SECTION 1.0
INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE AND NEED / OBJECTIVES

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), in cooperation with the City of Richmond (City), acting as Lead Agencies, initiated the preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) to address the environmental effects of selling approximately 266 acres of City owned property to Upstream Point Molate, LLC (Upstream) and the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians of the Guidiville Rancheria (Tribe), taking approximately 266 acres into federal trust for the Tribe, approval of a gaming management contract, and the approval of a mixed-use development to serve as the Tribe’s economic base. The land proposed for transfer into federal trust is located within the former Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate (NFD). The NFD (project site), which was closed in 1995, is approximately 413-acres in size (Figures 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3). As proposed, the City would retain title of a 50-foot strip of land along the shoreline of the project site (approximately seven acres) which, along with the submerged lands within San Francisco Bay (approximately 140 acres), will be leased to the Tribe and its partners, Upstream.

In 2003, 85 percent of the project site was transferred to the City pursuant to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process (Figure 1-4). The remainder of the project site is scheduled for transfer to the City in early 2009, on March 25, 2010 as provided for in the Early Transfer Cooperative Agreement (Appendix X), which provides for completion of environmental remediation work that is detailed in subsequent sections of the document. Prior to transferring the bulk of the former NFD, the Navy and City prepared a joint EIS/EIR that analyzed the potentially significant environmental impacts of disposal and reuse of the project site and is included as Appendix U.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the requirements set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508); the BIA’s NEPA handbook (59 IAM 3); the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14), and City of Richmond’s guidelines and procedures for implementation of CEQA (Resolution No. 125-03). Consistent with NEPA and CEQA, this Final EIR is a public information document that assesses potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action/Project, and identifies mitigation measures and alternatives to the Proposed Project that could reduce or avoid adverse environmental impacts. Alternatives to the Proposed Project include the “Preserve Building 6” Multi-Use...
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Tribal Destination Resort and Casino with Residential Component Alternative (Alternative B1) which has been added to the analysis of this Final EIR in response to comments received on the Draft EIS/EIR (see Section 3.0 of Volume I of this Final EIR). A No Action Alternative is also addressed as required under NEPA and CEQA. As an informational document for use in the planning and decision-making process, the Final EIR does not recommend either approval or denial of the Proposed Project.

The BIA is the federal agency that is charged with reviewing and approving tribal applications pursuant to 25 CFR Part 151 to take land into Federal trust status, which constitutes a major federal action (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.18). The Secretary of the Interior has the authority to proclaim lands acquired in trust as a new reservation for a tribe pursuant to Section 7 of the Indian Reorganization Act, 25 USC 467. The Secretary of the Interior also determines whether the lands are eligible for gaming under Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), 25 USC 2719.

As the local Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA, the City has responsibility for approving certain discretionary actions it may take including sale of the property, issuing a shoreline lease, and approval of design concept documents, which are further detailed in the Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) (Appendix C) and Section 2.2.1 of this document. The City has drafted a Municipal Services Agreement (MSA), but has not yet executed the agreement. If the City decides to adopt one of the alternatives that includes federal trust acquisition (Alternatives A, B, C, or B1), the mitigation measures prescribed in this EIS/EIR would become an attachment to the MSA, which would then be executed. Undertaking the series of actions that flow from the LDA and MSA constitutes a discretionary action, as defined by CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 21065(c)).

The “land into trust” decision, approval of land leases, and gaming management contract approval approval on the part of the federal government, Department of the Interior, as well as the discretionary actions on the part of the City, constitute the Proposed Action. The Proposed Project consists of the foreseeable consequence of the federal and City actions, namely the proposed trust land acquisition and development of mixed-use tribal destination development of a resort and casino-hotel complex with shoreline parks, open space, cultural facilities, entertainment and conference venues, retail, tribal government facilities, and housing components.

