

**California Environmental Quality Act
Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project Title: 500 Pittsburg Avenue, Warehouse Distribution Facility
County File #'s: DP14-3041 and GP14-0003
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Francisco Avila, Senior Planner, (925) 674-7801
4. Project Location: 500 Pittsburg Avenue
Richmond, CA 94801
APN: 408-180-010 and 408-170-072
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Redus EI, LLC/Wells Fargo Bank (Owner)
333 Market Street, 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Panattoni Development Company (Applicant's Representative)
8775 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95826
6. General Plan Land Use Designation(s): The subject property is located within a Multiple-Family Residential-Medium Density (MM) General Plan Land Use designation.
7. Zoning: The subject property is located within a Planned Unit District (P-1) zoning district.
8. Setting, Site Description & Surrounding Land Uses: The subject site is located on the southeast corner of the Richmond Parkway/Pittsburgh Avenue intersection in unincorporated North Richmond. The assessor's parcel numbers for the site are 408-180-010 and 408-170-072. The property consists of 29.5 relatively flat acres and is currently undeveloped. Numerous large trees are scattered at the periphery of the property. Parcels in the vicinity range in size from 0.25-acres to over 30-acres and tend to be developed with industrial uses. The Wildcat Creek and trail are located immediately to the south.
9. Project Description: The applicant is requesting approval of a Development Plan for the purposes of constructing and operating a new 482,055 square-foot warehouse distribution facility. The project includes: 1) off-street parking, 2) frontage improvements, 3) removal of 21 trees, 4) drainage improvements and 5) 244,238 cubic yards of grading (4,932 net import). An approximately 1.3-acre "Future Retail Pad" will be reserved at the northwest corner of the site.

The project also includes: off-site roadway improvements aimed at reducing cut-through semi-truck traffic in the residential portion of North Richmond, a County General Plan Amendment request to change the site's current Multiple-Family designation to Business Park, and levee improvements along the southern edge of the property.
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g. permits, financing, approval or participation agreement): Building Inspection Division, Grading Division, Fire Department, East Bay Municipal Utility District, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, Public Works Department, Flood Control District, West County Wastewater District, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Caltrans, Local Agency Formation Commission and City of Richmond.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

In accordance with Section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, a Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was mailed on September 21, 2017, to the Wilton Rancheria, the one California Native American tribe that has requested notification of proposed projects. Pursuant to Section 21080.3.1(d), Wilton Rancheria has not requested consultation for this project within the 30-day period afforded to them.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance		
<input type="checkbox"/> None of the above		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study:

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

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

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

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.


Signature

Francisco Avila

Senior Planner

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development

1/8/18
Date

SOURCES

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

1. Application received by Contra Costa County on October 16, 2014 and subsequent revisions.
2. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020
3. Contra Costa County Code – Title 8 Zoning Ordinance
4. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
5. Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (December, 2015)
6. Clean Water Act
7. Agency Comments
8. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2008* prepared by the California Department of Conservation
9. Public Resources Code section 12220(g)
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District proposed Thresholds of Significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions
11. California Department of Toxic Substances Control website
12. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threat
13. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map
14. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Dam Failure Inundation Areas
15. Arborist report prepared by Cardno Entrix, dated October 13, 2014.
16. Contra Costa County Code – Title 4 Health and Safety
17. Wildcat Creek Trail Feasibility/Conceptual Engineering and Biological Assessment Study Final Report prepared by DKS Associates, ALTA Planning + Design, Donaldson Associates and Environmental Collaborative, dated March 30, 2008.
18. Stormwater Control Plan prepared by Cartwright, Inc., dated May 19, 2017
19. Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Fehr and Peers, dated July 2017
20. Childcare Needs Assessment and Response Program, prepared by Kimley Horn, January 2016
21. Custom Soil Resource Report for Contra Costa County, California 500 Pittsburgh Avenue, prepared by United States Department Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Services, October 2014.
22. LSA, Cultural Resources Study Nove Project, dated January 31, 2005.
23. Biological Resources Report for the 500 Pittsburg Avenue Project Site in Richmond, California, prepared by Cardno, dated January 21, 2016.
24. Western Access Road and Eastern Closure Plan dated May 19, 2017, prepared by Balance Hydrologics, Inc..

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	_____	_____	✓	_____
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	_____	_____	✓	_____
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	_____	✓	_____	_____
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	_____	✓	_____	_____

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The subject property is located at the southwest corner of the Richmond Parkway and Pittsburgh Avenue intersection. According to the 2005-2020 County General Plan, this stretch of road is not designated as a scenic route. The site is not located near a scenic waterway or ridge. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are within the project area. The previous entitlements (SD10-9298 and DP10-3038) for this site allowed for grading and construction of 240 homes. The project represents a minor change in the overall massing of structures compared to what was previously approved for the site. The vast majority of the site's elevation range from 16 to 19 feet above mean sea level (msl). The finished floor level for the proposed 40-foot tall building will be 20.5 above msl. This minor change in site elevation represents a less than significant impact compared to what has been previously approved for this site.

c) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** - As proposed, 21 trees at the periphery of the project site will have to be removed in order to construct roadway and access improvements. However, the project sponsor is required to install new landscaping along the Pittsburg Avenue/Richmond Parkway frontages and the southern edge of the property which abuts the Wildcat Creek Trail. The project has been reviewed for compliance with the North Richmond Planned Unit District development standards, including the preliminary landscape design that has been submitted with the application. The final landscape plan must be reviewed by staff upon project approval and prior to applying for building permits. Once the vegetation has fully matured, it is expected that the landscaping will provide an effective visual buffer of the site as seen from surrounding properties. Therefore, given the site's location, relatively low profile at 40-feet tall and landscaping requirements, the proposal will have less than a significant impact on the site and surrounding North Richmond area upon implementation of Mitigation AES-1.

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

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

- d) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated** - The project will create limited new sources of glare and light predominantly during the dusk and night hours of any given day as a result of the new warehouse building, surface parking and/or other improvements on site. The retail portion of the site may include a gas station/convenience store, drive-thru fast-food building, freestanding car wash and freestanding fuel island canopy. A multi-tenant retail building may also be located on the future retail portion of this site. These types of visual alterations will be compatible with the surrounding industrial properties and will represent a less than significant impact with the implementation of the mitigation below.

Potential Impact (1-2): *The North Richmond Planned Unit District development standards require all outdoor lighting to be directed down and screened away from adjacent properties and streets. Compliance with this standard in the Final Lighting Plan must be ensured to mitigate the visual impact of the development.*

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

Potential Impact (1-3): *New exterior lighting from future tenants, may adversely impact nighttime views in the area.*

Mitigation Measure AES-3: Any proposal of new lighting that is not approved with this Development Plan permit shall be submitted to CDD staff for review and approval.

- II. **AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES** – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	_____	_____	_____	✓ _____
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	_____	_____	_____	✓ _____
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	_____	_____	_____	✓ _____
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	_____	_____	_____	✓ _____
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	_____	_____	_____	✓ _____
a-e) <u>No Impact</u> - The project site is listed as being Urban and Built-Up Land by the 2012 San Francisco Bay Area Important Farmland Map. No prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance will be affected due to the project. According to County records, no Williamson Act Contract is applicable to the subject parcel. The project site is currently zoned Planned Unit District (P-1) with a General Plan designation of MM. If approved, one warehouse distribution facility will be constructed along with the associated off-street parking and drainage features necessary for the project. Each of the contiguous parcels is developed with either industrial uses or residential neighborhoods, therefore, no forest land or timberland as defined by the California Public Resources code will be affected by the project.				

