

RESOLUTION NO. 105-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND CERTIFYING THE RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE #2014092082), ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND APPROVING A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN (PLN 13-108)

I. GENERAL FINDINGS

A. Introduction. The City of Richmond is proposing to adopt the Richmond Bay Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which presents a vision and specific regulations to improve the public and private realms along Richmond's waterfront ("Southern Shoreline"), as directed by the Richmond General Plan 2030 ("General Plan"). Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in development of a foreseeable maximum theoretic buildout scenario that contains: up to 5.7 million square feet of uses described as Research and Development (R&D)/Business/Service use; up to 720,000 square feet of retail use; up to 5,700 residences; and approximately 32.7 acres of open space uses over the next 35-40 years. The Specific Plan is divided into four sub-areas, which can develop as complete neighborhoods with access to affordable and quality services, transportation choices, and public space. In the near term, a likely future scenario for redevelopment of currently vacant and/or underutilized properties within a portion of the developable area of Sub-Area 4, consistent with the Specific Plan, could involve development of up to 1.27 million square feet of R&D/Business/Service uses; up to 190,000 square feet of retail use, up to 1,520 residences, and approximately 6.5 acres of new open space uses within a portion of Sub-Area 4 ("Sub-Area 4 Project"). Collectively, the Specific Plan and Sub-Area 4 Project are referred to as the Project. Required Project approvals include: (i) adoption of the Specific Plan; (ii) approval of a General Plan amendment establishing a new Richmond Bay Specific Plan land use classification for application to the Plan Area ("General Plan Amendment"); (iii) Zoning Map amendment to rezone the Plan Area to SP-2 Richmond Bay Specific Plan ("Zoning Amendment"); and (iv) repeal of the Knox-Cutting Specific Plan (collectively referred to as the "Project Approvals"). While additional approvals including, for example, tentative/parcel subdivision maps, use permits, design review permits, and improvement plans are necessary in order to implement the Project, these approvals are not proposed at this time.

B. Environmental Review Process. In accordance with the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Sections 21000 through 21177 of the California Public Resources Code, and Sections 15000 through 15387 of the California Code of Regulations Title 14 ("CEQA Guidelines"), a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") was filed for the Project with the State Clearinghouse ("SCH") Office of Planning and Research ("OPR") on September 30, 2014 (State Clearinghouse No. 2014092082). The NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested parties for a 30-day public review period which ended on October 30, 2014. In addition, the City held a public scoping meeting on October 16, 2014, to obtain public input on the proposed scope and content of the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA requirements, a Notice of Availability ("NOA") of the Draft EIR was filed with the SCH OPR on September 2, 2016. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 52-day public review period, which ended on October 24, 2016. During this public review period, the City held a duly noticed public hearing on October 6, 2016 to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR, and received written comments on the Draft EIR. Section 15088 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the Lead Agency responsible for the preparation of an EIR evaluate comments on environmental issues received from parties who reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare a written response addressing each of the comments. A Final EIR was prepared for the Project and circulated to commenting agencies on November 7, 2016. The Final EIR assembles in one document all of the environmental information and analysis prepared for the Project, including comments on

the information and analysis contained in the Draft EIR and responses by the City to those comments.

Pursuant to Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following:

- (a) The Draft EIR, including all of its appendices;
- (b) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- (c) Copies of all letters received by the City during the Draft EIR public review period and responses to significant environmental points concerning the Draft EIR raised in the review and consultation process;
- (d) Revisions to the Draft EIR;
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency to respond to written comments on the Draft EIR.

C. Administrative Record. The administrative record, upon which all Findings related to the approval of the Project are based, includes the following:

- The EIR and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the EIR.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City Staff to the Planning Commission and the City Council (“Council”) relating to the EIR, the Project Approvals, and the Project.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at or in preparation of any City public hearing or City workshop related to the Project and the EIR.
- For documentary and information purposes, all City-adopted land use plans and ordinances, including without limitation the general plan, specific plans and ordinances, together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs and other documentation relevant to project site.
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the Project.
- All other documents composing the record pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).

The custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the City’s decisions are based is the Director of Planning and Building Services or his or her designee. Such documents and other materials are located at City Hall, Planning Division, 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, California, 94804.

D. Findings. On December 6, 2016, the Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the Project. After considering public testimony and materials in the staff report, including the Final EIR (State Clearinghouse #2014092082), the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and findings in support of the Specific Plan, the Council finds, in its independent and objective judgment, that the Final EIR is adequate and sufficient in all respects and the findings set forth below are appropriate and adequate to support the Certification of the EIR, adoption of the Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and adoption of the Project Approvals. These Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are made pursuant to CEQA and City of Richmond Municipal Code. These findings explain the potential environmental impacts of the Project, identify mitigation measures that have been adopted to mitigate those impacts, explain the alternatives that were evaluated and rejected, include the overriding considerations to support approval of the Project, include the findings to

support the adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and include the findings to support the adoption of the Specific Plan ("Findings").

II. CEQA FINDINGS.

The City of Richmond is the Lead Agency with respect to the Project pursuant to Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines. The following findings of fact support the certification of the EIR:

(a) The City has complied with CEQA and CEQA Guidelines. The EIR is an accurate and objective statement that fully complies with CEQA and CEQA Guidelines.

(b) No evidence of new significant impacts, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, has been received by the City after circulation of the Draft EIR which would require recirculation.

(c) The Project is consistent with the development analyzed in the EIR.

(d) The EIR was presented to the Planning Commission on November 17, 2016, which reviewed and considered the Final EIR and recommended to the Council certification of the EIR, including adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment, adoption of the Richmond Bay Specific Plan, and repeal of the Knox/Cutting Specific Plan. The EIR was presented to the City Council for further review and consideration on December 6, 2016.

(e) Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the Council also finds that the EIR reflects the City's independent judgment as the Lead Agency for the Project.

(f) As noted above, Public Resources Code 21081 and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines require that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation for the rationale for each finding. The EIR identified potentially significant effects that could result from Project implementation. The City finds that the mitigation measures in the EIR will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less-than-significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less-than-significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific Project benefits identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. In accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the City adopts the following Findings.

III. FINDINGS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES

A. Environmental Impacts.

The EIR evaluated the potential for the Project to result in significant impacts to the following environmental topics: aesthetics; agricultural resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, seismicity and soils; greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; noise; population and housing; public services and recreation; traffic and circulation; and utilities and infrastructure, and energy. The EIR was prepared at both the program and the project level. Most impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant after incorporation of mitigation measures, as needed, with the exception of certain impacts relating to air quality, cultural resources, climate change and GHGs, and transportation and traffic, which were found to be significant and unavoidable. The EIR presents a conservative analysis of environmental impacts because it analyzed the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout scenario which is consistent with the Specific Plan standards, but would include a higher residential density than is identified in the Specific Plan conceptual, illustrative phasing diagrams. The Project analyzed in the EIR (including the Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project) is expected to be built over several decades. The purpose of the EIR analysis is to disclose all reasonably foreseeable environmental effects that could result from development under the Specific Plan. Therefore, the development scenario evaluated throughout the EIR represents the most

impactful (from an environmental perspective), foreseeable development plan that could occur with buildout of the Specific Plan. The EIR's focus on the maximum impacts expected to occur at full buildout promotes informed decisionmaking, and evidences a good faith effort at forecasting what is expected to occur if the Project is approved.

As provided by Public Resources Code Section 21081, the City must make certain findings for each significant impact identified in the EIR before adopting the Project and Project Approvals. These findings could include the following:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

These Findings summarize the determinations in the EIR relating to the potential environmental impacts before and after mitigation. Except with respect to certain impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, climate change and GHGs, and transportation and traffic, which are addressed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the City finds that changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. **Exhibit A** attached to this Resolution sets forth a summary description of each impact from the EIR, describes the recommended mitigation measures, and states whether or not the impact has been mitigated and if so, to what level. A full explanation of the conclusions relating to the impacts and mitigation measures can be found in the EIR. In making these Findings, the City is relying on all the information in the administrative record and the EIR. With respect to the EIR, the City adopts and incorporates in these Findings all determinations and conclusions made in the EIR relating to the environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent that such determinations and conclusions are modified by these Findings.

B. Mitigation Measures.

The City hereby adopts all mitigation measures set forth in **Exhibit B** of this Resolution which includes the Final EIR and MMRP for the Project, identifies each mitigation measure as adopted, an implementation schedule and method for verification of compliance. The MMRP is incorporated into and a part of Chapter 7: Appendices of the Specific Plan.

Based on the entire record, and having considered the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, the City hereby determines that all feasible mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City have been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts.

C. Alternatives.

The EIR evaluated three Specific Plan alternatives and two Sub-Area 4 Project alternatives, in addition to the proposed Project: (1) Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative; (2) Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative; (3) Specific Plan No Project / Existing Zoning Alternative; (4) Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative; and (5) Sub-Area 4 No Project / Existing Zoning Alternative. These alternatives are discussed in further detail in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR. The City's findings relating to these alternatives are set forth below:

1. Specific Plan No Project Alternative. CEQA requires that a "No Project" alternative be considered. A "No Project" alternative is generally considered to be

equivalent to a “no development” alternative. Under this scenario, the Project would not be implemented. While the No Project Alternative would reduce many of the impacts, certain impacts to air quality, cultural resources, GHGs, and traffic, would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Specific Plan CEQA objectives. Namely, the No Project Alternative would not provide a land use plan and development standards for a mix of uses, including a variety of housing types and intensities to provide a balance of jobs and housing in the South Shoreline area, as called for by the General Plan, Housing Element, and Plan Bay Area. It also would not create or enhance access to the shoreline, create complete neighborhoods, revitalize the South Shoreline area, or generate tax revenues and employment opportunities for residents of Richmond.

Specifically, the Specific Plan No Project Alternative would maintain status quo with respect to zoning and General Plan land use designations, but is not consistent with the General Plan policies that call for the creation of a Specific Plan for the Southern Gateway/Southern Shoreline area in order to redevelop this area as part of a vibrant, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, and identifies that the Specific Plan should maintain and improve public access to the shoreline including a mix of uses along the shoreline to activate the area throughout the day. The Specific Plan No Project Alternative is also not consistent with the City’s Housing Element policies that recognize the Specific Plan Area as a site identified for the development of housing, and more generally, substantial redevelopment of the area to include mixed-use community uses including education, research and development, light industrial, residential and other sensitive uses. Finally, the Specific Plan No Project Alternative is not consistent with Plan Bay Area which designates the Specific Plan Area as part of the transit-oriented South Richmond Priority Development Area (SRPDA). Plan Bay Area was adopted to help achieve region-wide GHG reduction targets by locating new population centers near jobs and mass transit. The Specific Plan No Project Alternative would not develop the uses anticipated by Plan Bay Area in the SRPDA including retail, commercial, and residential, as well as public transit and improvements to traffic and transportation infrastructure to improve connectivity, and other improvements that would promote mixed-use development. Although the Specific Plan exceeds the densities called for in the SRPDA, it is consistent with the overall goals of Plan Bay Area, which call for locating more intense and dense development near transit; and, in exceeding the land use intensities originally envisioned for the SRPDA, supports and furthers the policy of Plan Bay Area to reduce GHG emissions.

The Specific Plan No Project Alternative is not consistent with the Specific Plan CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions. A GHG consumption study (Jones and Kammen, 2015, *A Consumption-Based Greenhouse Gas Inventory of San Francisco Bay Area Neighborhoods, Cities and Counties: Prioritizing Climate Action for Different Locations*. University of California, Berkeley & Bay Area Air Quality Management District) found that the City of Richmond has the lowest per-household carbon footprint in Contra Costa County. Concentrating growth in the Specific Plan Area is consistent with the City’s recently adopted Climate Action Plan (“CAP”) and will help Richmond maintain its low per capita GHG emission rate. The Specific Plan No Project Alternative would limit growth within GHG efficient Richmond and would therefore thwart the CEQA objectives of the Project, as well as City (General Plan, Housing Element and CAP), and State (AB 32 and SB 375) policies to reduce GHG emissions. If the City’s planned population growth were directed to higher per capita GHG communities, the region would likely achieve lower GHG reductions than if the population growth were to occur in Richmond, as envisioned by Plan Bay Area and the proposed Specific Plan. In addition, a Transportation Management Association (TMA) would not be established for the South Shoreline Area under the Specific Plan No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, the City would not have an established mechanism to provide alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips, thereby reducing regional traffic congestion and GHG and air quality impacts associated with mobile source emissions. Therefore Specific Plan No Project Alternative would not meet Specific Plan CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan.

As a result of these factors, the Specific Plan No Project Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Specific Plan. The City finds that this alternative is “infeasible” as the term is used under CEQA and rejects this alternative.

2. Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative. As explained in the EIR, this alternative would reduce the Specific Plan's buildout by 55 percent (4.9 million square feet and 850 dwelling unit compared to 6.4 million square feet and 5,700 dwelling units) and would generate less population and employment growth than the Specific Plan. While the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would reduce many of the impacts, certain impacts to air quality, cultural resources, GHG, and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable.

This alternative would significantly reduce the amount of both residential and commercial development on Richmond's South Shoreline and would therefore not meet the Specific Plan CEQA objectives to contribute to regional efforts to reduce GHG emissions. As explained above, Richmond has the lowest per-household carbon footprint in Contra Costa County. The Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would limit growth within GHG efficient Richmond and would therefore thwart the CEQA objectives of the Project, as well as City (General Plan, Housing Element and CAP), and State (AB 32 and SB 375) policies to reduce GHG emissions. Similarly, the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would not reduce regional vehicle trips to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan. An effective TMA requires landowner and employer participation and reduced density would limit both revenue sources and participation such that shuttles, transit connections, and other alternatives may not be economically viable under the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative. Therefore it would not meet Specific Plan CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan.

Furthermore, the reduction in density would mean fewer development impact fees, less tax revenues, and fewer employment opportunities for residents of Richmond and would therefore not meet the Specific Plan CEQA objective to generate tax revenues and employment opportunities to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan. The Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would also not improve the City's jobs housing balance to the same extent as the Specific Plan. Finally, the limited development allowed for under the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would not generate enough development impact fees or allow for enough dedicated park space to create complete neighborhoods with connected bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections envisioned under the proposed Specific Plan. The City requires participation of future project sponsors to revitalize the South Shoreline Area with new parks and open space, and the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would hamper this effort.

As a result of these factors, the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Specific Plan. The City finds that this alternative is "infeasible" as the term is used under CEQA and rejects this alternative.

3. Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative. As explained in the EIR, this alternative would have development similar to the Specific Plan, but reduced by about 46 percent (in terms of area of buildout). The reduction in development reduces the degree of many impacts identified for the Specific Plan, but does not reduce any of the significant and unavoidable impacts to less than significant and therefore does not provide an environmentally superior alternative. Like the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative, it would frustrate the purpose of the Specific Plan because the reduction in density would mean fewer development impact fees, less tax revenues and fewer employment opportunities for residents of Richmond and would not meet the Specific Plan CEQA objective to generate tax revenues and employment opportunities to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative significantly reduces the amount of both residential and commercial development on Richmond's South Shoreline and would therefore not meet the Specific Plan CEQA objective to contribute to regional efforts to reduce GHG emissions. As explained above, Richmond has the lowest per-household carbon footprint in Contra Costa County. The Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would limit growth within GHG efficient Richmond and would therefore thwart the CEQA objectives of the Project, as well as City (General Plan, Housing Element and CAP), and State (AB 32 and SB 375) policies to reduce GHG emissions. Similarly, the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would not reduce regional vehicle trips to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan. An effective TMA requires landowner and

employer participation and reduced density would limit both revenue sources and participation such that shuttles, transit connections, and other alternatives may not be economically viable under the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative. Therefore it would not meet Specific Plan CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would also not improve the City's jobs housing balance to the same extent as the Specific Plan. Finally, the limited development allowed for under the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would not generate enough development impact fees or allow for enough dedicated park space to create the complete neighborhoods with connected bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections envisioned under the proposed Specific Plan. The City requires participation of future project sponsors to revitalize the South Shoreline Area with new parks and open space, and the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would hamper this effort.

As a result of these factors, the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Specific Plan. The City finds this alternative "infeasible" as the term is used under CEQA and rejects this alternative.

4. Sub-Area 4 No Project Alternative. This alternative would have the least amount of total development relative to the Sub-Area 4 Project (1.1 million square feet and no residential dwelling units compared to the 1.5 million square feet and 1,520 dwelling units), with predominant land uses being industrial and related office, as is consistent with the existing zoning in the area. This alternative would reduce the effects regarding most quantifiable impacts, but certain impacts to air quality and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative, however, would not meet the Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objectives because it would not ensure appropriate remediation of the Zeneca Site; would not build housing in complete neighborhoods as called for in the General Plan, Housing Element and Plan Bay Area; would not establish a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood; and would generate much lower tax revenues and employment opportunities as compared to the Sub-Area 4 Project. Specifically, this alternative provides for no residential units, which is wholly inconsistent with the Sub-Are 4 Project CEQA objectives to establish a vibrant-mixed neighborhood and to build new housing in complete neighborhoods.

As explained above under the Specific Plan No Project Alternative, this alternative would limit growth within GHG efficient Richmond and would therefore thwart the CEQA objectives of the Project, as well as City (General Plan, Housing Element and CAP), and State (AB 32 and SB 375) policies to reduce GHG emissions. A TMA would not be established for the Sub-Area 4 Project under this alternative, and therefore it would not reduce regional vehicle trips to the same extent as the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project. Therefore it would not meet Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions to the same extent as the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project. Finally, under the Sub-Area 4 No Project Alternative it is unlikely that any new publically accessible parks, recreation facilities or open spaces would be established and it would therefore not meet the Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objective to create and enhance access to the shoreline.

As a result of these factors, the Sub-Area 4 No Project Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project. The City therefore finds this alternative "infeasible" as the term is used under CEQA and rejects this alternative.

5. Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative. This alternative would reduce the Sub-Area 4 buildout by 57 percent (1.4 million square feet and 115 dwelling units compared to 1.5 million square feet and 1,520 dwelling units) and would generate less population and employment growth than the Sub-Area 4 Project. This alternative would reduce the effects regarding most quantifiable topics, but certain impacts to air quality and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. However, the significant reduction in residential units (115 as compared to the proposed 1,520) under the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative means that it could not meet the Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objectives to build housing in complete neighborhoods and establish a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood to the same extent as the Sub-Area 4 Project and as called for in the

General Plan, Housing Element and Plan Bay Area. The Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative would also generate lower development impact fees, tax revenues, and employment opportunities as compared to the Sub-Area 4 Project.

The Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative significantly reduces the amount of residential development within Sub-Area 4 and would therefore not meet the Sub-Area 4 CEQA objective to contribute to regional efforts to reduce GHG emissions. As explained above, Richmond has the lowest per-household carbon footprint in Contra Costa County. The Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative would limit growth within GHG efficient Richmond and would therefore thwart the CEQA objectives of the Project, as well as City (General Plan, Housing Element and CAP), and State (AB 32 and SB 375) policies to reduce GHG emissions. Similarly, the Specific Plan Low Intensity Alternative would not reduce regional vehicle trips to the same extent as the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project. Therefore it would not meet Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objective to reduce GHG emissions to the same extent as the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project.

Finally, the limited development allowed for under the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative would not generate enough development impact fees or allow for enough dedicated park space to create and enhance access to the shoreline as envisioned in the Sub-Area 4 Project. The City requires participation of future project sponsors to revitalize the South Shoreline Area with new parks and open space, and the limited residential density allowed under the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative would hamper this effort.

As a result of these factors, the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project. The City therefore finds this alternative "infeasible" as the term is used under CEQA and rejects this alternative.

6. Rejected Alternatives. The EIR also considered additional alternatives but did not evaluate them in detail since the alternatives would not meet the Specific Plan or Sub-Area 4 objectives and were found to be infeasible for technical, environmental or social reasons as explained in the EIR. These rejected alternatives include (1) a "High Intensity" scenario, whereby buildout under the Specific Plan would be more dense than presented in the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout Scenario; (2) Medium Density Sub-Area 4 Project scenario, whereby lower intensity of development than described for the Sub-Area 4 Project, partly based on a modification of the "Consolidated Rail – Medium Intensity" alternative presented in the Community Workshop Summary document; and (3) two potential offsite locations, the Northshore Area Specific Plan Site (located entirely within the City's Northshore Change Area (CA-12), on a site on the San Francisco Bay shoreline bordered by the Richmond Parkway to the south and east, Collins Avenue/Giant Road to the east, and open space and wetlands to the north and south) and the San Pablo Peninsula (Point Molate) Specific Plan Site (located within the City's San Pablo Peninsula Change Area. on a site occupying the majority of the change area.

As discussed in Chapter 5.3 of the EIR, the High Intensity Scenario would not reduce or avoid any of the Specific Plan's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and it is unlikely that market demand for this level of density exists. The Medium Density Sub-Area 4 Alternative was rejected from further analysis because no impacts identified as significant for the Sub-Area 4 Project would be avoided or substantially lessened under this alternative. Finally, the offsite alternatives would not meet any of the Specific Plan CEQA objectives. Both offsite alternative are inconsistent with the General Plan, Housing Element, and Plan Bay Area policies that identify Richmond's South Shoreline as a site for the development of housing, and more generally, substantial redevelopment of the area to include mixed-use community uses including education, research and development, light industrial, residential and other sensitive uses. Based on the information in the record, the City finds that these alternatives are infeasible and rejects the alternatives.

7. Specific Plan Environmentally Superior Alternative. CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[e][2]) stipulate "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project'

alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” The Specific Plan is the environmentally superior alternative that is not a “no project” scenario. While implementation of the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would reduce many of the impacts, certain impacts to air quality, cultural resources, GHG, and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would significantly reduce the amount of development on Richmond’s South Shoreline. As explained above, the reduction in density would mean fewer development impact fees, less tax revenues and fewer employment opportunities for Richmond residents. The Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative would not improve the City’s jobs housing balance to the same extent as the Specific Plan, and would not locate more intense and dense development near transit as called for by Plan Bay Area to reduce regional GHG emissions. As a result of these factors, the Specific Plan Lowest Intensity Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Specific Plan.

8. Sub-Area 4 Environmentally Superior Alternative. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[e][2]) stipulate “If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” The Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative that is not a “no project” scenario. This alternative would reduce the effects regarding most quantifiable topics, but certain impacts to air quality and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable. As explained above, the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative would not build housing in complete neighborhoods as called for in the General Plan, Housing Element and Plan Bay Area; would not establish a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood; and would generate slightly lower tax revenues and employment opportunities as compared to the Sub-Area 4 Project. As a result of these factors, the Sub-Area 4 Low Intensity Alternative was not deemed to be a viable alternative to the proposed Sub-Area 4 Project.

9. Summary Finding with Respect to Alternatives. Based on this analysis and substantial evidence in the record, the City finds and determines that the alternatives cannot achieve either the Specific Plan or the Sub-Area 4 Project CEQA objectives to the same degree as the proposed Specific Plan or the Sub-Area 4 Project, and do not represent substantial environmental benefits over the proposed Specific Plan or the Sub-Area 4 Project and are therefore rejected as infeasible, within the meaning of CEQA, in favor of the proposed Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project.

IV. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)) CEQA requires the agency to state, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened.

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and MMRP, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen most of the significant effects of the Project. However, certain impacts of the Project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, cultural resources, GHG, noise, and traffic. The Sub-Area 4 Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, and traffic. The EIR provides detailed information regarding these impacts.

The City has adopted all the mitigation measures and finds that all mitigation measures identified in **Exhibit B** will be implemented with the Project (both the Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project). The City further finds that the remaining significant and unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based upon the facts set forth above in the Findings, the Draft and Final EIR, and the record, as follows:

Economic Benefits

- Implementation of the Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would create 12,800 and 2,900 jobs, respectively.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project increase the City's jobs/housing ratio to a level that would further promote the goals of Plan Bay Area to locate jobs close to housing.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would generate revenue for the City through increased property tax revenue and tax revenue from commercial development.
- Construction related to development under the Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would result in temporary employment for construction workers. The Specific Plan's goals for community benefits for "public-private projects" developed under the Specific Plan include the City's intent that projects subject to a development agreement would comply with hiring practices required of an "Employer" under the City's Local Employment Program (Municipal Code, Chapter 2.56) (Section 6.6.2). If this goal/intention is met, at least 25 percent of total constructions work hours for most "public-private" projects would be performed by Richmond residents.
- Development facilitated by the Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would generate revenue for the City through development fees applicable to projects within the Specific Plan, which could be used to fund infrastructure and other improvements identified in the Specific Plan.

Social Benefits

- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would lead to the redevelopment of underutilized sites served by existing utility infrastructure.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would meet the City and regional land use planning goals of developing a mix of uses, including a variety of housing types and intensities to provide a balance of jobs and housing in the South Shoreline area, as called for by the General Plan, Housing Element, and Plan Bay Area.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would help achieve region-wide GHG reduction targets by locating new population centers near jobs and mass transit consistent with its designation in Plan Bay Area as a part of a Priority Development Area.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would improve the overall aesthetic and visual quality of the area because development standards and regulations in the Specific Plan that support a clearly articulated vision for complete neighborhoods, open space, and improvements to visual character will achieve a beneficial aesthetic effect on the visual quality of the Plan Area.
- The Specific Plan and Sub-Area 4 Project would improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, including the reinforcing Marina Way South as an important north/south connector through improvements to the Regatta Way intersection; establishing a new north-south connector across the rail line between the Lark/Meeker and R&D Campus neighborhoods; and Bridging I-580 to provide direct access for pedestrians and bicycles between Sub-Area 4 and the El Cerrito Del Norte BART Station.

Region-wide or Statewide Environmental Benefits

- The Sub-Area 4 Project would remediate soil contamination, including the removal of source material affecting groundwater, on-site to a level safe for human occupancy.

- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would provide approximately 145 acres of parks and open space within the Plan Area, approximately 32.7 acres of which would be newly created parks and open space.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would provide community parks Sub-Areas 1 and 4, as community-wide destinations providing open space for active and passive recreation. Neighborhood squares that would serve as open space for civic purposes, commercial activity, unstructured recreation, and passive uses are planned for Sub-Areas 1 and 4. Linear parks that would serve as spaces for community gathering and strolling for nearby residents and employees are planned for Sub-Areas 3 and 4.
- The Sub-Area 4 Project would provide a Shoreline Promenade, which would provide open space between the new neighborhoods of Sub Area 4 and the Bay. The Shoreline Promenade is planned to be elevated along the shoreline to avoid inundation and serve as a barrier from anticipated sea level rise.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would maintain existing sections of the Bay Trail and develop new extensions, such as the Creekside Greenway, that will serve as an open space connection between the shoreline and inland neighborhoods and open spaces.
- The Specific Plan would establish a Transportation Management Association (TMA) that would provide alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips, thereby reducing regional traffic congestion and GHG and air quality impacts associated with mobile source emissions.
- The TMA established by the project would provide regional benefits by allowing for additional shuttle destinations, landowner participants, revenue sources, programs, and areas served to be added over time.
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project would increase job opportunities at in the SRPDA, consistent with Plan Bay Area goals and policies to reducing GHG emissions. The predicted significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality and GHG emissions resulting from the operation of the Specific Plan and air quality for the Sub-Area 4 Project are an unintended consequence of the BAAQMD operational criteria pollutant mass-based thresholds is that even low-emitting/transit-friendly development projects that are also large are shown as having significant and unavoidable impacts due only to their size. Large-scale projects will necessarily produce more criteria emissions on a mass basis than smaller projects; however, on a service population basis (e.g., per capita basis for residential projects) larger projects may be much more efficient in terms of generation of criteria air emissions, and may produce significantly fewer emissions on a service population basis than a smaller project. [Although BAAQMD's GHG thresholds provide for an efficiency-based metric, the criteria air pollutant thresholds are mass-based.] Without consideration of whether such large-scale development would be preferable, in terms of air quality impacts, to other types of development in other locations (e.g., development in peripheral portions of the Bay Area region, or projects that are less accessible to transit) or projects that do not have transportation demand management programs, mass-based threshold may inappropriately identify a large-scale project as having a significant air quality impact
- The Specific Plan and the Sub-Area 4 Project include a mix of uses and mandatory requirements that would help reduce single-occupancy motor vehicle trips. The predicted significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic occur under Level of Service (LOS) thresholds, which is a metric that focuses on congestion. The Specific Plan allows a scale of development that would necessarily increase vehicle trips. However, the Specific Plan includes a mix of uses and mandatory requirements (such as multi-modal streets, TDM program) that would ensure reduction of single occupancy vehicle trips. Development under the Specific Plan would also add higher densities within the City of Richmond that exceed the densities assumed in the Plan Bay Area. Vehicle trips generated by development

under the Specific Plan estimated as a part of the transportation analysis for the made adjustments to the estimated trip generation rates developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers to account for internal trips afforded by the mixed-use development as well as for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity. This analysis indicated a 20 percent decrease in daily auto trips made by Plan Area residents by non-automobile means, over what would occur for development without this mixed use character and higher pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity. This reduction in trips indicates that development under the Specific Plan would result in a per capita reduction of VMT for Plan Area residents consistent with the Plan Bay Area policy to reduce per capita VMT by 10 percent. The Plan Area's infill location and proximity to major transportation corridors reduces the distance that customers would drive in motor vehicles to shop by providing increased retail opportunities within the Plan Area. Also, the Plan Area is located in direct proximity to nearby employment hubs. Taken together, these locational characteristics of the Specific Plan help reduce potential motor vehicle trips.

