project area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-13 and MM 7-15 .	PS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.47	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.48	Operation of ferry service under Alternative B in the year 2025 has the potential to decrease vehicles on roadways in the study area. This is a beneficial cumulative impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.49	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.50	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, implementation of Alternative B in the cumulative year 2025 has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15 .	PS	SU
4.15.51	Alternative B would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning with the City of Richmond and the Western Sub-Area of Contra Costa County. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.52	The local service provider, EBMUD, has the capacity to meet the potable water demand within its service area including foreseeable development projects and Alternative B. Therefore, Alternative B in combination with regional development projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the regional water supply or water treatment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.53	The demand for wastewater treatment of City-wide development projects and Alternative B would result in increased demand for the Richmond Municipal Sewer District wastewater treatment plant. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.54	Regional increases in solid waste, with implementation of Alternative B plus regional development projects could result in increased demand for landfill capacity. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.55	Development of Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.56	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects could create an increased demand for fire protection or emergency medical services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.57	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, could increase service demands on the City of Richmond Police Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.58	Alternative B could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.59	Alternative B and other regional developments could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.60	Noise and vibration resulting from operational activities under Alternative B in combination with other development projects would not result in increased the ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.61	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects in the area, would not result in cumulatively significant hazards to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.62	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.63	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.64	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact from the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.65	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.66	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.67	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.68	Alternative B, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not create a significant source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	LTS	LTS
4.15 Cumulative Impacts				
4.15.5 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative C				
4.15.69	Construction and Operation of Alternative C would not result in any cumulative impacts such as geology and soils. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.70	Concurrent construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative C would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface and groundwater quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.71	Concurrent operation of planned development projects and Alternative C would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface water quality or flooding. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.72	Concurrent construction and operation of proposed development projects and Alternative C would not significantly impact floodplain management. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.73	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative C in the year 2025 would result in emissions below BAAQMD thresholds for ROG and NO _x and above the BAAQMD threshold for PM ₁₀ . This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-19 and MM 3-20 through MM 3-24 .	PS	LTS
4.15.74	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative C in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.75	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative C in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas emissions. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-16 through MM 3-19 , MM 3-26 , through MM 3-35 , and IM 3-36 through IM 3-43 .	PS	LTS
4.15.76	Operation and construction of Alternative C would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.77	Construction of planned development projects and Alternative C would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.78	Operation of Alternative C along with other proposed developments would increase demand for businesses in the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County that provide goods and services and would increase the local area's reliance on economic activity from the travel, tourism, and leisure industry. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.79	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, increased traffic volumes from the operation of Alternative C in the year 2025 have the potential to substantially increase the existing traffic volumes of intersections within the project study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-6 through MM 7-12 , MM 7-16 , MM 7-17 , MM 7-24 , and IM 7-19 .	SI	SU

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.80	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, traffic from the operation of Alternative C in the year 2025 would substantially increase traffic volumes of roadways segments within the study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-13 and MM 7-15 .	PS	SU
4.15.81	Traffic from the operation of Alternative C in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. There is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.82	Operation of ferry service under Alternative C in the year 2025 has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic on roadways in the study area. This is a beneficial cumulative impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.83	Operation of Alternative C in the year 2025 would not increase riders on local rail and bus services beyond capacity. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.84	In combination with other foreseeable projects, implementation of Alternative C in the cumulative year 2025 has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15 .	PS	SU
4.15.85	Alternative C would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning within the City or the Western Sub-Area of Contra Costa County. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.86	The local service provider EBMUB has the capacity to meet the potable water demand of foreseeable development projects and Alternative C, within its service areas. This would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the regional water supply or potable water distribution system. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.87	Development of Alternative C in combination with foreseeable development projects would result in an increased demand for the RMSD wastewater treatment plant. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.88	Development of Alternative C in combination with regional increases in solid waste and foreseeable development projects would result in an increased demand for landfill capacity. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.89	Development of Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.90	Development of Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable development projects could create increased demand for fire protection services or emergency medical services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.91	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, could increase service demands for the City of Richmond Police Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.92	Alternative C would not result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.93	Alternative C and other regional developments could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.94	Noise and vibrations resulting from operational activities under Alternative C in combination with other development projects would not result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling, in the year 2025. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.95	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.96	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.97	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.98	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact from the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.99	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.100	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings within a state scenic highway. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.101	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.102	Alternative C, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not create a significant source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	LTS	LTS
4.15 Cumulative Impacts				
4.15.6 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative D				
4.15.103	Alternative D would not result in cumulatively considerable geological or soil impacts. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.104	Concurrent construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative D would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface and groundwater quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.105	Concurrent operation of planned development projects and Alternative D would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface water quality or flooding. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.106	Concurrent construction and operation of proposed development projects and Alternative D would not significantly impact floodplain management.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.107	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative D in the year 2025 would result in ROG and PM ₁₀ emissions above the BAAQMD CEQA thresholds. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-19 as well as, MM 3-20 through MM 3-24 .	PS	LTS
4.15.108	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative D in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.109	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative D in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas emissions. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-16 through MM 3-19 , MM 3-26 , through MM 3-35 , and IM 3-36 through IM 3-43 .	PS	LTS
4.15.110	Construction and operation of Alternative D would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.111	Construction of planned development projects and Alternative D would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.112	Operation of Alternative D along with other proposed developments would increase demand for businesses in the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County that provide goods and services and would increase the local area's reliance on economic activity from the travel, tourism, and leisure industry. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.113	Increased traffic volumes from the operation of Alternative D in the year 2025, in combination with other foreseeable projects, has the potential to substantially increase traffic volumes of intersections within the project study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-6 through MM 7-12, MM 7-16, MM 7-17, MM 7-24, and IM 7-18 and 7-19	PS	SU
4.15.114	Traffic from the operation of Alternative D in the year 2025, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would substantially increase the existing traffic volumes of roadways segments within the project area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-13 and MM 7-15	PS	SU
4.15.115	Traffic from the operation of Alternative D in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.116	Operation of ferry service, under Alternative D in the year 2025 has the potential to decrease vehicular traffic in the study area. This is a beneficial cumulative impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.117	Operation of Alternative D in the year 2025 would not increase riders on local rail and bus services beyond capacity. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.118	Implementation of Alternative D in the cumulative year 2025, in combination with other foreseeable projects, has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15.	PS	SU
4.15.119	Alternative D would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.120	The local service provider EBMUD has the capacity to meet the potable water demands within its service area and would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the regional water supply or potable water distribution system. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.121	The demand for wastewater treatment of County-wide development projects and Alternative D would result in increased demand for the Richmond Municipal Sewer District wastewater treatment plant. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.122	Regional increases in solid waste, with implementation of Alternative D plus foreseeable development projects would result in increased demand for landfill capacity. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.123	Implementation of Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. A less than significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.124	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable projects could increase demand for Fire Protection services or Emergency Medical Services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.125	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable projects could increase service demands for the City of Richmond Police Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.126	Alternative D could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.127	Alternative D and other regional cumulative developments could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact would be less-than-significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.128	Noise and vibration resulting from operational activities under Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.129	Impacts of Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.130	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.131	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.132	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact from the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.133	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.134	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.135	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not have a significant impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.136	Alternative D, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not create a significant source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	LTS	LTS