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	_____	_____	✓ _____	_____
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	✓ _____	_____

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

✓

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

✓

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

✓

a-c) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project proposes to build a 482,055-square-foot warehouse distribution facility and retail use on the subject site. The project includes construction of auxiliary parking, drainage improvements and frontage improvements. Potential air quality impacts from the proposed project have been evaluated with CalEEMod. CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model quantifies direct emissions from construction and operations (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the primary agency responsible for assuring that the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) are attained and maintained in the San Francisco Bay Area. The purpose of the BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The Guidelines provide BAAQMD-recommended procedures for evaluating potential air quality impacts during the environmental review process consistent with CEQA requirements. The thresholds listed in the table are from the guidelines prepared by BAAQMD in 2010 (updated in May, 2011). The CalEEMod results for the project, prepared by Cardno, dated January 2016, are presented below. The following tables from the Cardno report show the emission rates for the project in comparison with BAAQMD Guidelines.

Daily Operational-Related Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day) ^a				
Scenario	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Project Emissions	34.03	18.10	11.83	3.34
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	54	54	82	54
Notes:				
^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod.				
Source: Cardno January 2016				

Annual Operational-Related Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) ^a				
Scenario	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Project	5.79	2.70	1.77	.5
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	10	10	15	10
Notes: ^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod. Source: Cardno January 2016				

As described above, the project operational and construction emission levels for criteria pollutants are below the maximum thresholds that indicate significant impact. Air quality management conditions of approval will be added to the project to further ensure compliance with air quality standards during construction activities related to the project. Based on the analysis summarized in these tables, the project is not expected to have significant air quality impacts that would conflict with, violate, or cumulatively affect air quality standards.

- d-e) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** - Potential impacts to air quality which may affect sensitive receptors or the general public would be from exhaust emissions from equipment related to pre-development improvements (e.g. demolition and grading), and the construction of the project, which would occur over a limited period of time. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the agency responsible for maintaining federal and state air quality standards within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. Exhaust emissions and particulate matter (such as those from demolition equipment) produced by construction activities are regarded by BAAQMD as less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented. During the operational phase of the project, idling diesel trucks during pick-up and delivery would emit toxic air pollution. Effective February 1, 2015, the California Air Resources Board, adopted the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling (Measure). The purpose of the Measure is to reduce the exposure of the public to diesel emissions by limiting the idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles to no more than 5 minutes. The following air quality management mitigations will ensure that air quality standards are maintained during construction and operational activities related to the project.

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

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

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- e. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- f. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- g. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- i. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- j. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- k. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- l. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- m. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Potential Impact (3 - 2): *Exhaust emissions and particulate produced by idling diesel trucks during business operations (delivery and pick-up, etc.) may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants or objectionable odors.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Implement the following mitigation measures during all phases of the project.

- a) 30 days prior to applying for building permits for tenant improvement plans, the applicant/tenant shall submit plans for review and approval of CDD staff, which provide for a trucker's lounge appropriately sized for the square-footage/use intended for the space being occupied.

- b) Applicant/tenant shall electrify all loading docks to accommodate diesel-powered Transport Refrigeration Units (and similar pieces of equipment) and future use of electric trucks, both semi-trucks and delivery trucks (e.g., installation of conduit specifically designated for truck charging equipment in the future).
- c) All Transportation Refrigeration Units and similar pieces of equipment shall be plugged-in as soon as feasibly possible when entering the property.
- d) Applicant/tenants shall inform all truck drivers that idling is strictly prohibited on the warehouse property and adjacent streets in North Richmond.
- e) Applicant/tenant shall periodically sweep warehouse property to remove road dust/tire wear/brake dust in parking lots.
- f) Applicant/tenant shall not use diesel back-up generators on property unless absolutely necessary. If absolutely necessary, generators shall have Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that meets CARB's Tier 4 emission standards or meet the most stringent in-use standard, whichever has the least emissions.
- g) Applicant/tenant shall use a "clean fleet" (e.g., Zero or very low emissions, high efficiency, electric and/or alternative fuel vehicles) to the maximum extent possible. At a minimum, the applicant/tenant shall demonstrate compliance to the satisfaction of CDD staff, that all CARB requirements to control emissions from diesel engines have been met.
- h) Install sound walls and/or vegetation, when appropriate, to effectively block diesel emissions from nearby sensitive receptors (e.g., schools and residential neighborhoods).

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| of native wildlife nursery sites? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? | _____ | _____ | ✓ | _____ |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? | _____ | _____ | _____ | ✓ |

- a) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation** - The proposal is not anticipated to significantly affect the migration of wildlife as the site is not within a “Significant Ecological Area and Selected Location of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Area”, as mapped in the 2005-2020 General Plan. The entire site was occupied by a commercial nursery for many years prior to 2007. According to County records, a grading permit was also issued in 2010 which permitted the then property owner to perform remedial earthwork over the entire site. The grading was completed in August of 2011. On January 21, 2016, Cardno (consulting biologists), prepared a Biological Resources Report for the entire site. The analysis included a site survey which was conducted on December 10, 2015. The survey consisted of walking the site perimeter, followed by representative transects through the site to adequately evaluate its potential to support any of the special-status plant or wildlife species known from the region, and to determine if any wetlands subject to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board jurisdiction are present. The report concluded that the overall lack of cover due to disking and other historic disturbance on the site, in combination with the urban land uses and human activity on adjacent properties limits wildlife use of the site. According to the report, the only wildlife species observed included a number of common bird species such as mourning dove, common crow, turkey vulture, California gull, European starling, meadowlark, rock dove, and Anna’s hummingbird. Even though no special status wildlife species have been observed on the site, the following mitigation measures are added to the project to ensure that no unexpected migratory birds, etc., have occupied the site prior to construction related activities.

Potential Impact (4 - 1): *Special status wildlife species including the San Pablo Vole, and several special-status bird species, and other nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, could be harmed by the construction phase of the project.*

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Pre-construction nesting surveys shall be conducted for any nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of the onset of disturbance to affected areas. If nests are found, they will be flagged and a suitable buffer area established. No work will be conducted within this buffer area until young have fledged and are independent of the nest. Breeding bird surveys are not needed if work is conducted outside the nesting season (between September 1 and January 31).

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: A qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for bats and suitable bat roosting habitat at sites where culverts, structures and/or trees would be removed or otherwise disturbed prior to the initiation of construction. If bats or suitable bat roosting habitat is detected, CDFW shall be notified immediately for consultation and possible on-site monitoring.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Pre-construction surveys carried out for California clapper rail and California black rail would also detect other wildlife species of concern such as the San Pablo Vole. Exclusion fencing shall be installed along the southern border of the property prior to construction, and vegetation shall be cleared in phases using hand tools, exclusion fencing shall be installed as quickly as feasible, and special status species sensitivity training shall be conducted, and/or biological monitors shall be on-site to monitor pre-construction work related activities.