Considering all factors, the Council finds that these specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations associated with the Project outweigh the Project's significant and unavoidable effects, and the adverse effects are, therefore, considered acceptable.

V. FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN ("MMRP")

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the City to adopt a monitoring or compliance program regarding the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the proposed Project is hereby included in **Exhibit B**. The MMRP fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements, as follows:

- The MMRP is designed to ensure compliance with the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed on the Project during project implementation; and
- Measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment as set forth in the MMRP are fully enforceable through adoption of the Specific Plan, permit conditions, agreements or other measures.

VI. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FINDINGS

The Council has considered the General Plan Amendment, attached as **Exhibit C**, and makes the following findings in approving the General Plan amendment:

- (a) The proposed amendment is consistent with other General Plan elements.

Supporting Statement of Fact: *Satisfied.* The Specific Plan articulates a vision for the Plan Area at a level of detail beyond the General Plan adoption in 2012. The proposed General Plan amendment proposes to create a new General Plan land use category to be applied to the entire Plan Area to describe the intent and vision of the Plan Area and adopt development standards that accommodate the Specific Plans vision. The Richmond Bay Specific Plan furthers the General Plan policies that promote the establishment of complete, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods; access to open space; improved and efficient multi-modal connectivity, increased economic development opportunities, increased housing opportunities, and redevelopment of brownfield sites. As detailed in Table 4.9-2 of the Draft EIR, the General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan are consistent with the General Plan 2030.

- (b) The proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent with the General Plan EIR.

The General Plan Amendment is consistent with the overall build out anticipated in the General Plan EIR and the Specific Plan furthers General Plan policies that promote the

establishment of complete, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use neighborhoods; access to open space; improved and efficient multi-modal connectivity, increased economic development opportunities, increased housing opportunities, and redevelopment of brownfield sites. Moreover, an EIR was prepared for the Richmond Bay Specific Plan, and all feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, certain impacts of the Project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. The Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality, cultural resources, GHG, noise, and traffic.

X. SEVERABILITY

Should any provision, section, paragraph, sentence, or word of this Resolution be rendered or declared invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by reason of any preemptive legislation, the remaining provisions, sections, paragraphs, sentences and words of this Resolution shall remain in full force and effect.

XI. ACTION

The Council hereby certifies the Final EIR (State Clearinghouse #2014092082), adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and approves the General Plan Amendment.

- Exhibit A: Environmental Impacts Summary
- Exhibit B: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- Exhibit C: General Plan Amendment

I certify that the foregoing resolution was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on December 6, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Beckles, McLaughlin, Myrick, Pimplé, Vice Mayor Martinez, and Mayor Butt.

NOES: None.

ABSTENTIONS: None.

ABSENT: Councilmember Bates.

PAMELA CHRISTIAN
CLERK OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
(SEAL)

Approved:
TOM BUTT
Mayor

Approved as to form:
BRUCE GOODMILLER
City Attorney

State of California }
County of Contra Costa : ss.
City of Richmond }

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of **Resolution No. 105-16**, finally passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on December 6, 2016.



Pamela Christian, Clerk of the City of Richmond

**TABLE 6-1
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.1 Aesthetics							
None required.							
4.2 Air Quality							
Mitigation Measure AIR-2a.SP: Best Management Practices for Controlling Particulate Emissions. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall ensure the implementation of the following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control for all project construction activities. These measures will reduce particulate emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. 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. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. 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. 6. 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, § 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors, BAAQMD, and City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	BAAQMD and City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	Engineering Department to verify inclusion of BAAQMD BMPs in applicable construction plans and specifications submitted for building permits. City of Richmond Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
7. 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. Mitigation Measure AIR-2b.SP: Require Tier 4 engines on Construction Equipment. All applicants proposing development of projects within the Plan Area shall require their contractors, as a condition of contract, to further reduce construction-related exhaust emissions by ensuring that all off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall operate on a USEPA-approved Tier 4 engine. Construction equipment with Tier 4 engines currently comprise 22 percent of the statewide construction equipment fleet and CARB Regulations will result in the percentage increasing over the next several years. Alternatively, future project sponsors could have a construction air quality assessment performed which, if the results warrant and the City approves, would obviate the need for implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2b.SP. Mitigation Measure AIR-2c.SP: Require Construction Fleet to Use Renewable Diesel. All applicants proposing development of projects within the Plan Area shall require their contractors, as a condition of contract, to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions by ensuring that all off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall operate on renewable diesel (such as Diesel HPR). Renewable diesel is currently commercially available in Berkeley and Oakland. Alternatively, future project sponsors could have a construction air quality assessment performed which, if the results warrant and the City approves, would obviate the need for implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2c.SP.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure AIR-3a.SP: Use Super-compliant VOC Architectural Coatings in Maintaining Buildings through CC&Rs and Ground Leases. Future developer(s) of projects within the Plan Area shall require all residentially developed parcels to include within their CC&R's and/or ground leases requirements for all future interior spaces to be repainted only with "Super-Compliant" Architectural Coatings (http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/compliance/architectural-coatings/super-compliant-coatings). While Regulation 8 Rule 3 of the BAAQMD places limits on the VOC content of paint and other architectural coatings, use of lower VOC coatings available to consumers can further reduce operational ROG emissions. Mitigation Measure AIR-3b.SP: Promote use of Green Consumer Products. To reduce ROG, NOx and PM10 emissions associated with projects developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) of such projects shall provide education for residential and commercial tenants concerning green consumer products. Prior to receipt of any certificate of final occupancy and every five years thereafter, the project sponsors shall work with the City of Richmond to develop electronic correspondence to be distributed by email annually to residential and/or commercial tenants of each building on the project site that encourages the purchase of consumer products that generate lower than typical VOC emissions. The correspondence shall encourage environmentally preferable purchasing and shall include contact information and links to vendors of low VOC consumer products. Mitigation Measure AIR-3c.SP: Electrification of Loading Docks. For all projects developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) shall ensure that loading docks for retail, light industrial or warehouse uses that will receive deliveries from refrigerated transport trucks incorporate electrification hook-ups for transportation refrigeration units to avoid emissions generated by idling refrigerated transport trucks.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Engineer	City of Richmond Planning Division	Inclusion of VOC architectural coatings and green consumer products to be verified during Planning Division review of individual projects. Planning Division review also will verify electrification of loading docks, and deny permits for wood burning fireplaces. Additionally verify, Diesel Backup Generator Specifications.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure AIR-3d.SP: Prohibit Wood Burning Fireplaces. For all projects developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) shall ensure that building specifications for residential units preclude fireplaces, whether wood-burning or natural gas-fired. Compliance with this measure shall be verified upon plan review and prior to occupancy by the City of Richmond Building Department. Mitigation Measure AIR-3e.SP: Diesel Backup Generator Specifications. For all projects developed within the Plan Area, and to reduce NOx emissions associated with operation of stationary sources, the project sponsors shall implement the following actions: 1. Any new diesel backup generators shall: a. Have engines that meet or exceed CARB Tier 4 off-road emission standards which have the lowest NOx emissions of commercially available generators, and b. Be fueled with renewable diesel, if commercially available, which has been demonstrated to reduce NOx emissions by approximately 10 percent. 2. All new diesel backup generators shall have an annual maintenance testing limit of 50 hours, if feasible, and up to a maximum of 50 hours per engine, subject to any further restrictions as may be imposed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in its permitting process.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SP: Health Risk Assessment of Future Projects Under the Specific Plan. Prior to issuance of a building permit for development within the Plan Area that includes sensitive land uses (e.g., residential uses, schools, daycares), except the Sub-Area 4 Project, the City shall review and approve, as appropriate, a health risk assessment and mitigation plan documenting that exposure of sensitive land uses to concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs), including diesel particulate matter, meet or are less than (i.e., are as protective as) health-based thresholds established by BAAQMD. The health risk assessment and mitigation plan shall become an enforcement element of the building permit. At a minimum, the project-specific health risk assessment and mitigation plan shall: • Use up-to-date, project-specific sensitive receptor location information and a detailed assessment of risks associated with I-580 and any permitted stationary sources at that time; • Include an analysis of the health risks associated with each individual source, as well as an analysis of cumulative health risk impacts, and • Demonstrate a less than significant exposure risk for future uses based on then-current BAAQMD thresholds using one or more of the following (or comparable) measures to reduce TAC exposure: 1) Install and ensure the operation in good working order of indoor air filtration systems; and/or 2) Integrate building design features (e.g., strategic placement of HVAC air intakes, use of vegetative or structural screening, appropriate building set-back) to limit exposure from sources of TAC concentrations. Mitigation Measure AIR-4b.SP: Risk Reduction Plan for Backup Generators or New Permitted Stationary Sources. Applicants for projects that would include backup generators shall prepare and submit to the City a Risk Reduction Plan for City review and approval. The	X	X (except for Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SP)	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Engineer shall hire a qualified air quality consultant to prepare and HRA	City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	Approve air quality consultant selection. Review verification from air quality consultant. Verify inclusion of indoor air filtration systems and verify health risk assessment is completed. Verify a project specific HRA is completed. Verify and review the risk and reduction plan for backup generators.	Approve consultant selection, and review verification from air consultant, prior to approval of individual development permit. Verify inclusion of approved measures.	

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
applicant shall implement the approved Risk Reduction Plan. The Risk Reduction Plan shall reduce cumulative localized cancer risks to the maximum feasible extent. The Risk Reduction Plan may contain, but is not limited to the following strategies: 1. Demonstration using screening analysis or a health risk assessment that project sources, when combined with local cancer risks from cumulative sources with 1,000 feet would be less than 100 in one million. 2. Installation of non-diesel fueled generators. 3. Installation of diesel generators with an EPA-certified Tier 4 engine or engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy.							
Mitigation Measure AIR-2.SA4: Implement BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures. The Sub-Area 4 Project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement the following applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to reduce emissions of fugitive dust and equipment exhaust: • All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. • All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. • All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.		X	Sub-Area 4 applicant, BAAQMD, and City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	BAAQMD, City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department, and Sub-Area 4 applicant	Engineering Department to verify inclusion of BAAQMD BMPs in applicable construction plans and specifications submitted for building permits. City of Richmond Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, whichever is first. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
- 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. - All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. - 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 BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.							
Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SA4: As an alternative to Mitigation Measures AIR-2b.SP and AIR-2c.SP, the Sub-Area 4 Project construction contractor/s shall use other measures, or in combination with use of Tier 4 equipment, to minimize diesel particulate matter emissions during the construction period, provided such measures reduce the predicted cancer risk below the threshold of (a) an incremental cancer risk level greater than 10 in one million, (b) a noncancerous risk (chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0, or (c) an increase of annual average PM2.5 of greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3) and are approved by the City. Any diesel-powered off-road and portable equipment shall meet or exceed emission standards for Tier 2 engines. For example, the construction contractor(s) may use other measures such as the use of alternative powered equipment (e.g., LPG-powered or electric lifts), alternative fuels (e.g., biofuels), added exhaust devices, or a combination of measures.		X	Sub-Area 4 Applicant/Site Developer, Contractors, BAAQMD, and City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	Sub-Area 4 applicant/ Site Developer	For AIR-4a.SA4 the City of Richmond Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans. For AIR-4b.SA4, the HRA will be prepared by a qualified air quality consultant, and reviewed by a second independent air quality consultant.	Field inspections during construction. Approve consultant selection, and review verification from air consultant, prior to approval of individual development permit. Verify inclusion of approved measures.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.2 Air Quality (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure AIR-4b.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project applicant/s may choose to reassess the potential off-site cancer risk and PM2.5 concentration exposures to off-site residential receptors later in the design phase, but prior to the start of construction, and prepare a revised HRA using updated receptor location information and more detailed construction plans and equipment list and submit to the City for review. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk and exposure to PM2.5 for all potentially exposed off-site receptors will be less than BAAQMD project-level threshold of (a) an incremental cancer risk level greater than 10 in one million, (b) a noncancerous risk (chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0, or (c) an increase of annual average PM2.5 of greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3), then Mitigation Measure AIR-4a is unnecessary. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk or exposure to PM2.5 for off-site sensitive receptors will be less than presented in this analysis but still over BAAQMD thresholds, then the mitigation effort may be proportionately adjusted.							
4.3 Biological Resources							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.SP: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Western Pond Turtle. For any project proposed for development adjacent to the existing Upper Lagoon and/or Lower Lagoon, or in the area of Meeker Slough and Meeker Creek, project applicants shall determine the presence or absence of western pond turtle by conducting a preconstruction survey in areas of suitable habitat. If western pond turtle is present, the following measures shall be implemented: a) A qualified biologist shall supervise the installation of exclusion fencing along the boundaries of the work area adjacent to occupied and/or suitable habitat, as the biologist deems necessary to prevent western pond turtles from entering the work area. The construction contractor shall install species exclusion fencing, with a minimum height of 3 feet above	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall prepare construction plans that incorporate pre-construction surveys and buffer zones. If required shall also implement avoidance procedures.	City of Richmond Building Division, and Biologist	Review and approve a qualified biologist per requirements of measure. Biologist to review pre-construction survey reports. If the western pond turtle is found, inspect construction site to confirm buffer zones, and verify inclusion of condition on construction plans to the extend of the measure.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, whichever is sooner. Inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
ground surface and with an additional 4 to 6 inches of fence material buried such that species cannot crawl under the fence. b) A qualified biologist shall survey the project site within 48 hours before the onset of initial ground-disturbing activities and shall be present during initial vegetation clearing and ground-disturbing activities. (A qualified biologist is an individual who shall have a minimum of five years of academic training and professional experience in biological sciences and related resource management activities with a minimum of two years conducting surveys for each species that may be present within the project site.) The biological monitor shall monitor the exclusion fencing weekly to confirm proper maintenance and inspect for turtles. If western pond turtles are found, the City shall halt activities in the vicinity that pose a threat to the individual turtle or turtles as determined by the qualified biologist. If possible, the turtle or turtles shall be allowed to move out of the project site of their own volition (e.g., if it is near the exclusion fence that can be temporarily removed to let it pass). The qualified biologist shall relocate turtles to the nearest suitable habitat should they not leave the work area of their own accord. Construction shall resume after the turtles are out of harm's way. If western pond turtles occur repeatedly onsite after the exclusion fencing has been installed, a qualified biologist shall initiate preconstruction sweeps of the project site for this species prior to start of construction on a daily basis and thereafter throughout the duration of the project. c) During project construction or other ground-disturbing activities, excavations deeper than 6 inches shall have a sloping escape ramp of earth or a wooden plank installed at a 3:1 rise; openings, such as pipes, where western pond turtles might seek refuge shall be covered when not in use; and all trash that may attract predators or hide western			Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall hire a qualified biologist and the site developer's contractor(s) shall engage the qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys as described.				