The BIA and City were acting as joint Lead Agencies for the purpose of the Draft EIS/EIR. NEPA and CEQA encourage federal and state agencies to work together to eliminate duplication between their respective processes (40 CFR 1506.2, Elimination of Duplication with State and Local Procedures; CEQA Guidelines Sections 15170 and 15222). This cooperation includes the preparation of joint impact statements and impact reports as well as joint planning processes and hearings (40 CFR Sections 1506.2 (b) and (c); CEQA Guidelines Sections 15170, 15222 and 15226). Where states have requirements that go beyond NEPA, federal agencies are encouraged to cooperate in fulfilling those requirements “so that one document will comply with all applicable laws” (40 CFR Section 1506.2 (c); CEQA Guidelines...
Section 15222). The preparation of the Draft EIS/EIR insured that all the environmental requirements of both jurisdictions are fulfilled (once rather than twice).

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The approximately 413-acre project site is located within the City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, California (Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2). Approximately 140 acres of the project site are submerged within the San Francisco Bay. The project site consists of lands formerly and presently owned by the U.S. Navy (Figure 1-3). The Navy ceased operations on the site on September 30, 1995, and in September 2003 transferred approximately 85 percent of the property to the City pursuant to the BRAC process (Appendix U) and the City’s 1997 Point Molate Reuse Plan (Appendix D). The portions of the project site that are still retained by the Navy are depicted in Figure 1-4. The Navy and City prepared a joint EIS/EIR before the transferring of ownership of the project site. The remaining 15 percent of land will be transferred under an agreement between the City and the Navy that provides for the completion of petroleum and other hazardous materials remediation. The final Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) and Early Transfer Cooperative Agreement (ETCA) were executed on September 8, 2008, and are included as Appendix X. Contra Costa County has given the project site Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 561-100-008 (Figure 1-5).

1.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The foreseeable consequences of the Federal and City discretionary actions discussed above and detailed in Section 2.0 will be the development of a proposed resort casino-hotel complex at the project site (Proposed Project). The Proposed Project includes construction 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, shoreline parks, a Tribal park, Tribal government offices and cultural facilities, rehabilitation restoration of 34 of the historic buildings located on-site, and transportation facilities including a public-ferry terminal which is funded by the Project and open to the public.

An analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project is provided in this document, as required by CEQA. A Preferred Alternative will be identified in the Final EIR after a thorough review of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative, the potential for each alternative to satisfy the purpose and need (Section 1.4), and public comments on the Draft EIS/EIR. Further details of the Proposed Project are provided in Section 2.0 of this Final EIR.
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1.4 PURPOSE AND NEED AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

NEPA requires that an EIS include a discussion of the underlying purpose and need in pursuing the Proposed Action (40 CFR 1502.13). The purpose and need statement assists the Lead Agency in selecting an adequate and appropriate range of alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS. Similarly, Section 15124(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that “a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project” be provided and that it include the underlying purpose of the project. As with NEPA, the project objectives statement under CEQA assists the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives and aids the decision makers in preparing their findings.

Pursuant to NEPA requirements, the purpose and need of the Lead Agency (the BIA) in considering the Proposed Action is to strengthen the Tribal Government and improve the socioeconomic status of the Tribe by providing land that can sustain a stable economic base. Strengthening tribal governments and promoting tribal self-determination is an essential trust responsibility of the federal government. 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. Furthermore, the Federal Government was ordered to treat the Tribe in a manner consistent with that of other tribes with similar status. The Secretary of the Interior has the discretion and authority under 25 USC Section 465 to acquire lands in trust for Indian tribes, providing tribes with land subject to tribal jurisdiction and free from taxation. Procedures for such trust acquisitions are found in 25 CFR 151.