- b) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation** – The site was examined for potential wetlands during the site survey for this project, but none were observed within the project boundaries. Given the long history of the entire site's use as a commercial nursery and its recent grading and regular disking, it would be difficult for any wetlands to become established at this site. No riparian habitat or sensitive habitats are present within the boundaries of the project, however, riparian habitat does occur along Wildcat Creek which is located immediately to the south. The creek and subject property are separated by an existing levee. The Wildcat Creek Trail is located atop of the levee and provides a natural buffer between the site and the riparian corridor. It is possible that development adjacent to the creek corridor could have negative indirect effects to the riparian habitat due to changes in hydrology, increased pollution or other disturbance related to human activity. However, the Public Works Department, Engineering Services Division and Flood Control District staff have reviewed the project's drainage plan and have not submitted any issues of concern (e.g., all drainage will flow north away from the levee/creek). Implementation of the mitigation measure below and Mitigation Measure BIO-3, would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Potential Impact (4 - 2): *Development near the Wildcat Creek corridor could have a negative indirect impact to the riparian habitat due to changes in hydrology, increased pollution or other human related activities.*

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: To avoid potential indirect impacts on Wildcat Creek and its associated riparian habitat, the development shall observe a 45-foot setback from the southern property line. Levee/drainage improvements required by the County Flood Control District shall be allowed with the proper review and approval.

- c) **No Impact** - No wetlands, vernal pools or waters of the United States or State have been observed on the project site. Therefore, no impact is expected on wetlands.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed project is not expected to interfere with migratory fish as the project site does not contain any wetlands or navigable waterways. Nor will the project result in temporary or permanent disruption to movement of wildlife species as mitigated. The project site is not located on or near a wildlife nursery site and would therefore have no impact.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project as proposed will require the removal of 21 trees along Pittsburg Avenue for the required access and right-of-way improvements. The applicant is required to submit a landscaping improvement plan for review and approval of staff which must include an appropriate amount of trees and shrubs along this frontage as restitution. Therefore, as mitigated under AES-1, and conditioned, the project will result in a less than significant impact to any potential wildlife or tree resources.

- f) **No Impact** - The County has adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County. The subject site is located outside of the areas covered by the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, the project does not conflict with the provisions of the HCP/NCCP.

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____

- a-d) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated** - The proposed project consists of constructing a new warehouse distribution facility and retail business within a vacant property that has been completely disturbed. The area in which the facility will be constructed does not require the removal of any structures. Nevertheless, LSA completed a Cultural Resources Survey of the entire site in 2005. The survey consisted of background research, a literature review and a records search at the Northwest Information Center, consultation with potentially interested parties and a field survey. No historical resources as defined by Section 15064.5 were identified. The following mitigation measure will address any unexpected discovery or find which may occur during the construction phase of the project.

Potential Impact (5 - 1): *During the construction phases of the project, there is a potential to discover unexpected human remains or historic resources.*

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Stop work and conduct an evaluation of accidental discovery of human remains or find.

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined whether or not the remains are subject to the coroner's authority.

If human remains are encountered, work shall halt within 50-feet of the find and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist should be contacted to evaluate the situation. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Native American Most Likely Descendent to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. All work shall be postponed until a qualified archaeologist has had an opportunity to evaluate any potential find.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
4. Landslides?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1998), creating substantial risks to life or property?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____

- a-d) **Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated** - The site is approximately 1.75 miles southwest of the active Hayward fault which is capable of a magnitude of 7.1 and peak ground acceleration at the site of 0.61 g. According to the North Richmond Planned Unit District Map, the site is located in an area of “high to moderate” liquefaction potential. The

soils on the site are considered to be “moderately expansive” by the Soils Survey of Contra Costa County (1977). Such soils require special foundation design measures to avoid/minimize the damage potential. According to mapping of the U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 96-98, the site is underlain by fine-grained basin deposits of Holocene age (Qnb).

ENGO, Inc., geotechnical consultants performed an investigation to evaluate potential geotechnical hazards and provide criteria and standards to guide site grading, drainage and foundation design in 2005. The scope of subsurface investigation included logging of seven rotary wash borings (ranging from approximately 37 to 60 feet deep), along with laboratory testing of selected samples, and analysis 35 CPT probes. The data gathered indicate that the site is mantled by gray silty clay that ranges from “very soft” to “medium firm”. Based on borehole logs, this layer ranges up to 13 feet in thickness. It is underlain by stiff, sandy and silty clay that is interbedded with sands that are described as “loose” to “medium dense” and saturated. Locally, silty sands extend from the surface to a depth of 34 feet.

The 2005 ENGO, Inc. report did not identify any unavoidable geological hazards at the subject location. Engineering mitigations were identified that reduce all potential geologic hazards to less than significant levels. However, given the lapse in time and change in project parameters, the following mitigation once implemented will result in a less than significant risk with respect to geological hazards.

Potentially Significant Impact (6-1): *Construction of the proposed facility on a property with a generally high liquefaction potential and within close proximity to an active fault can cause significant structural damage if appropriate engineering considerations have not been incorporated into building/foundation designs addressing the soil characteristics of the site.*

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: At least 30-days prior to applying for building permits, the applicant shall submit for review and approval of CDD staff and the County Geologist a geotechnical report addressing the site specific soil conditions and engineering recommendations for the design of building foundations and related improvements.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: At least 30-days prior to applying for construction permits, the project geotechnical engineer shall review grading, drainage and foundation plans for consistency with recommendations in the approved geotechnical report. The letter issued by the project geotechnical engineer, shall update their recommendations for observation and testing services during a) clearing, b) grading, c) soil improvement (or importation of non-expansive fill), d) installation of drainage facilities (including bio-swales/water quality basins) and e) foundation-related work to ensure that all geotechnical recommendations are properly implemented during construction. Those monitoring services shall include any proposed retaining wall construction. Additionally, construction drawings shall include general notes that identify the inspections to be performed by the geotechnical engineer during construction.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: The project geotechnical engineer shall prepare a final report that documents the field observations and testing services provided during construction as well as provide a professional opinion on the compliance of construction with the recommendations in the design-level geotechnical report. The final report can be segmented into an as-graded report that is issued at the end of rough grading, but prior to the installation of the foundations, and a second letter commenting on the inspections made

during installation of foundations/parking lot/drainage facilities. CDD will place a hard hold on the final inspection, to ensure that the geotechnical engineer's grading-foundation inspection letter-report is provided prior to requesting the final building inspection for each building.

- e) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed facility will be serviced by existing sanitary infrastructure in the area. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts regarding the soil's inability to support a waste disposal system.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
a) <u>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</u> - The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the agency responsible for maintaining federal and state air quality standards within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines (Updated, 2011) provide screening criteria with which agencies can derive a conservative indication of whether the proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Although these thresholds have recently been challenged in court, they are utilized in this initial study as a <i>conservative</i> guideline for comparison to <i>generally</i> determine whether impacts from the project can be considered significant. The threshold for project significance of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) is 1,100 metric tons of CO ₂ e (carbon dioxide equivalent) per year. According to CalEEMod results for the project, prepared by Cardno, dated received, January 2016, the total project (construction and operation) GHG emissions are slightly above the threshold; however, the project will incorporate Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (CCC) emission reduction measures (as referenced in Appendix E "Developer Checklist" of the CCC). Implementation of these emission reduction measures is considered a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy under the CCC and therefore meets the BAAQMD's GHG threshold. Consequently, the following mitigation measure once implemented will reduce any potential GHG emission related impacts to less than significant levels.				

Potential Impact (7 – 1): Construction and operation of the project could potentially exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Implement the following Emission Reduction Measures (consistent with the CCC) into the final design of the project:

- Install High Energy Efficient Building Insulation (consistent with overall building use and as defined by the California Building Standards Code).
- Solar Energy Ready Connections (consistent with overall building use and as defined by the California Building Standards Code).
- Provide Pre-wiring at Designated Parking Spaces for Electronic Vehicle Charging Stations.