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
pond turtles shall be properly contained each day, removed from the worksite, and disposed of regularly. Following the completion of activities, the construction contractor shall remove all trash and construction debris from the work areas.							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.SP: Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, a project-specific Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training shall be developed and implemented by a qualified biologist and attended by all project personnel prior to beginning work onsite. The WEAP training shall generally include but not be limited to education about the following: • Applicable state and federal laws, environmental regulations, Specific Plan permit conditions, and penalties for non-compliance; • Special-status plant and animal species with potential to occur at or in the vicinity of the project site, avoidance measures, and a protocol for encountering such species including a communication chain; • Preconstruction surveys and biological monitoring requirements associated with each phase of work and at each project site as biological resources and protection measures will vary depending on the land managers; • Known sensitive resource areas in the project vicinity that are to be avoided and/or protected as well as approved project work areas, access roads, and staging areas; and • Best management practices (BMPs) and their location at various project sites for erosion control, species exclusion, in addition to general housekeeping requirements.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall hire a qualified biologist to develop and implement the WEAP training	City of Richmond Building Division	Verify attendance and training by all project personnel prior to beginning work onsite	Prior to construction commencement	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.SP: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area, the City shall require the project applicant to conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys in areas containing, or likely to contain, habitat for nesting birds as a condition of approval for any development-related permit. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts on nesting birds include, but are not limited to, those described below. - To the extent practicable, construction activities including building demolition, vegetation and tree removal, and new site construction shall be performed between September 1 and January 31 in order to avoid the avian nesting season. - If construction activities cannot be completed between September 1 and January 31, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. During the avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall survey construction areas within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area for nesting raptors and passerine birds not more than 30 days prior to any ground-disturbing activity or vegetation removal. All accessible potential nesting habitat, including bare ground, in the Plan Area and within a 500 feet (for raptors) and 250 feet (for all other species) around any construction activity will be surveyed. - If active nests are found either within the project site or within the 500-foot survey buffer surrounding the project site, “no-work” buffer zones shall be established around the nests by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW as necessary depending on the specific species encountered. No demolition, vegetation removal, or ground-disturbing activities shall occur within the no-work buffer zone until young have fledged or the nest is otherwise abandoned as determined by the qualified biologist. If work during the nesting season stops for 14 days or more and then resumes, then nesting bird surveys shall be	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall prepare construction plans that incorporate pre-construction surveys and buffer zones. If required, avoidance procedures shall be implemented. Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall hire a qualified biologist and the site developer’s contractor(s) shall engage the qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys as described.	Site developer City of Richmond Planning and Building Division Biologist	Review and approve a qualified biologist. Review pre-construction survey reports. If active nests are found, inspect construction site to confirm buffer zones.	No more than 14 days before start or restart of construction during the months of February through August.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
repeated, to ensure that no new birds have begun nesting in the area. - Typically, the size of individual buffers ranges from a minimum of 250 feet for raptors to a minimum of 50 feet for other birds but can be adjusted based on an evaluation of the site by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the USFWS and/or CDFW as necessary (i.e., in the case of protected species). Buffer distances may also be modified if obstacles such as buildings or trees obscure the construction area from active bird nests, or existing disturbances create an ambient background disturbance similar to the proposed disturbance. - Birds that establish nests after construction starts are assumed to be habituated to and tolerant of the indirect impacts resulting from construction noise and human activity. However, direct take of nests, eggs, and nestlings is still prohibited and a buffer must be established to avoid nest destruction. - Results of the surveys shall be forwarded to CDFW (if required by state law based on the species observed) and avoidance procedures shall be adopted, if necessary, on a case-by-case basis. These may include construction buffer areas (up to several hundred feet in the case of raptors) or seasonal avoidance. - A construction lighting plan for each project under the Specific Plan shall be prepared detailing measures to minimize light spillover outside of each project site. Burrowing Owls: The following measures shall be implemented to address construction or other ground-disturbing activities that could take place within burrowing owl nesting habitat in Sub-Area 4. All accessible potential nesting habitat, including bare ground, in the project site that could be affected by construction activity will be surveyed per guidance provided in Appendix C of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012). These guidelines shall determine timing and survey							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
methodology, and reporting requirements. Preconstruction surveys to determine absence or presence of active burrowing owl nesting sites within the project site shall generally be completed as follows, or as modified by any subsequent approved protocol: a) Two surveys shall occur no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbing activity: one no less than 14 days prior to ground disturbing activity, and one within 24 hours prior to ground disturbing activity. Habitat assessments shall be conducted per guidelines provided in Appendix C of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012). If no burrows are observed during the first survey, the second survey is not required. b) Conduct the survey/s between morning civil twilight and 10:00 AM and two hours before sunset until evening civil twilight to provide the highest detection probabilities. c) A survey for burrows and owls shall be conducted by walking through suitable habitat in the project site and in areas within 150 meters (approximately 500 feet) of the project site. This 150-meter buffer zone is included to account for adjacent burrows and foraging habitat outside the project site and impacts from factors such as noise and vibration due to heavy equipment which could impact resources outside the project site. d) Pedestrian survey transects shall be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (approximately 100 feet), and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. To efficiently survey projects larger than 100 acres, it is recommended that two or more surveyors conduct concurrent surveys. Surveyors should maintain a minimum distance of 50 meters (approximately 160 feet) from any owls or occupied burrows. It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
A report of the burrow survey stating absence or presence of burrows shall be prepared and submitted to the City and, if results are positive for birds, CDFW.							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP: Building Design and Lighting Strategies to Address Biological Resources Impacts. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, and prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each new building, the City of Richmond (City) shall require that the project applicant retain a qualified biologist experienced with bird strike issues to review and approve the design of the building windows and lighting to ensure that it sufficiently minimizes the potential for bird strikes. The City may also consult with applicable resource agencies with jurisdiction such as CDFW, USFWS, or others, as it determines to be appropriate during this review. Building Design. Prior to issuance of a building permit, The project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the Planning Director identifying the measures and features of the building design that are intended to reduce potential impacts on birds. The building design may include, but is not limited to, some of the following measures: • Employ design techniques that create “visual noise” via cladding or other design features that make it easy for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake buildings for open sky or trees; • Decrease continuity of reflective surfaces using “visual marker” design techniques, which may include: a) Patterned or fritted glass, with patterns at most 28 centimeters apart; b) One-way films installed on glass, with any picture or pattern or arrangement that can be seen from the outside by birds but appear transparent from the inside;	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Verify inclusion of minimizing design and lighting measures in applicable construction plans and specifications. City of Richmond Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans. Verify inclusion of educational materials to building tenants, occupants and residents.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
c) Geometric fenestration patterns that effectively divide a window into smaller panes of at most 28 centimeters; and/or d) Decals with patterned or abstract designs, with the maximum clear spaces at most 28 centimeters square. • Up to 60 feet high on building facades facing the shoreline, decrease reflectivity of glass, using design techniques such as plastic or metal screens, light-colored blinds or curtains, frosting of glass, angling glass towards the ground, UV-A glass, or awnings and overhangs; • Eliminate the use of clear glass on opposing or immediately adjacent faces of the building without intervening interior obstacles such that a bird could perceive its flight path through the glass to be unobstructed; • Mute reflections in glass using strategies such as angled glass, shades, internal screens, and overhangs; and • Place new vegetation sufficiently away from glazed building facades so that no reflection occurs. Alternatively, if planting of landscapes near a glazed building façade is desirable, situate trees and shrubs immediately adjacent to the exterior • glass walls, at a distance of less than 3 feet from the glass. Such close proximity will obscure habitat reflections and will minimize fatal collisions by reducing birds' flight momentum. • A construction lighting plan for each project under the Specific Plan shall be prepared detailing measures to minimize light spillover outside of each project site.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
Lighting Design. The project applicant shall ensure that the design and specifications for buildings implement design elements to reduce lighting usage, change light direction, and confine light exposure. These may include, but are not limited to, the following general considerations that should be applied wherever feasible throughout the proposed project to reduce night lighting impacts on fish, marine mammals, and avian species: a) Avoid installation of lighting in areas where not required for public safety; b) Examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting when interior lights would be visible from the exterior or exterior lights must be left on at night, including: i. Installing motion-sensitive lighting; ii. Installing task lighting; iii. Installing programmable timers; and, iv. Installing fixtures that use lower-wattage, sodium, and yellow-red spectrum lighting; and, c) Where exterior lights are to be left on at night, install fully shielded lights to contain and direct light away from the sky. Educating Residents and Occupants. The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that the project applicant agrees to provide educational materials to building tenants, occupants, and residents encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing window coverings at night. The City Planning and Building Services Division shall administratively review and approve the educational materials prior to building occupancy.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
Documentation. The City shall document undertaking the activities described in this mitigation measure and maintain records that include, among others, the written descriptions provided by the building developer of the measures and features of the design for each building that are intended to address potential impacts on birds, and the recommendations and memoranda prepared by the qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes who reviews and approves the design of any proposed projects to ensure that they sufficiently minimize the potential for bird strikes.							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1e.SP: Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse and Salt Marsh Wandering Shrew Measures. The following measures shall be implemented within occupied, or presumed-occupied, salt marsh harvest mouse and/or salt marsh wandering shrew habitat to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to these species and their habitat. 1. A qualified, CDFW and/or USFWS-approved biological monitor will be present during all project-related activities within habitat determined suitable for salt marsh harvest mouse and/or salt marsh wandering shrew, or within 100 feet of such habitat. The biological monitor will present supplemental Worker Environmental Awareness Program information as needed for construction personnel to provide guidance about listed species and their habitats. The biological monitor will monitor all activities to ensure that no salt marsh harvest mouse or salt marsh wandering shrew is harassed, killed, or injured, and to ensure that the project conforms to the conservation measures outlined in the EIR. The biological monitor will notify the construction management lead when any aspect of the project might result in unauthorized take of special-status wildlife.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall hire a qualified biologist (per requirements of the measures) and the site developer's contractor(s) shall engage the qualified biologist to monitor during all project-related activities within the habitat determined suitable for salt marsh harvest mouse and or salt marsh wandering shrew	City of Richmond Planning and Services Building Division / CDFW and/or USFWS Biologists	Review and approve a qualified biologist. Verify inclusion of condition on construction plans. If habitat must be removed, review and approve qualified biologist, WEAP, and construction plan that includes salt marsh harvest mouse/wandering shrew avoidance.	During construction	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
2. Vegetation within 100 feet of potential salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wandering shrew habitat shall be removed using hand-tools prior to the installation of the exclusion fencing under the supervision of the qualified biological monitor. If animals of either species are observed within the work area, a biologist, with the appropriate federal and state permits, will remove and relocate the species to the nearest appropriate habitat.							
3. To avoid potential impacts to salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wandering shrew, exclusion fencing shall be installed by hand in all locations containing pickleweed, fat hen, and alkali heath vegetation or suitable foraging or nesting habitat and all natural/undeveloped uplands within a minimum of 100 feet of these habitats to prevent these species from entering the active work area, to protect habitat from earthmoving activities or accidental spills, and to exclude workers from sensitive habitat. The fence shall be made of a heavy plastic sheeting material that does not allow salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wondering shrew to pass through or climb, and the bottom shall be buried to a depth of at least four inches so that the mouse and shrew cannot crawl under the fence. Fence height shall be at least 12 inches higher than the highest adjacent vegetation with a maximum height of four feet. All supports for the exclusion fencing shall be placed on the inside of the work area. A two-foot buffer will be maintained clear of vegetation along the outside of the exclusion fencing. Exclusion fencing shall be installed above the maximum high tide to prevent trapping animals between the fencing and rising tide waters. The fencing shall be installed under the supervision of the qualified biological monitor. Installation shall not occur during winter high tides, as determined by the biological monitor, when marsh habitats are submerged and these species are pushed to upland habitats.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure BIO-1f.SP: Special-Status Bat Protection Measure. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that would involve the removal of trees or buildings or the renovation of buildings, a preconstruction survey for special-status bats shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in advance of tree and structure removal to characterize potential bat habitat and identify active roost sites. Should the preconstruction survey find no bat habitat or bat roosting sites, then no further action is required. Should potential roosting habitat or active bat roosts be found in trees and/or structures to be removed under the project, the following measures shall be implemented: a) Removal of trees and structures shall be initiated when bats are active, approximately between the periods of March 1 to April 15 and August 15 to October 15; outside of bat maternity roosting season (approximately April 15 – August 31) and outside of months of winter torpor (approximately October 15 – February 28), to the extent feasible. b) If removal of trees and structures during the periods when bats are active is not feasible and active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes are found on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site where tree and structure removal is planned, a no disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be established around these roost sites until they are determined to be no longer active by the qualified biologist. The extent of this buffer may be modified by the qualified biologist depending on existing screening around the roost site (such as dense vegetation or a building) as well as the type of construction activity which would occur around the roost site.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall prepare construction plans that incorporate pre-construction surveys and buffer zones. If required, avoidance procedures shall be implemented. Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall hire a qualified biologist and the site developer's contractor(s) shall engage the qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys as described.	Site developer City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division/ Biologist	Verify inclusion of condition on construction plans. If large trees are to be removed or if vacant buildings are to be demolished, review and approve qualified biologist, pre-construction survey reports, and a construction plan that includes bat avoidance. Inspect construction site to confirm buffer zones, if required.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, whichever is sooner. Inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
c) The qualified biologist shall be present during tree and structure removal if potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roosts are present. Trees and structures with active roosts shall be removed only when no rain is occurring or is forecast to occur for 3 days and when daytime temperatures are at least 50°F. d) Removal of trees with potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roost sites shall follow a two-step removal process: i. On the first day of tree removal and under supervision of the qualified biologist, branches and limbs not containing cavities or fissures in which bats could roost, shall be cut only using chainsaws. ii. On the following day and under the supervision of the qualified biologist, the remainder of the tree may be removed, either using chainsaws or other equipment (e.g. excavator or backhoe). Removal of structures containing or suspected to contain potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roosts shall be dismantled under the supervision of the qualified biologist in the evening and after bats have emerged from the roost to forage. Structures shall be partially dismantled to significantly change the roost conditions, causing bats to abandon and not return to the roost. Removal of structures shall occur within the allowed construction hours detailed under the City's Municipal Code (Section 9.52.110) weekdays between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and between 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. If demolition/removal activities are expected to occur outside of the City's allowed construction hours, the applicant shall apply for a conditional use permit from the City of Richmond Planning and Building Division. All demolition/removal activities shall implement all feasible measures outline in Mitigation Measure NOI-1a.SP in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this EIR.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance		
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project							
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)									
Mitigation Measure BIO-2a.SP: Restoration of Northern Coastal Saltmarsh, Riparian, and Wetlands. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that may remove the habitat functions and services of northern coastal saltmarsh, riparian habitat, or freshwater emergent wetlands, these habitats shall be restored in-place to pre-project conditions, if possible, or an equivalent area of these habitats shall be established (ratio of 1:1) at suitable off-site locations along the Richmond shoreline. A habitat-specific Restoration and Monitoring Plan shall be prepared by the project applicant for each development project that removes the respective habitat, and shall contain the same principles as the existing Berkeley Global Campus Wetland Restoration Monitoring Plan for affected areas, subject to approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies, and shall generally include, but not be limited, to the following: 1. A final grading plan for the affected northern coastal saltmarsh, riparian habitat, and/or wetlands, which would restore the topography of the affected habitat areas to pre-project conditions, or to conditions that will achieve long-term stability, and will support site-appropriate habitat; 2. A planting plan, composed of native plant species appropriate to the target restored habitat; 3. A management plan, including provisions for weed control to prevent the spread of invasive non-native plant species in the restoration area; 4. Performance criteria for the revegetated areas that establish success thresholds over a specific amount of time (typically five years) as determined by the regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over the affected areas; 5. A monitoring and reporting program under which progress of the revegetated areas shall be tracked to ensure survival of the mitigation plantings. The program shall document overall health and vigor of	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall prepare construction plans that identify wetlands and buffer zones. If required, avoidance and/or protection measures shall be implemented.	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division / Biologists	Review and approve project specifications and grading and construction plans for inclusion of this measure in specifications.	Inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
mitigation plantings throughout the monitoring period and provide recommendations for adaptive management as needed to ensure the site is successful, according to the established performance criteria. An annual report documenting monitoring results and providing recommendations for improvement throughout the year shall be provided to the regulatory agencies; and 6. A best management practices element describing erosion control measures to be installed around the affected areas following mitigation planting in order to avoid sediment runoff into adjacent waters.							
Mitigation Measure BIO-2b.SP: Restoration of Coastal Terrace Prairie. For the Lark Avenue Variant, road construction within the coastal prairie that removes this sensitive plant community shall be restored according to UC Berkeley's Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan (Stromberg, 2014). To facilitate construction of the Lark Avenue Variant on UC land, the City would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UC, and would adopt and implement the Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan, which would result in net ecological benefit for the prairie community. Implementation of the Plan in conjunction with UC would include the following (adapted from the LRDP FEIR): - UC shall commence initial phase implementation of the 2014 Richmond Bay Campus Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan (Appendix G of the LRDP FEIR) that addresses exotic plant removal, tree and coyote brush removal, weed management, and programs for native plant stock preservation to aid in preservation and enhancement of the grassland portion of the Natural Open Space area. - When the Lark Avenue Variant is constructed, proactive (not passive) measures to improve the quality of the native grasslands in the Natural Open Space area shall be funded and undertaken. This	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors, and UC Berkeley	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Verify inclusion and execution of UC Berkeley's Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan. Review and approve project specifications and construction plans for inclusion of this measure in specifications.	Prior to issuance of building permits.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
may take the form of support for research and education into effective restoration. Possible fund sources would be established as part of the MOU between the City and UC. Once the Lark Avenue Variant is constructed, UC shall update its Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan to guide conservation and enhancement efforts, as well as the siting of boardwalks and minor access roads and structures in a resource-sensitive manner. The plan shall include weed management actions, annual monitoring and reporting, and adaptive management sufficient to maintain or improve the quality of the grasslands preserved in the designated Natural Open Space. The effectiveness of the plan shall be continually evaluated and the plan adjusted as needed. Prior to the commencement of the construction of the Lark Creek Variant in high, medium, or low quality grasslands outside of the Natural Open Space land use zone, UC shall conduct a site-specific native plant survey. All survey results would be published to the UC environmental website for the Berkeley Global Campus/Richmond Field Station. UC would apply the results of such surveys to implement a program that would use the native plant stock from such area to aid enhancement and restoration in Natural Open Space grassland areas, and to develop or restore meadow acreage elsewhere. Possible locations include formal landscaped open areas of the Richmond Field Station, rooftops of buildings at the Richmond Field Station, demonstration meadows at UC Berkeley or in the city of Richmond that help explain the former extent of regional coastal terrace prairie grasslands.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.3 Biological Resources (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure BIO-3.SP: Wetland Protection. For any project proposing development within or adjacent to wetlands within the area of the Specific Plan, wetland protection measures shall be applied to protect identified state and federal jurisdictional wetlands. These measures shall include the following: a) To the extent feasible, construction projects that might affect jurisdictional drainages or wetlands shall be scheduled for dry-weather months. Avoiding ground-disturbing activities during the rainy season would further decrease the potential risk of construction-related discharges to jurisdictional waters; b) A protective barrier shall be erected around any wetland feature designated for complete avoidance in project construction plans and regulatory permits to isolate it from construction or other ground-disturbing activities; c) Signage shall be installed on the fencing to identify sensitive habitat areas and restrict construction activities; d) No equipment mobilization, grading, clearing, or storage of vehicles, equipment or machinery, or similar activity shall occur at each project site until a City representative has inspected and approved the wetland protection fencing; and e) The City shall ensure that the temporary fencing is continuously maintained until all construction or other ground-disturbing activities are completed. A fencing material meeting the requirements of both water quality protection and wildlife exclusion may be used, such as heavy plastic sheeting material. Fences must be properly installed with final approval by a City representative, including adequate supports or wire backing for use in windy sites, and with the lower edge keyed in to the soil to ensure a proper barrier.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall prepare construction plans that identify wetlands and buffer zones. If required, avoidance and/or protection measures shall be implemented.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors / City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Review and approve project specifications and grading and construction plans for inclusion of this measure in specifications. Inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, whichever is first. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historic Resources Evaluation. During the preliminary design for each project proposed for development within the Plan Area, and prior to submittal of a project application to the City of Richmond Planning Division, the project applicant shall undertake the following: 1. Historic Resources Survey. The historic resources survey shall include, at a minimum: a. An updated records search at the Northwest Information Center; b. An intensive historical resources survey, documenting and evaluating resources within the project footprint (area of ground disturbance) and located on adjacent parcels within 200 feet of the project footprint, that are 45 years or older for listing in the California Register and local Richmond Historic Inventory; c. Recommendations for any additional measures that are required to resolve adverse impacts to recorded historical resources; and d. A report documenting the results of this research and recommendations, for submittal to the City. The survey shall be carried out by a qualified historian or architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural History. Site-specific surveys and evaluations that are more than 5 years old shall be updated to account for changes which may have occurred over time. For all historic resources identified as a result of site-specific surveys and evaluations, the project applicant shall undertake the following: 2. Historic Resources Treatment Plan. The historic resources treatment plan shall be prepared by a qualified historian or architectural historian, and shall discuss, but not be limited to, the following options for the resource:	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors, and historian or architectural historian	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division, and historian or architectural historian	Review and approval of archaeologist. Review and approval of the construction plan that includes archaeological mitigation. Inspect site during construction.	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
a. <i>Avoidance.</i> The City shall ensure, where feasible, that all future development activities allowable under the Specific Plan, including demolition, alteration, and new construction, would avoid historical resources (i.e., those listed on federal, state, and local registers). b. <i>Adaptive Reuse.</i> If avoidance is not feasible, adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of historical resources shall occur in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. c. <i>Appropriate Relocation.</i> If avoidance or adaptive reuse in situ is not feasible, the project applicant shall make a good faith effort to relocate the affected building(s) to a site acceptable to the City. Projects that relocate the affected historical property to a location consistent with its historic or architectural character could reduce the impact less than significant, unless the property's location is an integral part of its significance, e.g., a contributor to a historic district. For all historic resources identified as a result of site-specific surveys and evaluations which cannot be feasibly avoided (and including resources that would be adaptively reused, or appropriately relocated) the project applicant shall undertake the following: 3. Recordation and Public Interpretation. A qualified historian or architectural historian shall evaluate the feasibility and appropriateness of recordation and public interpretation of identified resources prior to any construction activities which would directly affect them. Should City staff decide recordation and or public interpretation is required, the following activities would be performed: <i>Recordation.</i> Recordation shall follow the standards provided in the National Park Service's Historic American Building Survey (HABS)							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
program, which requires photo-documentation of historic structures, a written report, and/or measured drawings (or photo reproduction of original plans if available). The photographs and report would be archived at the Richmond Planning Department and local repositories, such as public libraries, historical societies, and/or the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University. The recordation efforts shall occur prior to demolition, alteration, or relocation of any historic resources identified in the Plan Area. Additional recordation could include (as appropriate) oral history interviews or other documentation (e.g., video) of the resource. <i>Public Interpretation.</i> A public interpretation or art program shall be developed by a qualified historic consultant or local artist in consultation with City staff, based on a City-approved scope of work and submitted to the City for review and approval. The program could take the form of plaques, commemorative markers, or artistic or interpretive displays which explain the historical significance of the properties to the general public. Such displays would be incorporated into project plans as they are being developed, and would typically be located in a publicly accessible location on or near the site of the former historical resource(s). Public interpretation displays shall be installed prior to completion of any construction projects in the Plan Area. Photographic recordation and public interpretation of historically significant properties does not typically mitigate the loss of resources to a less-than-significant level (CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4[b][2]).							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure CUL-2a.SP: Archaeological Resources Evaluation. During the preliminary design for each project proposed for development within the Plan Area and the Lark Drive Variant, and prior to submittal of a building permit application to the City of Richmond Planning Division as needed, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall undertake the following: 1. Archeological Resources Survey. The archeological resources survey shall be completed by a qualified archeologist, and shall include, at a minimum: a. An updated records search at the Northwest Information Center (per Mitigation Measure CUL-1.SP); b. A cultural resources survey of the project site that meets industry standards, including subsurface presence/absence studies; c. Recommendations for any additional measures that are required to resolve potential adverse impacts to recorded and/or undiscovered archaeological resources, with a preference for preservation in place for historical resources of an archaeological nature, where feasible; and d. A report documenting the results of this research and recommendations, for submittal to the City. If the results of the initial survey indicate the presence of or high likelihood for archaeological resources, the City shall require additional measures as outlined below. If the archeologist determines that a significant archaeological resource that could be adversely impacted by a project is present at the site, the project applicant shall undertake the following:	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	Contractor, City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division, and Archeologist	Review and approval of archaeologist. Review and approval of the construction plan that includes archaeological mitigation. Inspect site during construction.	Prior to issuance of grading permit. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
2. Preservation in Place. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Planning Director or designee at the City of Richmond, the project applicant, and the appropriate Native American representative, where applicable, shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Consistent with CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4(b)(3), this may be accomplished through: planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If the archeologist determines that preservation in place is not feasible for the resource and another type of mitigation would better serve the interests protected by CEQA, mitigation shall include data recovery through archaeological investigations and the project applicant shall undertake the following: Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP). If avoidance/preservation in place is not feasible for the identified resource, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall hire a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeological consultant who shall prepare a detailed ARDTP that shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The ARDTP shall identify a proposed data recovery program, and how the data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim of targeting the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The ARDTP shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context;							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
reporting of results within a timely manner and subject to review and comments by the appropriate Native American representative, where applicable, before being finalized; curation of artifacts and data at a local facility acceptable to the City and appropriate Native American representative, if applicable; and dissemination of final confidential reports to the appropriate Native American representative, if applicable, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System and the City. Mitigation Measure CUL-2b.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources. During construction of each project proposed for development within the Plan Area and/or the Lark Drive Variant, if prehistoric or historic-era cultural materials are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt and the City shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. The project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall ensure that a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist shall inspect the find within 24 hours of discovery. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, shall follow the guidelines provided in Mitigation Measure CUL-2a.SP above.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, and for each project-level development proposal submitted to the City of Richmond for approval (and for construction of the Lark Drive Variant), the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall ensure the following: 1. In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find. The Contra Costa County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to their authority, they shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the project applicant shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further ground disturbance. 2. Project construction personnel shall be informed of the potential of encountering human remains during construction, and the proper procedures to follow as described above under 1., in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Verify mitigation measure on construction plans. Inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of a building permit. Field inspections during construction	Verified by: Date:
Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP: Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program. For each project-level development proposal submitted to the City of Richmond for approval and the Lark Drive Variant, and prior to initial ground disturbance, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) will retain a qualified paleontologist or a California Registered Professional Geologist (California RPG) with appropriate paleontological expertise to carry out all mitigation measures related to paleontological	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	Project Applicant / Contractor City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	If resources are encountered, Contractor to verify work is suspended as required, review and approve paleontologist and paleontologist's recommendations. City to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	During construction	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
resources. The qualified paleontologist or geologist will be available on-call to the project applicant (or City) throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant (or City) will also ensure the following measures are undertaken: 1. All construction forepersons and field supervisors conducting or overseeing subsurface excavations will be trained in the recognition of potential fossil materials prior to ground disturbing activities. A pre-construction training on paleontological resources will also be provided to all other construction workers, but may include videotape of the initial training and/or the use of written materials rather than in-person training by the qualified paleontologist/California RPG. In addition to fossil recognition, the training will convey procedures to follow in the event of a potential fossil discovery. If potential fossils are discovered during construction, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find will stop until the qualified paleontologist/California RPG can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist/California RPG may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If treatment and salvage is required, recommendations will be consistent with current professional standards. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection. 2. If found to be warranted based on experience during construction, the qualified paleontologist/California RPG, or paleontological monitor working under the supervision of the qualified paleontologist/California RPG, will monitor ground-disturbing activities. This monitoring will consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites. The frequency of monitoring will be							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
determined by the qualified paleontologist/California RPG. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, it will be assessed and recorded or salvaged it as described above.							
4.5 Geology, Soils, and Minerals							
None required.							
4.6 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases							
Mitigation Measure GHG-1.SP: GHG Prevention and Control. The City will continue to work proactively with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Air Resources Board, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency to help these agencies implement and enforce GHG prevention and control mandates within the City, and will work with the community to identify and advocate for GHG measures that are within the jurisdiction of these agencies and can and should be implemented to further reduce GHG emissions from the Richmond Bay Specific Plan and Sub-Area 4 Project.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Verify mitigation measure on construction plans.	Prior to issuance of a building permit.	Verified by: Date:
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a.SP: Protection of Human Health From Environmental Contamination. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any new project proposed within the Plan Area at a location where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred or resulted in environmental impacts, the City shall ensure the project will be developed under the supervision of the environmental agency(ies) of applicable jurisdiction (e.g., Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Contra Costa County Department of Human Health Services) such that health-based goals appropriate for the proposed new use are achieved, and soil management plans and/or environmental land use covenants are observed. The City shall not issue a building, use, or other permit for a new use that is inconsistent with any applicable land use covenant(s).	X	X	Individual Project Applicants/ Contractors	Contra Costa Health Services Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Department	Contra Costa Health Services to confirm receipt of hazardous material assessment. RWQCB to verify approved measures on construction plans. Engineering Division to receive and review soil vapor assessment as well as confirmation that the site remedial action plan has been revised as necessary, and approved by the RWQCB, to address the construction of housing and other infrastructure (i.e., water utilities) in areas of the site not otherwise contemplated	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)							
Measures to protect environmental health shall include one or more of the following strategies and approaches: removal of environmental contaminants from the subject area (e.g., excavation and off-site disposal, use of soil vapor extraction equipment); separation of site users from contamination (e.g., engineering or institutional controls), or treatment of environmental contamination (e.g., in situ chemical oxidation). Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for such new project, the project proponent shall provide evidence to the City of successful implementation of protective measures through a certificate of completion, finding of suitability for the project's intended use or similar documentation issued by the environmental agency having jurisdiction over the project. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b.SP: Health and Safety Plan. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for a new project proposed within the Plan Area at a location where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred, the City shall document that a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared and will be implemented for the protection of workers, the public and the environment. Such HASP shall be prepared by a California licensed professional of applicable expertise (e.g., certified industrial hygienist, professional engineer). The HASP shall include measures consistent with customary protocols and applicable regulations (including, but not limited to Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations) for the protection of workers, site users, the public, and the environment (e.g., management of impacted soil; use of personal protective equipment; management, use and or treatment of water associated with construction activities; dust mitigation) and to address the discovery of any suspect soils (e.g., petroleum odor and/or discoloration) during construction activities, including notification of appropriate oversight agencies and investigation, removal, and disposal of soils as appropriate under agency directives and local, state, and Federal regulations).					for housing or infrastructure in the 2005 Updated Proposed Remedial Action Plan, and that all remedial actions required to be completed per the revised remedial action plan prior to project construction have been approved as complete, and documented as such, by the RWQCB. Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.		