Economic opportunities for the Tribe are limited by the same two factors that limit opportunities for many Indian tribes in California – the lack of both developable land and capital necessary for commercial or other development. Unemployment among Tribal members is extraordinarily high. Of the Tribe’s 114 members, 79 are available for work, of which 16 percent are unemployed. Of the 84 percent employed, 83 percent earn a wage below the poverty threshold. The low wages earned by the Tribe correspond with the low education level of Tribe members. According to information provided by the Tribe approximately 86 percent of the members have not graduated from high school. 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. When the Tribe was restored in 1991, it was barred from reestablishing the historic reservation boundaries or transferring the former tribal land, a 244-acre parcel near Talmage, into trust. In 1994, the Tribe acquired a 44-acre parcel in Ukiah with a federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) block grant specifically for housing purposes. The Tribe investigated the potential for using a portion of the Ukiah parcel for commercial development but it was found to be impracticable due to limited site access, steep topography, existing wetlands, streams, and oak woodlands, and active landslides. The portions of the property suitable for development (approximately eight acres) have been developed for housing. As such, the Tribe currently does not have land in Trust suitable for economic development (refer to Section 3.7 Socioeconomics for a more detailed discussion of Tribal lands).
The approval of the Proposed Project would provide a Tribal land base for its members and establish a Tribal Headquarters from which its Tribal Government can operate to provide housing, health care and other governmental services, and from which it can conduct the economic development necessary to fund these Tribal Government services and provide employment opportunities for its members. The Proposed Action 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 decision.

Approval and construction of the Proposed Project would assist the Tribe in meeting the following specific objectives:

- Replace wrongfully terminated reservation lands, 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);
- Improve the socioeconomic status of the Tribe by providing a revenue source that would be used to: a) strengthen the Tribal Government, b) fund a variety of social, cultural, environmental, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, health and welfare services to improve the quality of life of Tribal members consistent with federal policy, and c) provide capital for future economic development and investment opportunities;
- Allow the Tribe to establish a foundation for economic self-sufficiency;
- Provide employment and business opportunities to the Tribal and non-Tribal community;
- Provide funding for local governmental agencies, programs, and services; and
- Make contributions to charitable organizations and governmental operations, including local educational institutions.

Each of these purposes is consistent with the limited allowable uses for gaming revenues, as required by IGRA. To ensure that revenues raised from gaming are used to “promote tribal economic development, tribal self sufficiency, and strong tribal government,” IGRA (25 U.S.C. § 2710(b)(2)(A)) limits the use of net gaming revenues to the following:

- Funding tribal government operations or programs;
- Providing for the general welfare of the Indian tribe and its members;
- Promoting tribal economic development;
- Making donations to charitable organizations; and
- Funding operations of local government agencies.

Creating a mechanism for improving the Tribe’s economic base represents one of the primary purposes of IGRA. IGRA states that Congress finds “a principal goal of Federal Indian policy is to promote tribal economic development, tribal self sufficiency, and strong tribal government...” (25 USC Section 2701). IGRA also states that one of the purposes of the act is “to provide a statutory basis for the operation of
gaming by Indian tribes as a means of promoting tribal economic development, self-sufficiency, and strong tribal governments...” (25 USC Section 2702).

The casino facility will be operated pursuant to the requirements of federal law, Tribal law, and a Tribal/State Compact that will be negotiated between the State of California and the Tribal Government. The gaming derived revenues, combined with other revenue streams from the Proposed Project, will substantially contribute to the Tribal Government’s long-term, sustainable revenue base from which to fund government operations and Tribal programs that will decrease Tribal members’ dependence on Federal and State funding. The Tribal Government will use revenues from business developed on the project site to fund a variety of social, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, health and welfare services to improve the quality of life of Tribal members, and to provide capital for other economic development and investment opportunities. The casino will provide employment opportunities for Tribal members and many local non-Tribal residents. Casino operations will also promote the purchase of goods and services, which may be provided by nearby communities. Additionally, funds from the Proposed Project will be used to assist local governmental operations, programs and services, and charitable organizations, including local educational institutions.