Estimated Emissions of Greenhouse Gases (metric tons CO ₂ e/year) ^a	
Source	Emissions
Area Sources	<1
Energy Sources	1,795
Mobile Sources	1,809
Waste Sources	216
Water Sources	323
Total Project GHG Emissions	4,143
Notes:	
^a GHG emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model for project construction and operations.	
Energy emissions assume compliance with 2013 Title 24 building standards.	
Source: Cardno January 2016	

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - BAAQMD guidelines also considers a project less than significant if it is consistent with an adopted qualified GHG Reduction Strategy. The County Climate Action Plan (CAP), adopted in December, 2015, contains a GHG Reduction Strategy to achieve the state-recommended reduction target of 15% below 2005 emissions levels by 2020. The project does not conflict with any of the land use and planning policies in the CAP.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?		✓		
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		✓		
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		✓		
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		✓		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety				✓

hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	_____	_____	_____	✓
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?	_____	_____	_____	✓

- a-d) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation** – The project site is located immediately adjacent to the Richmond Parkway, which is a heavily traveled roadway and within 1/3 of a mile of the Verde Elementary school. The project primarily consists of constructing a warehouse distribution facility on a vacant piece of property. However, the site plan indicates that an approximately 1-acre portion of the site is reserved for “Future Retail” which may include a gas station and separate retail building. A gas station/car wash would utilize underground fuel storage tanks and car wash related chemicals. Gasoline and diesel would be routinely transported to the site. Typically, gas station fuel systems consist of double wall fiberglass storage tanks with large volumes in excess of 40,000 gallons. Fuel dispensers and underground piping would also be double walled and include a monitoring and automatic cutoff system. These detailed project elements are regulated by California codes which are typically more stringent than Federal standards. Given compliance with these standards, the project will represent minimal risk of exposure to the public within the immediate area. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that the routine use, transport, storage and disposal of hazardous materials would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment:

Potential Impact (8 – 1): *Operation of the warehouse facility, gas station and other related retail businesses will involve the routine delivery, storage and use of hazardous materials.*

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: The project applicant/or owners and operators of businesses on the site shall obtain all required permits and follow all applicable County, State, and Federal regulations regarding the use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials and shall conduct their operations in compliance with such permits and regulations.

- e-f) **No Impact** - The subject property is not located within an airport land use plan area.
- g) **No Impact** - The proposed warehouse distribution facility/retail component will be located completely within the boundaries of the subject property, and will not interfere with transport or access along any roadways or waterways that may be part of an emergency

response or evacuation plan. The proposed project does not propose to remove or alter any existing structures that may be an element of any existing emergency response or evacuation plans. Lastly, the proposed facility will not negatively impact any communications methods that may be used during an emergency situation.

- h) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed project is strictly intended for use as a distribution facility/retail business, and will not expose people or structures to any additional risks involving wildfires.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	_____	_____	✓	_____
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	_____	_____	✓	_____
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface run-off in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	_____	_____	✓	_____
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	_____	_____	✓	_____
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	_____	_____	✓	_____
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	_____	_____	_____	✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area	_____	✓	_____	_____

structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	_____	_____	_____	_____

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

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

The project applicant will be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) as part of the construction phase of the project. The SWPPP will include specifications for Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented before, during and after project construction to control surface discharge and pollutants. Post construction drainage control will be managed by a system of sub drains, area drains, driveway culverts, and bio-retention/detention basins. These drainage control features are included as part of the Storm Water Control Program (SWCP) which has been reviewed and deemed preliminarily complete. Routine maintenance of the basins/swales will generally involve maintaining unobstructed flow in the swale, preventing and repairing any erosion in the swale, and maintaining healthy vegetation in the swale. Typical routine maintenance will involve the following activities:

- Inspecting swales for erosion and exposure of soils, removal of accumulated sediment, and repair of exposed areas;
- Periodic inspection of subdrain pipes and driveway culverts beneath the swales for evidence of sediment accumulation or other flow obstructions. Removal of accumulated sediment or flow obstructions;
- Inspection and monitoring of soil at the bottom of the swale to maintain uniform percolation. If areas of the swales are not percolating within 48-hours after a storm, the soil would be tilled and replanted;

- Periodic examination of vegetation to ensure that it is healthy and dense enough to provide the required filtration and to prevent soil erosion within the swale. Mulch should be replenished, and any fallen leaves or debris should be removed from the swale. Routine maintenance will also include mowing the vegetation, which should be limited to removing no more than 1/3 of the height of grasses. Irrigation would be performed so as not to be excessive, but to maintain healthy vegetation; and
- As part of vector control activities, any holes in the swale, or areas where water could pond for more than 48-hours, would be promptly backfilled or repaired. If any mosquito larvae are present and persistent, the Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control District would be contacted for information and advice. The use of larvicide and other pesticides would be kept to an absolute minimum and applied only when necessary by a licensed individual or contractor.

The selection, sizing, and preliminary design of the water treatment BMPs identified in the Stormwater Control Plan for the project will be required to meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board Order R2-2003-022 as part of the plan's final review prior to initiation of the project.

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

- b) **No Impact** - Ground water occurs at a depth of approximately 1 to 6 feet below the soil surface. The Project will not adversely affect groundwater or reduce the water available to the public since a public groundwater source is not affected.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact** - There are no streams or other significant hydrological features on the project site. Proposed drainage improvements will help eliminate localized water ponding by collecting and treating the surface flows from all areas of the project using the SWCP as described above. All exposed slopes will be stabilized and vegetated. The bio-retention/detention basins would reduce peak discharge rates, particularly compared to conventional inlet and pipe storm drain systems. Additionally, as proposed, the majority of the site will include roofing or paved parking lot surfaces, therefore, water flows will be directed to the DA19A storm drain via a system of pipes, reducing any potential for erosion.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact** - As indicated above, there are no streams or other significant hydrological features on the project site. After site grading and project construction, runoff from the site would be diverted through the approved drainage improvements to an drainage system, DA19A, which has been designed to take runoff from the site. On-site storm drainage systems will be required to meet County Ordinance collect and convey requirements. Based on the proposed design and enforcement of ordinance code requirements, on-site and off-site storm drain capacity is anticipated to be adequate to prevent flooding on-site or off-site.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact** – The applicant has prepared a hydrological study which demonstrates that adequate capacity exists within storm drain system DA19A to accommodate the stormwater runoff generated by the project. As mentioned above, the SWCP will slow out flows into the system to pre-project rates. Therefore, based on the approved SWCP, the project will not cause or contribute to flooding on or off-site.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact** - A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) which incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the project is required by the Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division, Grading Section prior to issuance of grading permits for the construction phase of the project. County inspection during site preparation and construction would confirm the implementation and on-going maintenance of the SWPPP and BMPs and other pertinent County requirements related to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts on water quality.
- g) **No Impact** - The project proposes to construct a warehouse distribution facility at the subject location. No housing will be constructed at the site due to this project.
- h-i) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** - The project is located immediately north of Wildcat Creek and protected by levees. Currently, the project is located in area that is outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area. However, according to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06013C0228, the levee at the project boundary does not comply with Section 65.10 of the National Flood Insurance Program Regulations. As such, FEMA plans to map the existing subject property as well as the western portion of the Republic Services property to the east, into the floodplain unless measures are taken to provide continuous protection with the appropriate freeboard near the western end of the project site. In response, the applicant proposes to add fill to the site to reinforce the existing adjacent high ground of the levee system.