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)							
Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for activities covered by the grading or building permit, a completion report documenting the implementation of the HASP and any deviations shall be submitted to and approved by the City. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c.SP: Hazardous Building Material Assessment (ACM, LBP, PCBs, other hazardous building materials). For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area (or in the area of the Lark Drive Variant) that would require building demolition, and prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project applicant (or, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant, the City) shall submit to the City and/or the Contra Costa Health Services Department, according to relevant jurisdiction, a hazardous building material assessment prepared by qualified licensed contractors for any structure intended for demolition indicating whether asbestos containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP) or lead-based coatings, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing equipment, and/or other hazardous building materials are present. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1d.SP: Hazardous Building Materials Removal Plan (ACM, LBP, PCBs). For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area (or in the area of the Lark Drive Variant), if the assessment required by Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c indicates the presence of ACM, LBP, PCBs, or other hazardous building materials, prior to issuance of any demolition permit the project applicant (or, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant, the City) shall submit and implement a hazardous building materials removal plan in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements to protect demolition and construction workers and the public from risks associated with such hazardous materials during demolition or renovation of affected structures.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a.SP: Safety Management Techniques and Practices. The City shall make an additional finding for any use permit for any facility within the Plan Area that may pose a risk to human health or safety to the public due to the potential for an accidental release of hazardous substances, as follows: the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Fire Department that risk of accidental release and any off-site consequences to the public have been minimized to the extent feasible using best safety management techniques and practices and will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public, as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards. Such safety management techniques and practices may include among others: training; emergency notification systems; substitution to equipment subject to less risk of upset condition; substitution of chemicals that pose less risk to members of the public; equipment (e.g., safety shutoff valves, secondary containment) or practices to contain or lessen the off-site effect of any release. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b.SP: Review of New Sensitive Uses. Prior to issuance of a use permit, design review approval, or issuance of a building permit for new construction of, major renovation of, expansion of, or addition to a project within the Plan Area that includes sensitive land uses, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Fire Department that the risk to: (1) on-site sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, schools, daycare) from an off-site accidental release of hazardous substances will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public once mitigated (e.g., evacuation and shelter-in-place procedures), as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards; and (2) off-site members of the public from an on-site release of hazardous substances will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public once mitigated, (e.g., best safety management techniques and practices, as described above), as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards.	X	X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Verify approved measures on construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	<i>Verified by:</i> <i>Date:</i>