The project objectives of the local Lead Agency (City of Richmond), for purposes of CEQA requirements, are to implement a reuse for the project site that:

- Is consistent with the BRAC processes, as well as the applicable conveyance legislation, and Navy Record of Decision (ROD) for the transfer;
- Promotes employment and long-term economic development within the City and creates business opportunities within the City and Contra Costa County;
- Provides long-term income to the City for operation of governmental programs;
- Provides enhanced public recreational facilities and opportunities within the City and improved access to the shoreline;
- Balances economic development with preservation of open space and important historic resources;
- Facilitates the early environmental clean-up of Point Molate
- Enhances regional public transportation facilities;
- Is consistent with the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Board recommendations, as codified in the Point Molate Base Reuse Plan (Brady and Associates, 1997);
- Is consistent with the recommendations of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB);
- Protects natural resources; and
- Satisfies the City’s obligations pursuant to the stipulations of the LDA.
1.5 OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

1.5.1 LEAD AGENCIES

The BIA serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with NEPA and the City of Richmond serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with CEQA.

Contact information for the two agencies is as follows.

U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Region Office
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2820
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
(916) 978-6042

City of Richmond
City Manager’s Office Planning Division
450 Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, CA 94804
(510) 620-6512 620-6706

1.5.2 SCOPING

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for implementing NEPA require a process, referred to as “scoping” for determining the range of issues to be addressed during the environmental review of a Proposed Action (Section 1501.7). CEQA Guidelines Section 21083.9(2) requires that a lead agency hold at least one scoping meeting for a project that has statewide, regional, or area-wide significance. The scoping process entails a determination of issues by soliciting comments from agencies, organizations and individuals.

The BIA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register on March 11, 2005, and the City issued the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the preparation of an EIR on March 15, 2005. The NOI and NOP briefly described the Proposed Action/Project and the reasons why an EIS/EIR was being prepared. Local public notices announcing the Proposed Action/Project and the joint scoping meeting were published in The Contra Costa Times on March 16, 2005, and The West County Times on March 15, 2005. The NOI, NOP, and local public notices are included as Appendix A.

The issues that were raised during the NOI/NOP comment period have been summarized within the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report Scoping Report, Point Molate Fee-to-Trust and Gaming Resort Development Project (Appendix B). This report was issued by the BIA in July 2005 and is available for review at the BIA’s Pacific Region Office. The Draft EIS/EIR is responsive to the issues and concerns summarized within the Scoping Report.
During the NOI/NOP comment period (March 11 to April 12, 2005), four Cooperating Agencies were identified: (1) National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), (2) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), (3) Contra Costa County, and (4) the Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians. In addition to these agencies, the BIA issued Cooperating Agency invitations to the following agencies:

**Federal**
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – SF District

**State**
- California State Lands Commission
- State Historic Preservation Office
- California State Department of Transportation
- Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- California Environmental Protection Agency
- California Coastal Commission
- California Coastal Conservancy
- California Department of Fish and Game
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

To date, none of these agencies have accepted Cooperating Agency status.

### 1.5.3 Public Review of the Draft EIS/EIR

The Draft EIS/EIR was distributed to Federal, Tribal, State, and local agencies and other interested parties for a 75 to 105-day review and comment period. The review and comment period began following publication of a Notice of Filing in the Federal Register by the USEPA and filing of a Notice of Completion with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse. The Notice of Availability (NOA) published simultaneously by the BIA and the City provided the time and location of public hearing(s).

The Lead Agencies will carefully consider and respond to timely comments on the Draft EIS/EIR and will take those comments into consideration when making a decision about the Proposed Project. Members of the public that chose to submit a comment on the Proposed Project for the agencies’ consideration must have done so during the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Comments may address any portion of the document or the Proposed Project.

### 1.5.4 Final EIR and EIR Certification

Written comments received during the comment period, including those submitted or recorded at the public hearing(s), are addressed in a Response to Comments addendum document, (Volume I of the Final EIR), which, together with the revised DEIS/DEIR Draft EIS/EIR text will...
constitute the Final EIS/EIR. 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.