By raising the elevation, there will be potential to concentrate flood flows along the Richmond Parkway frontage and the adjacent parcel to the east. In response, the applicant has submitted a Western Access Road and Eastern Closure Plan dated May 19, 2017, that demonstrates it is feasible to construct flood control improvements along Wildcat Creek which will protect adjacent properties. The Closure Plan includes the following:

North Access Road and Western Closure – The flood protection measures at the southwest corner of the project site consists of a cantilevered floodwall with a total length of 28 linear feet. On the one end, the floodwall ties directly into the existing parapet on the Richmond Parkway bridge. On the other end, it transitions to an earthen levee in order to provide vehicle access between the Richmond Parkway and existing East Bay Regional Park District trail that serves as the primary maintenance access for the north bank of the creek. A tie back levee is proposed to run north from the access road to the future high ground created by the project fill pad in order to provide a continuous flood protection system.

The top of the floodwall, access road, and top of levee are proposed to be constructed to a finished elevation of 17.6 feet NAVD. The modeled 100-year water surface elevation at this location is 13.6 feet NAVD. In order to receive FEMA levee accreditation, the NFIP requirements state that the “minimum freeboard required is 3 feet above the Base Flood Elevation all along its length and an additional 1 foot within 100 feet of structures (such as bridges) or wherever flow is restricted. At this time, a detailed floodwall/levee structural analysis has not been carried out, but will be completed as part of the FEMA accreditation process carried out by the Flood Control District.

Eastern Closure – As mentioned above, the proposed fill pad will provide high ground that is more than 5 feet above BFE along the length of the project. At the eastern end moving upstream, the fill pad slopes down, meets existing ground at the adjacent western property, then slopes back up as it transitions into the existing sound barrier berm on that western adjacent property. The Eastern Closure work will reinforce the existing high ground between the subject property fill pad and the sound barrier and provide positive drainage to the trail within a proposed slope protection easement intended to preserve flood protection integrity along the creek.

The elevation of the existing trail is between 17.0 and 18.0 feet NAVD. The proposed additional 850 cubic yards of fill will result in a finish grade elevation of 19.7 feet NAVD. Fill placement will require working around existing utility poles and also raising of an existing sanitary sewer manhole rim. This work will be coordinated with the respective utilities to assure that there are no interruptions in service. Once the following mitigation measure is completed, the associated flood protection improvements will ensure that the proposed project will be outside of the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area and protected by the improved flood protection levee/floodwall system.

Potential Impact (9 – 1): *Raising the elevation of the site to a height above the adjacent Flood Control District levee, may divert flood flows to the Richmond Parkway and adjacent parcel to the east.*

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1:

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall provide, at their expense, any needed supporting documentations requested by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Contra Costa County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (FC District) for the Section 408 review of the applicant’s proposed work along Wildcat Creek. The FC District will submit the Section 408 application package to the Corps of Engineers.
2. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall obtain any regulatory permits that may be required.
3. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the FC District for construction of the “Western Access and Eastern Closure” (flood protection improvements along Wildcat Creek). The calculated water surface elevation (WSE) levels and required freeboard line shall be shown on the project plans in order to obtain approval of the plans from the FC District.

4. Applicant shall construct the “Western Access Road and Eastern Closure” (flood protection improvements along Wildcat Creek).
5. Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, applicant shall specify import fill on its grading plans, subject to the approval of the FC District, for the flood control access road, closure structures, and related improvements. Import material shall conform to the FC District’s specifications for levee fill material and, at a minimum, shall be lean clay (CL) or clayey sand (SC) material per ASTM D 2487 from a known source free of man-made refuse, organic, and other deleterious materials; 2-inch maximum particle size and 30 percent minimum passing #200 sieve per ASTM D 1140; liquid limit of 45 or less and plasticity index greater than 12 and less than 32 per ASTM D 4318; and attain 90% compaction per ASTM D 1557-12 in maximum 8-inch thick layers with moisture at least 3 percent over optimum moisture condition.
6. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall submit a geotechnical analysis to the FC District for approval, which shall include analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed fill material at the site and the improvements for the Western Access Road and Eastern Closure to the integrity of the existing levee and creek embankment of Wildcat Creek. The geotechnical study shall evaluate the long-term impacts to the levee and creek embankment resulting from the shrubs, trees, v-ditch and irrigation system being proposed near Wildcat Creek. The geotechnical study should provide recommendations for addressing adverse impacts.
7. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall submit the site grading plans to the FC District for review.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, applicant shall submit to the Public Works Department evidence of a funding and maintenance agreement for the perpetual maintenance of the flood protection improvements within the slope easements on assessor’s parcel numbers 409-300-038 and 409-300-0-39. The applicant shall be responsible for the perpetual maintenance of the drainage and flood protection improvements within the slope easements.
9. The applicant shall be responsible for the perpetual maintenance of the drainage and flood protection improvements (including storm drains, inlets, the “western access road and eastern closure”, toe drains, etc.) within the on-site drainage (levee) easements.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, applicant shall offer to dedicate drainage (levee) easements to Contra Costa County for the “45’ Drainage Easement” along the south side of the development site and for the area labeled “Drainage Easement” on the southwest corner of the development site per the approved site plan and as shown on Western Access Road and Eastern Closure plans. These Offers of Dedication are for a future levee project and will be recorded only and will not be accepted by the County unless needed for future levee improvement purposes. Applicant shall prepare and submit a legal description and plat map of the offered area to be used as exhibits for the offer of dedication. Once it is determined that the easements are not needed for levee purposes, the property owner may request the County to vacate or terminate the offers of dedication.

11. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, applicant shall grant deed by separate instrument a drainage easement to the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for the purposed access road from Richmond Parkway to the existing service road along Wildcat Creek. This easement is shown on sheet C-3 of the 60% Western Access Road and Eastern Closure plans. Applicant shall prepare the legal description and plat map to be used as exhibits for the Grant deed.
 12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, applicant shall submit a signed agreement (permission or right of entry) with the owners of the adjacent properties on the east side of the development site (assessor parcels 409-300-039 and 409-300-038) for the construction and maintenance of the fill improvements shown on the Western Access Road and Eastern Closure plans on those properties. Applicant shall secure a signed Offer of Dedication to Contra Costa County for a slope easement from the adjacent property owners over the high ground fill area, and prepare and provide a legal description and plat map of the offered area.
 13. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, applicant shall record a deed disclosure document where the property owners acknowledge their maintenance responsibilities over the drainage improvements (concrete toe drain, structures, and drainage pipes), site fill slope, gates, fences, access roads, landscaping, and responsibility for weed abatement within the drainage (levee) easements dedicated to the County on the south side of the development site.
 14. The project is located in an area at risk of being mapped into a Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year flood boundary) as designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The applicant shall be aware of the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and the County Floodplain Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 2000-33) as they pertain to future construction of any structures on this property.
 15. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, applicant shall file for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to determine if the proposed wall and fill meet the FEMA standards and submit a copy of the CLOMR to the Public Works Department. Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the conditions of the CLOMR and file for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) with (FEMA) to remove the project site from the floodplain. Applicant shall submit a copy of the LOMR to the Public Works Department.
- j) The project would not be inundated by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. The available data indicates a reduction in the risk of a tsunami that is proportional to the distance from the Golden Gate and the western San Francisco Bay. There have been no recorded occurrences of a seiche wave in the project area.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or the regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____

a) **No Impact** - Development of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project will occur on vacant land within an overall industrial portion of North Richmond.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project site is zoned P-1 (North Richmond Planned Unit District) which has specific development standards for industrial uses. The project's floor area ratio, height, off-street parking, and setbacks all meet the prescribed requirements. Prior to construction of any proposed gas station or retail uses on the site, the applicant will be required to submit a Development Application to ensure the new gas station/gas improvements are also consistent with the development standards as prescribed within the North Richmond P-1.