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure HAZ-4.SP: O&M Plan. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for any project within the area of the Specific Plan at a location where a cleanup plan is being implemented, as provided under HAZ-1a.SP, where an operation and maintenance (O&M) plan is required by an agency of applicable jurisdiction, the applicant shall demonstrate that an O&M plan has been approved by the agency and will be implemented to ensure the long-term protection of environmental health of site users. The O&M plan shall ensure the maintenance of health-based goals by periodic inspection of the remedy and taking such actions (e.g., repairing any deficiencies in durable covers that cap residual environmental contamination, performing maintenance on remedial equipment). Evidence of such an O&M plan and its implementation may be demonstrated by a document issued by an agency of applicable jurisdiction.							
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality							
Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP: Water Quality Best Management Practices for All Construction Activities. All applicants for projects proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan shall ensure that best management practices consistent with the most recent version of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Construction BMP Handbook are included in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared in accordance with the NPDES Construction General Stormwater Permit. BMPs may include without limitation: 1. The Straw bales, wattles, fiber rolls, gravel bags, or equivalent devices shall be installed around the perimeter of stockpiled materials and construction sites adjacent to water bodies (i.e., Meeker Channel and Slough, Baxter Creek, and Stege Marsh), to prevent debris from being transported to any receiving waters or open channel via runoff;	X	X	Project Applicant / Contractor	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) City of Richmond Building Division and Engineering Services Department/ Water Resource Recovery Department	The San Francisco Bay RWQCB to review and approve the project applicant prepared MMDP. City of Richmond Water Resource Recovery Department to monitor implementation of project BMPs.	Review and approval of the MMDP prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)							
2. The use of hazardous materials during construction shall be minimized to the extent practical, and the amount of hazardous materials stored adjacent to waterbodies shall be limited to what is needed to immediately support construction activities. Hazardous materials shall be centrally stored safely and securely in approved containers, under cover or in an approved storage shed, and in adequate secondary containment. Fueling of generators and other equipment shall be conducted in a central location with secondary containment, and adequate spill cleanup materials shall be provided during all fueling operations;							
3. Well-maintained equipment shall be used to perform the construction work, and, except in the case of a failure or breakdown, equipment maintenance shall be performed off site. Equipment shall be inspected daily by the operator for leaks or spills. If leaks or spills are encountered, the source of the leak shall be identified, leaked material will be cleaned up, and the cleaning materials shall be collected and properly disposed;							
4. Inactive material stock piles must be covered at all times;							
5. Construction material shall be covered in anticipation of any rainfall event;							
6. Active debris boxes shall be covered during rain events to prevent contact with rainwater;							
7. Non-stormwater discharges to the Bay shall be prohibited unless specified in the SWPPP and approved by the City; and							
8. A Materials Management and Disposal Plan (MMDP) shall be prepared to prevent any debris from falling into waterbodies in the Plan Area during construction to the maximum extent practicable and also ensure the appropriate disposal of all construction-related materials. The MMDP shall be submitted to the							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)							
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and approval. The measures identified in the MMDP shall be based on Best Available Technology, and will include, but not be limited to, the following: – During construction, in the event that debris does reach the Bay or a tributary, personnel within the work area shall immediately retrieve the debris for proper handling and disposal. All debris shall be disposed of at an authorized upland disposal site; – Construction waste shall be collected and transported to an authorized upland disposal area, per federal, State, and local laws and regulations; and, – All construction material, wastes, debris, sediment, rubbish, trash, fencing, etc., shall be removed from the project site once project construction is completed, and transported offsite in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations.							
Mitigation Measure HYD-7a.SP: Sea Level Rise Measures. All applicants for projects proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan will ensure that the project design includes the installation of appropriate stormwater inlet infrastructure, and/or the installation of back flow prevention devices on storm drain lines, and/or the design of the stormwater infrastructure to accommodate the future installation of back flow prevention devices on an as-needed basis. Stormwater infrastructure shall be designed to address up to 3 feet of sea level rise, as well as include capacity to adapt to up to 5.5 feet of sea level rise. Mitigation Measure HYD-7b.SP: Sea Level Rise Adaptation. Prior to issuance of building permits, all projects proposed for development within areas of the Plan Area shown on Figure 4.8-2 of the EIR to be affected by greater than 3 feet of sea level rise,	X	X	Project Applicant	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division and Engineering Department	Building Division to ensure mitigation language is provided in the projects Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions. Engineering Department to receive and review Plan.	Prior to certification of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)							
including the 100-year flood event and wave overtopping, shall submit an Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan to the City for approval. The City shall require implementation of such plan as a condition of approval for entitlement approvals and/or building permits as applicable. The Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan shall be consistent with City efforts to plan for sea level rise under General Plan Action Item EC6.g and Specific Plan Action Item A1.8, and shall include an Adaptive Flood Risk Management Strategy to address 100-year flood impacts associated with a rise in sea level of greater than 3 feet including the 100-year flood event and wave overtopping. Adaptive flood risk management strategies may include development setbacks, regrading, construction of raised berms or a wall, or other measure to protect future development from a rise in sea level above 3 feet. Consistent with General Plan Action Item EC6.g, the Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan shall include discussion of financing mechanisms for sea level rise adaptations.							
Mitigation Measure HYD-3.SA4: Pre-project stormflow levels. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, project applicants shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Director of the Public Works Department, one of the following: 1. Upon completion of construction activities, there will be sufficient detention capacity on the Project site to detain the incremental increase in stormflow volume that occurs during the 24-hour, 10-year design storm, which incremental increase is due to the increase in impervious surface above pre-project levels. This standard could be met with one or more detention vaults, tanks or other facilities, or through other means; 2. Upon completion of such construction, the total square footage of impervious surface area throughout the Project site will remain at or below pre-project levels; or		X	Project Applicant	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division / Engineering Services Department	Director of the City of Richmond Engineering Department to review and approve project stormwater plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)							
3. The proposed development has met the requirements of Provision C.3.g by demonstrating through compliance of CCCWP that any increases in stormwater flows are unlikely to cause downstream erosion or off-site siltation.							
4.9 Land Use and Planning							
None required.							
4.10 Noise							
Mitigation Measure NOI-1a.SP: Construction Noise Control Measures and Noise Control Plan. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, the applicant shall employ site-specific noise attenuation measures during project construction to reduce the generation of construction noise, including pile-driving noise. These measures shall be included in a Noise Control Plan that shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Department to ensure that construction noise is consistent with the standards set forth in the City's Noise ordinance and other standards as appropriate. Measures specified in the Noise Control Plan and implemented during project construction shall include, at a minimum, the following noise control strategies: Equipment and trucks used for construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds); Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to approximately 10 dBA. External jackets on the	X	X	Individual Project Applicants / Contractor	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division and Engineering Department	Engineering Department to review and approve project specifications and grading and construction plans for inclusion of this measure into specifications. Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures, such as use of drills rather than impact tools, shall be used; - Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or include other measures; and - Noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be performed as specified in Mitigation Measure NOI-1b. Mitigation Measure NOI-1b.SP: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that would require pile-driving during construction, noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be employed. These techniques shall include: - Limiting pile driving or other impact-related noise-generating activity to 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday. No pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; - Installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile-driving equipment; - Vibrating piles into place when feasible; - Installing shrouds around the pile-driving hammer where possible; - Implementing “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as drill and cast-in-place methods), where possible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; - Implementing the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration, where possible;							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
- Using cushion blocks to dampen impact noise, if feasible based on soil conditions. Cushion blocks are blocks of material that are used with impact hammer pile drivers, and placed atop a piling during installation to minimize noise generated when driving the pile. Materials typically used for cushion blocks include wood, nylon and micarta (a composite material); and - At least 48 hours prior to pile-driving activities, the applicant shall notify building owners and occupants within a minimum of 600 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.							
Mitigation Measure NOI-2.SP: Construction Vibration. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, and prior to the issuance of any building permit for each phase of project development, the project applicant shall conduct a historic survey of the project site, and a 200-foot buffer extending around the project site, to determine the locations of historic structures. If historic structures are identified, the project applicant shall develop a Vibration Reduction Plan (Plan) in coordination with an acoustical consultant, geotechnical engineer, and construction contractor, and submit the Plan to the City Chief Building Official for approval. The Plan shall include measures and/or controls to ensure that buildings within 200 feet of the project site will be exposed to less than 80 VdB and 83 VdB where people sleep and work, respectively, and less than 0.25 PPV for historic buildings to prevent building damage. Measures and controls shall be identified based on project-specific final design plans, and may include, but are not limited to, either or both of the following: 1. Implementation of buffers and the use of specific types of equipment to minimize vibration impacts during construction at nearby receptors in order to meet the specified standards.	X	X	Individual Project Applicants / Contractor	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division and Engineering Department	Engineering Department to review and approve project specifications and grading and construction plans for inclusion of this measure into specifications. Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
2. Implementation of a vibration, crack, and line and grade monitoring program for identified historic buildings located within 50 feet of construction activities, in coordination with a geotechnical engineer and qualified architectural historian. The following elements shall be included in this program: a) Prior to construction, a qualified architectural historian shall conduct a thorough survey of identified historic resources to identify, measure the dimensions of, and document (photographs and text) any existing cracks in the historic buildings. b) During construction activities: i. The construction contractor shall identify, and regularly inspect and photograph, crack gauges and include records of these inspections in construction reporting. Gauges shall be inspected every two weeks, or more frequently during periods of construction activity in close proximity to identified crack gauges. ii. The construction contractor shall collect vibration data from receptors and report vibration levels to the City Chief Building Official on a monthly basis. The reports shall include annotations regarding project activities as necessary to explain changes in vibration levels, along with proposed corrective actions to avoid vibration levels approaching or exceeding the established threshold. iii. With regards to historic buildings, if vibration levels exceed the threshold and monitoring or inspection indicates that the project may damage or is damaging the building, the building shall be provided additional protection or stabilization. If necessary and with approval by the City Chief Building							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
Official, the construction contractor shall install temporary shoring or stabilization to help avoid permanent impacts. Stabilization may involve structural reinforcement or corrections for deterioration that would minimize or avoid potential structural failures or avoid accelerating damage to the historic structure. Stabilization shall be conducted following the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. This treatment shall ensure retention of the historic building's character-defining features. Stabilization may temporarily impair the historic integrity of the building's design, material, or setting, and as such, the stabilization must be conducted in a manner that will not permanently impair a building's ability to convey its significance. Measures to shore or stabilize the building shall be installed in a manner that when they are removed, the historic integrity of the building remains, including integrity of material. Post-construction: i. The applicant (and its construction contractor) shall provide a report to the City Chief Building Official regarding crack and vibration monitoring conducted during demolition and construction. In addition to a narrative summary of the monitoring activities and their findings, this report shall include photographs illustrating the post-construction state of cracks and material conditions that were presented in the pre-construction assessment report, along with images of other relevant conditions showing the impact, or lack of impact, of project activities. The photographs shall sufficiently illustrate damage, if any, caused by the project and/or show how the project did not cause physical damage to the historic and non-historic							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
buildings. The report shall include annotated analysis of vibration data related to project activities, as well as summarize efforts undertaken to avoid vibration impacts. Finally, a post-construction line and grade survey shall also be included in this report. The project applicant (and its construction contractor) shall be responsible for repairs from damage to historic and non-historic buildings if damage is caused by vibration or movement during demolition and/or construction activities. Repairs may be necessary to address, for example, cracks that expanded as a result of the project, physical damage visible in post-construction assessment, or holes or connection points that were needed for shoring or stabilization. Repairs shall be directly related to project impacts and will not apply to general rehabilitation or restoration activities of the buildings. If necessary for historic structures, repairs shall be conducted in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. The project applicant shall provide the City Chief Building Official and City Preservation Officer for review and comment both a work plan for the repairs and a completion report to ensure compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mitigation Measure NOI-2b.SP: Exposure to Rail Vibration. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that involves new residential buildings or new dwelling units located adjacent to or within 200 feet of an active rail line, and prior to the approval of a construction-related permit, the project applicant shall submit a Vibration Reduction Plan (Plan) prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant for City review and approval that contains vibration reduction measures to reduce groundborne vibration to acceptable levels per Federal Transit Administration guidance (Federal Transit Administration, 2006, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006). The applicant shall implement the approved Plan during construction. Potential vibration reduction measures include isolation of							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.10 Noise (cont.)							
foundation and footings using resilient elements such as rubber bearing pads or springs, such as a “spring isolation” system that consists of resilient spring supports that can support the podium or residential foundations. The specific system shall be selected so that it can properly support the structural loads, and provide adequate filtering of groundborne vibration to the residences above.							
Improvement Measure NOI-3.SP: Project-Specific Noise Study. For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area, applicants shall conduct a project-specific noise study to determine compatibility of the proposed use with the existing noise environment based on land use/noise compatibility guidelines in the City’s General Plan. If the noise environment is found to be “conditionally acceptable” or “normally unacceptable” for the proposed use, a detailed acoustical analysis shall be conducted to specify the noise insulation measures needed to reduce noise exposure to “normally acceptable” levels, and these measures will be implemented. Measures may include, but are not limited to, appropriate site design to achieve maximum sound attenuation, use of enhanced noise insulation features in the form of appropriate sound-rated assemblies and/or other features/measures to reduce interior noise levels to meet Title 24 requirements.	X	X	Individual Project Applicants / Contractor	City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division and Engineering Department	Engineering Department to review and approve project specifications and grading and construction plans for inclusion of this measure into specifications. Building Division to inspect site during construction to ensure compliance with project construction plans.	Prior to issuance of building permit. Field inspections during construction	<i>Verified by:</i> <i>Date:</i>
4.11 Population and Housing							
None required.							
4.12 Public Services and Recreation							
Mitigation Measure PUB-1.SP: Fire Protection Services and Facilities. Not later than achieving 20 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout of the Specific Plan, the City of Richmond shall document the scope of additional fire protection services and facilities necessary to maintain a six minute response time required at the complete buildout of the Specific Plan. The City shall issue no	X	X	Individual Project Applicants / Contractor	City of Richmond Public Safety Department	City of Richmond Public Safety Department to document the implementation of fire services and facilities necessary	During project construction at 50% buildout	<i>Verified by:</i> <i>Date:</i>