4.15 Cumulative Impacts

4.15.7 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative E

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.137	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to soils and geology. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.138	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.139	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative E in the year 2025 would not result in ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} emissions above BAAQMD CEQA threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.140	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative E in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions; however, under the CO Protocol, no CO modeling would be needed below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.141	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative E in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas emissions. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-19h	PS	LTS
4.15.142	Construction and operation of Alternative D would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.143	Construction of planned development projects and Alternative E would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.144	Alternative E would generate minimal new economic activity, but no new population growth to the project area. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.145	Operational traffic under Alternative E in the year 2025 would introduce new traffic to the study area. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.146	Operational traffic under Alternative E in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.147	Implementation of Alternative E in the cumulative year 2025 would not increase riders on local rail and bus services beyond capacity. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.148	Implementation of Alternative E has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15 .	PS	SU
4.15.149	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in significant adverse impacts to land use planning. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.150	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in significant impacts to the regional water supply or potable water distribution systems. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.151	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in significant impacts to the Richmond Municipal Sewer District Wastewater Treatment Plant or wastewater conveyance systems. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.152	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in significant impacts to solid waste and landfill capacity. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.153	Development, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, of Alternative E would not result in significant impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.154	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not create a significant impact to fire protection services or emergency medical services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.155	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not create significant impacts to the City of Richmond Police Department. A less-than-significant cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.156	Alternative E includes the creation of new Shoreline and Open Space parks and recreation facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.157	Alternative E would not result in cumulative adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.158	Noise and vibrations resulting from operational activities under Alternative E in the year 2025 would not result in increased ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a less than significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.159	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable projects in the area, would not result in cumulatively significant hazards to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.160	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.161	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.162	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact related to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.163	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.164	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.165	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, could have a significant impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	PS	PS
4.15.166	Alternative E, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not create a cumulatively considerable source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15 Cumulative Impacts				
4.15.8 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative F				
4.15.167	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to soils and geology. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.168	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable development projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to hydrology and water quality.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.169	Under Alternative F in the year 2025 no ROG, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} emission would occur. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.170	Under Alternative F in the year 2025 there would be no CO emissions. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.171	Under Alternative F in the year 2025 no GHG emissions would occur. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.172	Alternative F would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species). No impacts would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.173	Alternative F may result in neglect of structures located within the Winehaven Historic District (CA-CCO-422H), a listed historic district. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	None proposed.	PS	PS
4.15.174	Alternative F would not contribute economic activity or population growth to the project area. No impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.175	Alternative F in the year 2025 would not increase the existing traffic load and capacity of intersections and roadways within the project area. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.176	Alternative F in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.177	Under Alternative F in the year 2025 no ferry service would be available and there would be no increase in public transportation ridership. No cumulative impact to the existing setting would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.178	Alternative F would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.179	Alternative F would not result in cumulative impacts to the regional water supply or potable water distribution systems. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.180	Alternative F would not result in cumulative impacts to the Richmond Municipal Sewer District wastewater treatment plant or wastewater conveyance systems. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.181	Alternative F would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to solid waste and landfill capacity. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.182	Implementation of Alternative F, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.183	Alternative F would not create a cumulative impact to fire protection or emergency medical services. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.184	Alternative F would not create cumulative impacts to the City of Richmond Police Department. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.185	Alternative F would not result in cumulative adverse impacts associated with the need for new or expanded schools or parks, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Therefore, no impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.186	Under Alternative F in the year 2025 would not produce noise or vibration from operational activities. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.187	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable projects in the area, would not result in cumulatively significant hazards to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.188	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.189	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have no impact related to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.190	Alternative F, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have no impact related to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.191	Alternative F could have a cumulatively considerable impact on a scenic vista. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	None proposed.	PS	PS
4.15.192	Alternative F would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.193	Alternative F could have a cumulatively considerable impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	None proposed.	PS	PS
4.15.194	Alternative F would not create a cumulatively considerable source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