Notwithstanding the project's conformance to the North Richmond P-1, the current General Plan designation for the site is Multi-Family Residential Medium-Density (MM) which is not consistent with the proposed uses. Therefore, the applicant has gained approval from the Board of Supervisors to proceed with a General Plan Amendment Study to change the site's current MM designation to Business Park (BP). According to the 2005-2020 County General Plan, the BP designation allows for a mix of commercial, office, and light industrial uses which, are compatible with adjacent commercial and residential uses. Additionally, the BP designation allows smaller retail uses aimed at serving local employees and neighboring areas. It is anticipated that the General Plan Amendment application will be approved simultaneously along with the Development Plan application for this project.

The County's Urban Limit Line (ULL) limits potential urban development in the County to 35% of the land in the County, and prohibits the County from designating any land located outside the ULL for an urban land use. The project site is located within the boundaries of the County ULL, and thus the proposed warehouse and retail uses are consistent with the intent and purpose of the ULL.

c) **No Impact** - The subject property is not located within the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/Natural Community Conservation (NCCP) coverage area. Therefore, there is no need for this project to be covered under the plan.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Result in the loss or availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	_____	_____	_____	✓
a-b) <u>No Impact</u> - According to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the Contra Costa County General Plan, the subject property is not located within an area identified as a significant mineral resource area. Additionally, staff is unaware of any prior studies done at the subject property that indicate the presence of mineral resources.				

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	_____	✓	_____	_____
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	_____	✓	_____	_____
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	✓	_____	_____
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	✓	_____	_____
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	✓

- a-d) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** - Contra Costa County has established recommended external noise levels for long-term land uses in the Noise Element of the General Plan. For industrial uses, external noise levels up to 75 dBA Ldn are conditionally acceptable. The County does not maintain recommended noise standards for temporary construction noise. The following discussion describes the anticipated short-term and long-term effects of the proposed project on noise levels.

Short-Term. Short-term noise levels related to construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase in the vicinity of the project site. Construction is performed in discrete steps, each of which has its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. Typical construction noise levels vary up to a maximum of 91 dBA at 50 feet from the construction site during the noisiest construction phases. The site preparation phase, which includes excavation and grading of the site, tends to generate the highest noise levels because the noisiest construction equipment is earthmoving equipment. Earthmoving equipment includes excavating machinery such as backhoes, bulldozers, front loaders and compacting equipment. Typical operating cycles of these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full power operation followed by 3 to 4 minutes of lower power settings.

Due to the short-term nature of this construction-related impact, the County considers it a less-than-significant impact if each of the noise-reducing measures described below is implemented. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the project's temporary construction-period noise impact to a less-than-significant level.

Potential Impact (12-1): *Construction phases of the project will cause temporary elevated noise levels.*

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: The project shall comply with the following noise reduction measures:

- General construction noise shall be limited to weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- Any pile driving and similarly loud activities (tractor use) shall be limited to weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- All heavy construction equipment used on the project site shall be maintained in good operating condition, with all internal combustion, engine-driven equipment equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition. All stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far away as possible from neighboring property lines, especially residential uses.

Long-Term. The largest increase in noise that would occur as a result of the proposed project would be due to employee/truck traffic on Pittsburgh Avenue east of the Richmond Parkway. Noise levels on this roadway segment would slightly increase due to the additional vehicular trips, however, the subject property and surrounding area is currently experiencing noise levels in the 60 to 72 dB range due to traffic along the Richmond Parkway. Therefore, given that the project will remain consistent with the allowable 70- 75 dB noise levels for industrial uses as set by the General Plan, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on long-term noise levels at the site and area in general.

The nearest residential development to the site would be the homes located approximately 235 feet to the south. At this distance, noise generated by on-site operations such as parking

lot activities and delivery trucks would be negligible. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to excessive noise levels.

- e-f) **No Impact** - The subject property is not located within an airport land use plan area. No evidence has been provided to the County that suggests noise levels associated with the warehouse facility will be above what is normally associated with the site or surrounding properties. Therefore, the project will not subject any persons or employees in the immediate vicinity of the project to noise levels substantially above that which currently exist in the area.

XIII. **POPULATION AND HOUSING** – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	_____	_____	✓	_____
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	✓

Impact: Less Than Significant Impact

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project includes the development of a warehouse distribution facility and retail business (e.g., gas station) on a vacant piece of property. The project site is located in the immediate vicinity of unincorporated North Richmond, City of Richmond and San Pablo, therefore a significant portion of employees are expected to be drawn from the nearby communities. Utility and transportation infrastructure that would serve the proposed project is in place. Access to the site is readily available from Pittsburgh Avenue via the Richmond Parkway. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the extension of infrastructure into an undeveloped area or cause the displacement of existing housing or people.
- b-c) **No Impact** - Construction of the proposed project will not require construction of housing or displacement of people as the site is currently vacant and the project is not of a scale where new employees will need to be drawn from outside of the County.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?				
1. Fire protection?	_____	_____	✓	_____
2. Police protection?	_____	_____	✓	_____
3. Schools?	_____	_____	✓	_____
4. Parks?	_____	_____	✓	_____
5. Other public facilities?	_____	_____	✓	_____

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed project consists of construction/operation of a warehouse distribution facility, as well as, a retail component which may include a gas station. The level of public services required for the site would not require construction of new governmental facilities (only extension of existing utilities). As part of the land use entitlement process, all departments and agencies responsible for providing services are consulted to determine their ability to provide services to the proposed project. Such services within the project area include, but are not limited to fire, police protection, schools, flood control, and traffic control. Each agency/department has indicated that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the proposed project.

XV. RECREATION

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

- a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The Contra Costa County General Plan bases the need of parks and other recreational facilities on the needs and changes in the number of people living in the County. As stated throughout this study, the project involves the construction

of a new warehouse distribution facility and retail business (e.g., gas station). Therefore, no new residential neighborhoods will be constructed or required as part of this development. Additionally, the proposed project does not consist of eliminating or altering any existing recreational facilities within the County. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact the amount of parks and other recreational facilities that would be required within the subject area and County as a whole.

It should be noted, that due to the projects proximity to the Wildcat Creek Trail, and potential use of the trail by employees, the developer will be dedicating a 15-foot wide, 380-foot long pedestrian bridge easement for the potential Richmond Parkway overcrossing footings at the southern end of the project site. Separate from this project, the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) commissioned the Wildcat Creek Trail Feasibility/Conceptual Engineering and Biological Assessment Study, dated March 30, 2008. The report outlines alternatives for providing year round access for trail users to cross the Richmond Parkway (overcrossing being a potential alternative). It is anticipated that sometime in the future, once EBRPD collects sufficient funds, EBRPD will secure all necessary permits and construct the overcrossing.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

✓

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

✓

- a-b) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation** - The project proposes to build a 482,055-square foot ware distribution facility. Additionally, a 1.3 acre portion of the property will be reserved at the northwest corner to allow for future retail business uses (e.g., gas station, retail business, etc.). Given these uses, the project is estimated to generate 100 or more AM and PM peak-hour trips, therefore, the applicant has contracted Fehr & Peers to prepare a Focused Transportation Impact Assessment (Report) for the project – Final Traffic Impact Analysis dated July 2017. The Report analyzed existing conditions, existing with project conditions, cumulative without project, cumulative with conditions and potential for increased cut-through truck traffic in the residential North Richmond neighborhood. Eleven intersections have been studied in preparation of the Report, in part using traffic counts during weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. According to the report, the project's passenger vehicle trip generation is approximately 2,421 daily trips. However, industrial uses are also expected to generate net new truck trips. Based on the proposed warehouse and retail uses proposed, an additional 315 total new truck trips are expected, including 21 AM and 24 PM trips. Most of these truck trips would travel via Richmond Parkway. It is estimated that unless mitigated, approximately 17 percent of the daily truck trips may travel through the North Richmond residential neighborhood, which is consistent with current travel patterns.