1.5.5 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CEQA Guidelines Section 21081.6 requires lead agencies to “adopt a reporting and mitigation monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” The specific “reporting or monitoring” program required by CEQA is not required to be included in the Final EIR. Throughout this Final EIR, however, mitigation measures have been clearly identified and presented in language that will facilitate establishment of a monitoring and reporting program. Any mitigation measures adopted by the City of Richmond as conditions for approval of the project will be included in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to verify compliance. Moreover, if the City decides to adopt one of the alternatives that includes federal trust acquisition of the project site (Alternatives A, B, C, and B1), the mitigation will be attached as an exhibit to the MSA, and thus will be incorporated into a legally enforceable contract that provides for a limited waiver of the Tribe’s sovereign immunity for enforcement of contractual obligations specified in the LDA and its attachments (including the MSA). The waiver of sovereign immunity is provided in Section 11.3 of the MSA (Appendix C).

CEQ directs all federal agencies to include in an EIS the appropriate means to mitigate any adverse environmental impacts (40 C.F.R 1502.16(h)). CEQ also requires that a Mitigation Monitoring and Enforcement Plan (MMEP) be adopted and summarized in the Record of Decision (ROD) (40 C.F.R. 1505.2(c)).

1.6 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, PERMITS, AND APPROVALS

Implementation of the Proposed Project will require federal, state, and City permits and approvals. Table 1-1 identifies each responsible agency and the potential permit or approval required. If the City adopts one of the redevelopment Alternatives (A, B, C, D, or B1), environmental remediation could begin at the project site following certification of the Final EIR and transfer of title to Upstream. In the event that the
The federal government does not accept the project site into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, the developer would be subject to the City’s established review process for development approval, including entitlement, design review, etc.

**TABLE 1-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit or Approval</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Indian Gaming</td>
<td>Approval of Tribal gaming ordinances.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Approval of Management Contract.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Interior</td>
<td>Transfer of a portion of the project site into Federal trust status for the Tribal Government.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issuance of a Reservation Proclamation.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of long-term land leases.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of a Tribal-State Compact</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities as required by the Clean Water Act.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification for Trust Lands.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Approval of permit(s) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the filling of jurisdictional wetlands/waters.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Section 7 Consultation under the Federal Endangered Species Act if endangered species may be affected by the project.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Marines Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Execution of a Tribal – State Compact</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Historic</td>
<td>Consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Commission Permit (for activities within 100 feet from the San Francisco Bay) and Consistency Determination with the Bay Plan.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>Permit and lease for pier modifications and use of offshore area for ferry service.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
<td>Early transfer of Navy Parcels.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Regional Water</td>
<td>Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for construction or operation of facilities on fee lands that would result in discharge into waters of the State (as regulated under the Porter Cologne Act) or navigable waters of the U.S, including those presently underground, and permits</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.0 Introduction / Purpose and Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit or Approval</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and approvals by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remediation Plan final approval authority</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game Approval of permit(s) under Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code for activities that would result in changes in, removal of material from, and addition of certain material to, streams and lakes.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Department of Transportation Approval of an Encroachment Permit for the construction of mitigation improvements.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Richmond Execution of the Municipal Services Agreement</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of a General Plan Amendment and zoning changes.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of subdivision map and zoning changes.</td>
<td>B, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of Design Concept Documents as required by the MSA.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer of the land from the City of Richmond to Upstream Point Molate LLC.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval and acceptance of conservation easements.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of encroachment permits for Western Drive widening, off-site utility alignments and connections, and off-site roadway improvements.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade of Western Drive and water/sewer infrastructure.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of the City's lease of the shoreline park and Bay Trail.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contra Costa County Contra Costa County encroachment permits and approvals may be required for road improvements within the County right of way.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians Approval of all necessary Tribal permits and /or ordinances for development on newly acquired trust lands.</td>
<td>A, B, C, B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AES, 2011.