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.12 Public Services and Recreation (cont.)							
building permits for new or expanded projects after 20 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout has been achieved unless an analysis with conclusions regarding the scope of these additional fire protection services and facilities has been prepared and approved by the City of Richmond Fire Department. The City shall also identify a fair share funding mechanism to support the cost of completing the identified improvements, and shall establish a program to collect funds and guarantee they are used for these improvements. Not later than achieving 50 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout of the Specific Plan, the City shall document the implementation of fire protection services and facilities necessary to maintain a six minute response time. The City shall issue no building permits for new or expanded projects after 50 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout has been achieved unless such implementation has been certified by the City of Richmond Fire Department.							
4.13 Transportation and Traffic							
Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SP: Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Signalize intersection and provide warning lights and gates for the at-grade railroad crossing. b) Restripe the southbound Harbour Way South approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Signalization of the intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the Richmond Ferry Terminal Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (May 2014). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection would be required when approximately 55 percent of the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 50 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the City shall either fully fund or cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City may implement this mitigation measure prior the time the 55 percent buildout trigger occurs. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS A during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SP: Wright Avenue/Marina Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Restripe the westbound Wright Avenue approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane within the current right-of-way. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection would be required when approximately 40 percent of the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 40 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the City shall either fully fund or cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City may implement this mitigation measure prior the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. The proposed signalization of this intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection would be required when approximately 45 percent of the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 35 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the City shall either fully fund or cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City may implement this mitigation measure prior the time the 45 percent buildout trigger occurs. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-3.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Restripe westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane. b) Upgrade signal to actuated operations, convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection would be required when approximately 25 percent of the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the City shall either fully fund or cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City may implement this mitigation measure prior the time the 25 percent buildout trigger occurs. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. The implementation of this measure would improve conditions at the intersection; however, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second left-turn lane on the southbound Regatta Boulevard approach and a second through lane on the northbound Regatta Boulevard approach. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-4.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP: Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. Coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/ Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. The proposed improvements at this intersection are consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required by the Specific Plan developments. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection would be required when approximately 425 percent of the Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 15 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the City shall either fully fund or cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City may implement this mitigation measure prior the time the 15 percent buildout trigger occurs. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP: Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected left-turn phasing on all approaches. b) Restripe southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/ through lane. The proposed improvements at this intersection are consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 35 percent of the Sub-Area 4 is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 35 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as an additional through lane on the northbound Bayview Avenue and southbound 51st Street approaches. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-6.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-7.SP: Central Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install a signal at the intersection. The proposed improvement at this intersection is consistent with the planned and funded project to signalize the I-580/Central Avenue ramp intersections. If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 40 percent of the Plan Area is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS A during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-7.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-8: Central Avenue/ Westbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install a signal at the intersection. The proposed improvement at this intersection is consistent with the planned and funded project to signalize the I-580/Central Avenue ramp intersections. If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 40 percent of the Plan Area is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-8.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-9.SP: Cutting Boulevard/Harbour Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the Cutting Boulevard improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of both Cutting Boulevard and Harbour Way South to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Convert the signal phasing for the north and south intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and coordinate signal timings with adjacent signals along Cutting Boulevard.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 40 percent of the Specific Plan area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Cutting Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-10.SP: Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South Intersection Signalization, Channelization, and Safety Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically at this intersection, the Harbour Way South/Wright Avenue intersection improvement would signalize intersection and provide warning lights and gates for the at-grade railroad crossing. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SP, which would consist of signalizing intersection and restriping the southbound Harbour Way South approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-11: Wright Avenue/Marina Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the Marina Way South between Cutting Boulevard and Hall Avenue improvement would eliminate one through traffic lane along both directions of Marina Way South to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SP, which would consist of restriping the westbound Wright Avenue approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane within the current right-of-way. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.			Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:
Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP: Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically the Cutting Boulevard improvement would eliminate one through traffic lane along both directions of Cutting Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
b) Update signal to actuated-coordinated operations and coordinate signal timings with adjacent intersection along Cutting Boulevard. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 45 percent of the Plan Area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 45 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Cutting Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-13.SP: Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Restripe the eastbound Meeker Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. c) Update signal to actuated-coordinated operations and convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing. Coordinate signal timings with adjacent signal timings along Marina Bay Parkway.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 20 percent of the Specific Plan area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 20 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-14.SP: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-14.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:
Mitigation Measure TRF-15.SP: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
b) Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP, which would consist of restriping westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane, upgrading the signal to actuated operations, changing the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinating signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/ Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-16.SP: Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and coordinating signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-17.SP: Bayview Avenue/ 51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected signal phasing (i.e., vehicles turning left do not have to yield to oncoming traffic) on all approaches, and restriping southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:
Mitigation Measure TRF-18.SP: Bayview Avenue/Carlson Boulevard intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically the Carlson Boulevard between Broadway	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
and Tehama Avenue and Bayview Avenue Overcrossing I-580 improvements would eliminate one through traffic lane along both directions of both Bayview Avenue and Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities, provide marked pedestrian crossings across all intersection approaches, and replace the northbound slip right-turn with a dedicated right-turn lane. a) Convert the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and provide an overlap phase for the northbound right-turn movement. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 30 percent of the Specific Plan area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 30 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-19.SP: Carlson Boulevard/Westbound I-80 Ramps Intersection Widening and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the Carlson Boulevard between Broadway and Tehama Avenue improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
b) Widen the southbound Westbound I-80 Off-Ramp to provide one right-turn lane and one shared through/left turn lane. The proposed improvement (item b) at this intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR (November 2013). The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 60 percent of the Specific Plan area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 60 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-19.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-20.SP: Carlson Boulevard/Eastbound I-80 Ramps Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the Carlson Boulevard between Broadway and Tehama Avenue improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities.	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 40 percent of the Specific Plan area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-6.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-21.SP: MacDonald Way/Harbour Way Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Restripe the southbound Harbour Way approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. c) Upgrade intersection signal equipment to convert the signal phasing for the north and south intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements,	X		Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 50 percent of the Plan Area is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 50 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SA4: Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and restriping southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 60 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, if the improvement has not already been implemented, the individual Sub-Area 4 Project development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 60 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as an additional through lane on the northbound Bayview Avenue and southbound 51st Street approaches. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SA4: Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street Intersection Signal Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP, item b, which would update the signal to actuated-coordinated operations and coordinate signal timings with adjacent intersection along Cutting Boulevard.		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 90 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 90 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SA4: Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP, items b and c, which would restripe the eastbound Meeker Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way, update the signal to actuated-coordinated operations, convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing, and coordinate signal timings with adjacent signal timings along Marina Bay Parkway. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 90 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 90 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SA4: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 10 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 10 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions, and would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-4.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SA4: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP, which would restripe westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane, upgrade the signal to actuated operations, convert the signal phasing for east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 75 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 75 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-5.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SA4: Regatta Boulevard/ Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing.		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 85 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 85 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-7.SA4: Bayview Avenue/ 51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected signal phasing on all approaches, and restripe southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:
Mitigation Measure TRF-8.SA4: Bayview Avenue/ Carlson Boulevard Intersection Signal Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-18.SP, item b, which would convert the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and provide an overlap phase for the northbound right-turn movement. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 30 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 30 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a third through lane on eastbound or westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure TRF-9.SA4: Carlson Boulevard/ Westbound I-80 Ramps Intersection Widening. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-19.SP, item b, which would widen the southbound Westbound I-80 Off-Ramp to provide one right-turn lane and one shared through/left turn lane. The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may be required when about 80 percent of the Sub-Area 4 Project is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact shall either fully fund or implement the mitigation measure. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 80 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would		X	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors shall contribute fair-share funds for traffic impact fees or construct the improvement.	Applicants of Individual Projects / Project Contractors City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Division	Develop the funding mechanism, the calculation of, and receipt of payment.	Prior to granting certificate of occupancy.	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.13 Transportation and Traffic (cont.)							
not be required to be implemented by an individual project and the City may collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-9.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.							
4.14 Utilities and Service Systems							
Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP: Confirmation of Sanitary Sewer System Capacity. For each project developed within the Plan Area, the project applicant shall ensure that a qualified civil engineer confirm the capacity of the surrounding sanitary sewer system to accommodate the proposed project, prior to the issuance of final certificate of occupancy or equivalent permit to operate or occupy. As part of project plan review, the project applicant shall provide a plan to the City that shows how any necessary stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements would be implemented to accommodate the proposed project,	X	X	Individual project applicants shall hire a qualified civil engineer	City of Richmond Engineering Department/ Planning and Building Services Division	A qualified civil engineer will verify the capacity of the sewer system. City Planning and Building Division to review the sanitary sewer system capacity study and confirm needed improvements to the WPCP.	Prior to issuance of final occupancy or equivalent permit to operate or occupy	<i>Verified by:</i> <i>Date:</i>

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.14 Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)							
and commit to funding improvements that are not otherwise funded through City programs, and/or to implementing the improvements, which may include onsite treatment of stormwater to reduce demand on the sanitary sewer system due to Infiltration/Inflow. Mitigation Measure UTL-3b.SP: Determine Upgrades to Water Pollution Control Plant. For each project developed within the Plan Area, the City Planning and Building Division shall review the sanitary sewer system capacity study prepared per Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP, and additionally confirm whether improvements planned for the Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) in the most current Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan are required to be operational prior to project operation, and shall ensure that any required improvements are completed prior to issuance of a building permit for the project. The City shall also commit to preparing and implementing a Water Pollution Control Plant Improvement Fee Program to guarantee funding for upgrades to the WPCP, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Water Pollution Control Plant Improvement Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the WPCP improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.							