Analysis Methods.

The operations of roadway facilities are described with the term level of service ("LOS", a qualitative description of traffic flow based on such factors as speed, travel time, delay, and freedom to maneuver). Six levels are defined from LOS A, as free-flow operating conditions, to LOS F, or the over-capacity operating conditions. LOS E represents "at-capacity" operations. When traffic volumes exceed intersection capacity, stop-and-go conditions result, and operations are designated as LOS F. Due to the addition of the project related traffic, the following mitigation measures once implemented will reduce any potential traffic related impacts to less than significant levels.

Potential Impact (16-1): *Based on the impact criteria for intersection operations, the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact (increase of traffic delay of more than 5 seconds) at the following two study intersections unless mitigated:*

1. Richmond Parkway/Goodrick Avenue-City of Richmond Intersection (PM Peak Hour)
2. Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue (PM Peak Hour)

City of Richmond Intersection

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1: Applicant shall work with the City of Richmond to implement the following at the Richmond Parkway/Goodrick Avenue intersection:

- Stripe the current defacto right turn pocket along northbound Goodrick Avenue.
- Modify the Richmond Parkway/Goodrick Avenue signal to include a right turn overlap phase for the northbound right turn and adjust signal timings.

Constructing these improvements would result in acceptable traffic operations (LOS D) at the intersection (53.4 seconds of delay in the PM peak hour). Therefore, constructing the improvements results in the impact at the intersection being less-than-significant with mitigation. The prohibition of the westbound Richmond Parkway U-turn movement (required to support the overlap phase) is not anticipated to cause a secondary significant impact because the number of U-turns on this movement is minimal. *Construction of this mitigation measure would be subject to approval of the City of Richmond.*

Contra Costa County Intersection

Potential Impact (16-2): *Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue (PM peak hour) – The addition of the project traffic under existing plus project conditions exacerbates unacceptable intersection operations (LOS F without the project) by increasing the average delay at the study intersection by more than 5.0 seconds, resulting in a significant impact unless mitigated.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-2: Implement the following at the Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue intersection:

- Adjust signal timings to better accommodate changed travel patterns.

Adjusting the signal timing at the intersection would result in an intersection delay value of 53.9 seconds (LOS D). The net increase in delay versus Existing Conditions would be less than 5.0 seconds; therefore, adjusting the signal timing results in the impact at the intersection being less-than-significant with mitigation.

CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

Level of service calculations were conducted to evaluate intersection operation under 2040 no Project and 2040 plus Project conditions. The results of the LOS analysis are as follows:

The impact at Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue Richmond, Parkway/Goodrick Avenue and Canal Boulevard/I-580 Westbound Ramps intersections would be significant unless mitigated.

City of Richmond Intersection

Potential Impact (16-3): *Richmond Parkway/Goodrick Avenue – The addition of project traffic under 2040 plus Project conditions would worsen unacceptable LOS conditions during the weekday PM peak hour by increasing average delay by more than 5.0 seconds, resulting in a significant impact unless mitigated.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-3: Implement mitigation measure TRAFFIC-1 at the Richmond Parkway/Goodrick Avenue intersection.

Constructing these improvements would result in an intersection delay value of 191.3 seconds. The net increase in delay versus Cumulative without Project Conditions would be less than 5.0 seconds; therefore, constructing the improvements results in the impact at the intersection being less-than-significant with mitigation.

Contra Costa County Intersection

Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg intersection is a signalized intersection that operates unacceptably in the PM peak hour under Cumulative without Project Conditions and Cumulative with Project Conditions. Therefore, the project would cause a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

Potential Impact (16-4): *Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue – The addition of project traffic under 2040 plus Project conditions would exacerbate the unacceptable PM peak hour operating conditions (projected LOS F) by increasing intersection delay by more than 5.0 seconds per vehicle. Therefore the project would cause a significant impact unless mitigated.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4: Applicant shall implement the following at the Richmond Parkway/Pittsburg Avenue intersection:

- Widen the westbound approach to include a second lane, such that the final lane geometry configuration would include:
 - One left turn only lane
 - One left turn-through-right turn shared lane
- Adjust signal pole and mast arm, curb returns and any other roadside features that need to be relocated as a result of the intersection widening.
- Adjust signal timings to accommodate the new westbound approach configuration.

Constructing the improvements would result in an intersection delay value of 126.3 seconds (LOS F). The net increase in delay versus Cumulative without Project Conditions would be less than 5.0 seconds; therefore, constructing the improvements results in the impact at the intersection being less-than-significant with mitigation.

City of Richmond/Caltrans Intersection

Potential Impact (16-5): *Canal Boulevard/I-580 Westbound Ramps (PM peak hour) is a signalized intersection that operates unacceptably in the PM peak hour under Cumulative without Project Conditions and Cumulative with Project Conditions. Therefore the project would cause a significant impact unless mitigated.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-5: The applicant shall construct the following prior to requesting a final building inspection (occupancy):

- Adjust signal timings to better accommodate changed travel patterns.

Adjusting the signal timing at the intersection would result in an intersection delay value of 60.7 seconds (LOS E). The net increase in delay versus Cumulative without Project Conditions would be less than 5 seconds; therefore, adjusting the signal timing results in the impact at the intersection being less-than-significant with mitigation. *Implementation of this mitigation measure would be subject to approval by the City of Richmond and Caltrans.*

NORTH RICHMOND NEIGHBORHOOD CUT-THROUGH SEMI-TRUCK TRAFFIC

The project is located just north of the North Richmond residential neighborhood, and the project is anticipated to generate some truck trips with origins/destinations in the City of San Pablo area. Depending on the level of congestion on the designated truck routes in the area, some truck traffic generated by the project could cut-through the North Richmond residential neighborhood via Fred Jackson Way-Market Avenue to access destinations in San Pablo. Trips to/from I-80 and points north and east are expected to use Richmond Parkway, which is a high speed roadway (50 mph expressway) and offers a travel time advantage versus travel through the City of San Pablo towards the I-80/El Portal Drive interchange.