4.15 Cumulative Impacts

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.9 Cumulative Impacts of Alternative B1				
4.15.195	Construction and operation of Alternative B1 would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts such as soils or geology. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.196	Concurrent construction and operation of planned development projects and Alternative B1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface and groundwater quality. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.197	Concurrent operation of planned development projects and Alternative B1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to surface water quality or flooding. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.198	Concurrent construction and operation of proposed development projects and Alternative B1 would not significantly impact floodplain management. No impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.199	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would result in emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions above the established thresholds. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-25 .	PS	LTS
4.15.200	Operation of the proposed development under Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would result in CO emissions below the established threshold. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.201	Construction and operation of the proposed development under Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would result in greenhouse gas emissions. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 3-17 through MM 3-19 , MM 3-29 , through MM 3-35 , and IM 3-36 through IM 3-43 .	PS	LTS
4.15.202	Construction and operation of Alternative B1 would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to biological resources (i.e., native habitats, waters of the U.S., and special-status species).	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.203	Construction of planned development projects and Alternative B1 would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.204	Operation of Alternative B1 along with other proposed developments would increase demand for businesses in the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County that provide goods and services and would increase the local area's reliance on economic activity from the travel, tourism, and leisure industry. This is a beneficial impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.205	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, increased traffic volumes from the operation of Alternative B1 in the year 2025 have the potential to substantially increase traffic volumes of intersections within the study area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-6 through MM 7-12 , MM 7-16 , MM 7-17 , MM 7-24 , and IM 7-18 and IM 7-19 .	PS	SU
4.15.206	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would substantially increase traffic volumes of roadways segments within the project area. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	Implement MM 7-13 and MM 7-15 .	PS	LTS
4.15.207	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.208	Operation of ferry service under Alternative B1 in the year 2025 has the potential to decrease vehicles on roadways in the study area. This is a beneficial cumulative impact.	None warranted.	BI	BI
4.15.209	Traffic from the operation of Alternative B1 in the year 2025 would not result in inadequate emergency access. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.210	Combined with increased traffic from other regional projects, implementation of Alternative B1 in the cumulative year 2025 has the potential to increase delays at the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge toll plaza. This is a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.	Implement MM 7-14 and MM 7-15 .	PS	SU
4.15.211	Alternative B1 would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse impacts to land use planning with the City of Richmond and the Western Sub-Area of Contra Costa County. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.212	The local service provider, EBMUD, has the capacity to meet the potable water demand within its service area including foreseeable development projects and Alternative B1. Therefore, Alternative B1 in combination with regional development projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to the regional water supply or water treatment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.213	The demand for wastewater treatment of City-wide development projects and Alternative B1 would result in increased demand for the Richmond Municipal Sewer District wastewater treatment plant. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.214	Regional increases in solid waste, with implementation of Alternative B1 plus regional development projects could result in increased demand for landfill capacity. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.215	Development of Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telephone services. A less-than-significant impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.216	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects could create an increased demand for fire protection or emergency medical services. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.217	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, could increase service demands on the City of Richmond Police Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.218	Alternative B1 could result in the need for new or expanded schools, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.219	Alternative B1 and other regional developments could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated. This impact would be less than significant.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.220	Noise and vibration resulting from operational activities under Alternative B1 in combination with other development projects would not result in increased the ambient noise level due to traffic, HVAC, and refuse handling. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.221	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects in the area, would not result in cumulatively significant hazards to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.222	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not result in a cumulatively significant hazards resulting from reasonably foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.223	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable growth in the area, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.224	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would have a less-than-significant impact from the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	None warranted.	LTS	LTS
4.15.225	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-1 .	LTS	LTS
4.15.226	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No cumulative impact would occur.	None warranted.	NI	NI
4.15.227	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not have a significant impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-2 .	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI

TABLE ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (REVISED)

Environmental Impact No.	Impact Statement	Mitigation Measures	Significance Before Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
4.15.228	Alternative B1, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not create a significant source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. This is a less-than-significant cumulative impact.	Implement MM 12-3 .	LTS	LTS

No Impact = NI Less than Significant = LTS Potentially Significant = PS Significant = SI Significant and Unavoidable = SU Beneficial Impact = BI