Fehr & Peers has prepared a truck traffic calming assessment, dated August 24, 2016, to address the County's concerns about cut-through traffic in the North Richmond neighborhood. The assessment utilized findings from the County's 2007 North Richmond Truck Route Study, and traffic count data of cut-through traffic in 2016. The assessment provides suggestions for potential traffic calming strategies that may be used to reduce cut-through truck traffic in the North Richmond neighborhood, while improving neighborhood aesthetics and pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

Potential Impact (16-6): *Of the total net-new truck trips expected to be generated by land use development in the area, the proposed Pittsburgh Avenue project is expected to generate approximately 315 new daily truck trips, or approximately 30 percent of the 1,030 total cumulative new truck trips in the area. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential travel time advantages for cut-through truck traffic, which will reduce the amount of current and potential future project related cut-through truck traffic in the residential North Richmond area.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-6: The applicant/developer shall construct one offsite truck traffic calming improvements as identified within the August 24, 2016, Preliminary Truck Traffic Calming Assessment for the North Richmond Neighborhood, subject to the review and approval of the CDD staff and the Public Works Department. Key corridors that have been identified for improvement include but are not limited to the following:

- Fred Jackson Way north of Market Avenue
- Fred Jackson Way south of Market Avenue
- Gertrude Avenue
- Chesley Avenue
- Market Avenue

The offsite calming improvements identified for Fred Jackson Way shall be the first priority. Should the Fred Jackson Way improvements already be physically completed/underway by the time the applicant/developer is prepared to commence construction, then a secondary improvement (as identified within the August 24, 2016, Fehr & Peers assessment) approved by CDD staff and the Public Works Department, shall be constructed. The approved truck traffic calming measure shall be completed prior to occupancy (final building inspection) of the subject project.

The applicant's cost for completing the approved truck traffic calming improvements shall be evidenced and verified by valid receipts for said work, including all hard construction costs and engineering, architectural, geotech and other valid professional costs as specified in the County's credit and reimbursement policy (but excluding County fees and plan check costs), and those costs deemed eligible by the Public Works Department shall be credited against the North Richmond Area of Benefit fees as administered by the Public Works Department, provided the applicant contributes to the AOB update rate for the revised project list. To the extent said costs are less than the fees assessed for the project, the applicant shall be obligated to pay the difference upon demand by Contra Costa County. Applicant shall be obligated to complete the offsite traffic calming work in the event the cost of the work exceeds the fee amounts available as credits.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-7: The applicant shall also pay the Contra Costa County, Department of Conservation and Development, Current Planning Division, a flat not-to-exceed amount of \$60,000 as its fair share contribution towards the cost of a General Plan update for the North Richmond area.

- c) **No Impact** - As discussed above in 13a, the project proposal is not expected to cause a substantial increase in population, and thus, is not expected to cause an increase in air traffic levels.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact** - Design features proposed with the project include site improvements such as grading, repairs and new connections to public roadways. These improvements will be reviewed by the appropriate County agencies at the time of application for building permits for compliance with established standards to prevent the construction of improvements which may cause safety hazards.
- e) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project has been reviewed by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and recommendations were made for the project to ensure adequate emergency access. The Fire Protection District's approval will be part of project implementation.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation** - Pedestrians will access the site from Pittsburg Avenue via two walkways. Striped crosswalks will be provided where these pedestrian facilities cross parking aisles. The walkways are required to meet American with Disabilities Act standards and will be reviewed as part of the Plan Check Process of the project. Frontage improvements (sidewalk) will also be constructed along the northern edge of the property. This sidewalk will tie directly into the Pittsburg Avenue/Richmond Parkway intersection and provide convenient access to the Wildcat Creek Trail immediately south of the project site. Additionally, the applicant dedicated an access easement along the southern portion of the property for the potential construction of a Richmond Parkway overcrossing for pedestrians. The East Bay Regional Park District

would be responsible for permitting and construction related responsibilities to construct overcrossing project.

No on-site bicycle parking has been identified within the site plan for this project, therefore to promote bicycle commuting to the project site, the following mitigation measure will encourage an alternative means of travel other than automotive vehicles.

Potential Impact (16-8): *Lack of onsite bicycle parking will limit commuting options to and from the project site.*

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-8: At least 30-days prior to applying for a building permit, the applicant shall submit for review and approval of CDD staff a revised site plan reflecting the addition of on-site bicycle parking compliant with the County's Off-Street Parking Ordinance, Chapter 82-16.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____

- a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** – As discussed in Section 5.a-d above, the cultural resources study completed by George McKale M.A., RPA #11628, LAS Associates, Inc., dated January 31, 2005, concluded that no historical resources are likely to exist on the project site. Further, according to the County's Archaeological Sensitivities map, Figure 9-2, of the County General Plan, the subject site is located in an area that is considered "largely urbanized," and is generally not considered to be a location with significant archaeological resources. Thus, there is little potential for the project to impact cultural or tribal resources. Nevertheless, the expected construction and grading could cause ground disturbance which may impact heretofore undocumented cultural resources. Implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1 would reduce the impact on archeological resources during project related work.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	✓	_____
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	✓	_____
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	✓	_____
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	_____	_____	_____	✓
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	_____	_____	_____	✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs?	_____	_____	_____	✓
g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	_____	_____	_____	✓

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The sewage collection system would transport wastewater from the project site to a West County Wastewater District (WCWD) facility for treatment. The onsite piping system is required to comply with all applicable requirements established by the WCWD. WCWD staff has returned comments indicating that capacity exists within their system to accommodate the proposed uses associated with this project. Therefore, the project related wastewater is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact** - As detailed in section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, stormwater runoff from the developed areas would flow through a system of bioswales, channels and storm drain pipes to several detention basins. This system will reduce the rate and amount of surface runoff leaving the project site and help reduce "first flush" pollutant levels. Any excess runoff that passes through the detention basins will be directed to Lines F and C of drainage area DA 19A. These facilities are located near the corner of Pittsburg Avenue and Richmond Parkway. Line C, which is the primary drainage outfall line for DA

19A, is located along Pittsburgh Avenue and drains westerly towards San Pablo Bay. These drainage lines are located within the public right-of-way, which have been previously disturbed. Therefore, any new drainage improvements at this location will not result in any substantial environmental disturbance.

- d-e) **No Impact** - Potable water services will be provided to the site by East Bay Municipal Utilities District. Wastewater services will be provided to the site by West County Wastewater District. Both utilities have submitted “agency comments” indicating that sufficient capacity exists to serve the proposed development.
- f-g) **No Impact** - The proposed project will be served by the West Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill. This landfill generally acts as a transfer station which trucks much of its waste to other County facilities. As such, capacity exists within the County’s landfill network to accommodate the proposed project.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but are cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	_____	_____✓_____	_____	_____
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
a) <u>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</u> - The combination of type and location of the proposed project creates a scenario where there is fairly minimal potential for adverse impacts to plant/animal communities, examples of California history, or environment in general. However, the construction phase of the project may have impacts on unforeseen cultural resources yet to be discovered and air quality. To mitigate those potential impacts, mitigation measures have been incorporated into this project that once implemented will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Once constructed, the proposed warehouse and retail uses will primarily require electrical power for				

operation, and will not produce significant amounts of hazardous waste as a byproduct of its operation.

- b) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated** - Construction of the proposed 482,055-square-foot warehouse facility and associated parking and drainage improvements will not significantly alter the environmental characteristics of the site. The project also includes potential retail business uses on the northwest corner of the site which has been addressed in the Traffic Impact Analysis for this proposal. However, staff is aware of several other similarly sized projects in the general North Richmond area. Each project (new warehouses at 2601 Goodrick Avenue and at 81 Parr Boulevard) is required to complete an independent environmental review and to mitigate each projects' potential impacts. Both of those projects are at various stages of County review/approval at the time this analysis was completed. Nevertheless, the combined traffic worst cases scenarios have been evaluated as part of this analysis and mitigations have been included as part of this document, that once implemented will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project as mitigated, along with the other identified North Richmond projects would have a less than significant cumulative effect on the environment.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed warehouse facility will primarily be used for shipping and receiving of goods. As of the date of this initial study, staff is unaware of any studies or other reports that have been issued that indicate the project will result in a hazard to humans.