TABLE 6-1 (Continued)
MITIGATION AND FEATURES MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Applicable To		Implemented By	Monitored By	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Monitoring Schedule	Verification of Compliance
	Specific Plan Area	Sub-Area 4 Project					
4.14 Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)							
Mitigation Measure UTL-4.SP: ICI Pump Station Upgrades. For any development proposed within the Plan Area, prior to the recordation of a Final Map, the issuance of a grading permit, the issuance of a building permit, or utility extension approval, whichever is sooner, the project developer shall submit written verification from the City's Utility Planning Division (or Engineer) that the ICI Pump Station is adequately improved to provide service to the proposed development. Alternatively, project applicants may construct equivalent improvements to ensure the facility's function to the satisfaction of the City Public Works Department.	X	X	Individual project applicants	City of Richmond Engineering Department	Verify the ICI Pump Station is adequately improved	Prior to issuance of permits	Verified by: Date:

TABLE 2-2
RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN FINAL EIR: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Aesthetics (SP)		
Impact AES-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic resource. (Criteria a., b.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AES-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Plan Area and its surroundings. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AES-3.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP: Building Design and Lighting Strategies to Address Biological Resources Impacts.	Less Than Significant
Aesthetics (SA4)		
Impact AES-1.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic resource. (Criteria a., b.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AES-2.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AES-3. SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP: Building Design and Lighting Strategies to Address Biological Resources Impacts.	Less Than Significant
Aesthetics (C)		
Impact C-AES-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future development would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-AES-1.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future development would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SP)		
Impact AIR-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would be consistent with the primary goals of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan and would not fundamentally conflict with the Clean Air Plan because the Specific Plan demonstrates reasonable efforts to implement control measures contained in the CAP. (Criterion a.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AIR-2.SP: Construction associated with development under the Specific Plan would result in average daily emissions of greater than 54 pounds per day of ROG, NOX, or PM2.5 or 80 pounds per day of PM10. (Criteria a., b.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure AIR-2a.SP: Best Management Practices for Controlling Particulate Emissions. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall ensure the implementation of the following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control for all project construction activities. These measures will reduce particulate emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. 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. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. 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. 6. 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, § 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 7. 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. Mitigation Measure AIR-2b.SP: Require Tier 4 engines on Construction Equipment. All applicants proposing development of projects within the Plan Area shall require their contractors, as a condition of contract, to further reduce construction-related exhaust emissions by ensuring that all off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall operate on a USEPA-approved Tier 4 engine. Construction equipment with Tier 4 engines currently comprise 22 percent of the statewide construction equipment fleet and CARB Regulations will result in the	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact AIR-2.SP (cont.)	percentage increasing over the next several years. Alternatively, future project sponsors could have a construction air quality assessment performed which, if the results warrant and the City approves, would obviate the need for implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2b.SP. Mitigation Measure AIR-2c.SP: Require Construction Fleet to Use Renewable Diesel. All applicants proposing development of projects within the Plan Area shall require their contractors, as a condition of contract, to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions by ensuring that all off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall operate on renewable diesel (such as Diesel HPR), <u>to the extent renewable diesel is commercially feasible and available</u>. Renewable diesel is currently commercially available in Berkeley and Oakland. Alternatively, future project sponsors could have a construction air quality assessment performed which, if the results warrant and the City approves, would obviate the need for implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2c.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AIR-3.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would result in operational average daily emissions that could violate any air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively significant net increase of any nonattainment pollutant. (Criteria b., c.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure AIR-3a.SP: Use Super-compliant VOC Architectural Coatings in Maintaining Buildings through CC&Rs and Ground Leases. Future developer(s) of projects within the Plan Area shall require all residentially developed parcels to include within their CC&R's and/or ground leases requirements for all future interior spaces to be repainted only with "Super-Compliant" Architectural Coatings (http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/compliance/architectural-coatings/super-compliant-coatings). While Regulation 8 Rule 3 of the BAAQMD places limits on the VOC content of paint and other architectural coatings, use of lower VOC coatings available to consumers can further reduce operational ROG emissions. Mitigation Measure AIR-3b.SP: Promote use of Green Consumer Products. To reduce ROG, NOx and PM10 emissions associated with projects developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) of such projects shall provide education for residential and commercial tenants concerning green consumer products. Prior to receipt of any certificate of final occupancy and every five years thereafter, the project sponsors shall work with the City of Richmond to develop electronic correspondence to be distributed by email annually to residential and/or commercial tenants of each building on the project site that encourages the purchase of consumer products that generate lower than typical VOC emissions. The correspondence shall encourage environmentally preferable purchasing and shall include contact information and links to vendors of low VOC consumer products. Mitigation Measure AIR-3c.SP: Electrification of Loading Docks. For all projects <u>new loading docks at existing businesses as well as new projects</u> developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) shall ensure that loading docks for retail, light industrial or warehouse uses that will receive deliveries from refrigerated transport trucks incorporate electrification hook-ups for transportation refrigeration units to avoid emissions generated by idling refrigerated transport trucks.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact AIR-3.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure AIR-3d.SP: Prohibit Wood Burning Fireplaces. For all projects developed within the Plan Area, developer(s) shall ensure that building specifications for residential units preclude fireplaces, whether wood-burning or natural gas-fired. Compliance with this measure shall be verified upon plan review and prior to occupancy by the City of Richmond Building Department. Mitigation Measure AIR-3e.SP: Diesel Backup Generator Specifications. For all projects developed within the Plan Area, and to reduce NOx emissions associated with operation of stationary sources, the project sponsors shall implement the following actions: - Any new diesel backup generators shall: - Have engines that meet or exceed CARB Tier 4 off-road emission standards which have the lowest NOx emissions of commercially available generators, and - Be fueled with renewable diesel, if commercially available, which has been demonstrated to reduce NOx emissions by approximately 10 percent. - All new diesel backup generators shall have an annual maintenance testing limit of 50 hours, if feasible, and up to a maximum of 50 hours per engine, subject to any further restrictions as may be imposed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in its permitting process. Mitigation Measures TRF-9.SP through TRF-20.SP	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AIR-4.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would result in new sources of toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and could expose new receptors to existing sources of TACs. (Criterion d.) <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SP: Diesel Particulate Matter Exposure for Residential and Other Sensitive Land Uses. Should residences or other sensitive land use be proposed within 500 feet of the nearest traffic lane for I-580 or permitted stationary sources, to reduce DPM exposure to proposed receptors of the Specific Plan, all applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall either: - Install and ensure the operation in good working order of indoor air filtration systems that meet or exceed an efficiency standard of Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 (i.e., a filter efficiency of approximately 80 percent of fine particulates in the range of 1.0 to 3.0 micrometers) to limit DPM within proposed sensitive land uses of the Specific Plan; or - Alternatively, the proposed project sponsor will perform a health risk assessment which, if the results warrant and the City approves, could obviate the need for filtration systems by demonstrating a less than significant exposure risk for future occupants.	Significant and Unavoidable <u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact AIR-4.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure AIR-4b.SP Health Risk Assessment of Future Projects under the Specific Plan. For all projects proposed for development within the Plan Area (except the Sub-Area 4 Project), project applicants shall assess the potential cancer risk exposures to on-site residential receptors or any proposed school facilities later in the design phase, but prior to occupancy, and to prepare a project-specific HRA using updated receptor location information and a more detailed assessment of risks associated with I-580 or permitted stationary sources at that time and submit to the City for review. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk exposures for on-site receptors will be less than BAAQMD project-level thresholds, then Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SP would be unnecessary. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk for on-site sensitive receptors will be less than presented in this analysis, but still over BAAQMD threshold, the mitigation effort may be proportionately reduced. Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SP: (Health Risk Assessment of Future Projects Under the Specific Plan). Prior to issuance of a building permit for development within the Plan Area that includes sensitive land uses (e.g., residential uses, schools, daycares), except the Sub-Area 4 Project, the City shall review and approve, as appropriate, a health risk assessment and mitigation plan documenting that exposure of sensitive land uses to concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs), including diesel particulate matter, meet or are less than (i.e., are as protective as) health-based thresholds established by BAAQMD. The health risk assessment and mitigation plan shall become an enforcement element of the building permit. At a minimum, the project-specific health risk assessment and mitigation plan shall: • <u>Use up-to-date, project-specific sensitive receptor location information and a detailed assessment of risks associated with I-580 and any permitted stationary sources at that time;</u> • <u>Include an analysis of the health risks associated with each individual source, as well as an analysis of cumulative health risk impacts, and</u> • <u>Demonstrate a less than significant exposure risk for future uses based on then-current BAAQMD thresholds using one or more of the following (or comparable) measures to reduce TAC exposure: 1) Install and ensure the operation in good working order of indoor air filtration systems; and/or 2) Integrate building design features (e.g., strategic placement of HVAC air intakes, use of vegetative or structural screening, appropriate building set-back) to limit exposure from sources of TAC concentrations.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable Less Than Significant with Mitigation

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SP) – (cont.)		
	Mitigation Measure AIR-4c.SP: Risk Reduction Plan for Backup Generators or New Permitted Stationary Sources. Applicants for projects that would include backup generators shall prepare and submit to the City a Risk Reduction Plan for City review and approval. The applicant shall implement the approved Risk Reduction Plan. The Risk Reduction Plan shall reduce cumulative localized cancer risks to the maximum feasible extent. The Risk Reduction Plan may contain, but is not limited to the following strategies: 1. Demonstration using screening analysis or a health risk assessment that project sources, when combined with local cancer risks from cumulative sources with 1,000 feet would be less than 100 in one million. 2. Installation of non-diesel fueled generators. 3. Installation of diesel generators with an EPA-certified Tier 4 engine or engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Mitigation Measures AIR-2b.SP and AIR-2c.SP.	
Impact AIR-5.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not contribute to carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations exceeding the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) of nine parts per million (ppm) averaged over eight hours and 20 ppm for one hour. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact AIR-6.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not frequently and for a substantial duration, create or expose sensitive receptors to substantial objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. (Criterion e.) <i>(Less Than Significant)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Air Quality (SA4)		
Impact AIR-1.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SA4)		
Impact AIR-2.SA4: Construction activities associated with the Sub-Area 4 Project could generate fugitive dust and exceed construction criteria air pollutants emissions. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure AIR-2.SA4: Implement BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures. The Sub-Area 4 Project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement the following applicable BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to reduce emissions of fugitive dust and equipment exhaust: • All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. • All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. • All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. • All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. • 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. • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. • 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 BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.	Less Than Significant
Impact AIR-3.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that could violate an air quality standard, or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Criterion b) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure AIR-3a.SP, AIR-3b.SP, AIR-3c.SP, AIR-3d.SP, AIR-3e.SP, and TRF-9.SP through TRF -20.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact AIR-4.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Criterion d) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure AIR-2b.SP and AIR-2c.SP (or) Mitigation Measure AIR-4a.SA4: As an alternative to Mitigation Measures AIR-2b.SP and AIR-2c.SP, the Sub-Area 4 Project construction contractor/s shall use other measures, or in combination with use of Tier 4 equipment, to minimize diesel particulate matter emissions during the construction period, provided such measures reduce the predicted cancer risk below the threshold of (a) an incremental cancer risk level greater than 10 in one million, (b) a noncancerous risk (chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0, or (c) an increase of annual average PM2.5 of greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3) and are approved by the City. Any diesel-powered off-road and portable equipment shall meet or exceed emission standards for Tier 2 engines. For example, the construction contractor(s) may use other measures such as the use of alternative powered equipment (e.g., LPG-powered or electric lifts), alternative fuels (e.g., biofuels), added exhaust devices, or a combination of measures. Mitigation Measure AIR-4b.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project applicant/s may choose to reassess the potential off-site cancer risk and PM2.5 concentration exposures to off-site residential receptors later in the design phase, but prior to the start of construction, and prepare a revised HRA using updated receptor location information and more detailed construction plans and equipment list and submit to the City for review. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk and exposure to PM2.5 for all potentially exposed off-site receptors will be less than BAAQMD project-level threshold of (a) an incremental cancer risk level greater than 10 in one million, (b) a noncancerous risk (chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0, or (c) an increase of annual average PM2.5 of greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m3), then Mitigation Measure AIR-4a is unnecessary. If the revised HRA demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the City, that the cancer risk or exposure to PM2.5 for off-site sensitive receptors will be less than presented in this analysis but still over BAAQMD thresholds, then the mitigation effort may be proportionately adjusted.	Less Than Significant
Impact AIR-5.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Criterion e) <i>(Less Than Significant)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Air Quality (C)		
Impact C-AIR-1.SP: The Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development would contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measures AIR-3a.SP, AIR-3b.SP, AIR-3c.SP, AIR-3d.SP, AIR-3e.SP, and Mitigation Measures TRF-9.SP through TRF -20.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-AIR-2SP: The Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development would contribute to cumulative health risk impacts on sensitive receptors. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure AIR.2b.SP, AIR.2c.SP, AIR-4a.SP, AIR-4b.SP, and 4c.SP.	<u>Significant and Unavoidable</u> <u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Air Quality (C) – (cont.)		
Impact C-AIR-1.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development of cumulative projects would contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure AIR-3a.SP, AIR-3b.SP, AIR-3c.SP, AIR-3d.SP, AIR-3e.SP, and Mitigation Measure TRF-9.SP through TRF -20.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-AIR-2.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development of cumulative projects would contribute to cumulative health risk impacts on sensitive receptors. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure AIR-4ba.SP and AIR-4c.SP.	Less Than Significant
Biological Resources (SP)		
Impact BIO-1.SP: Development facilitated by the Specific Plan would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.SP: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Western Pond Turtle. For any project proposed for development adjacent to the existing Upper Lagoon and/or Lower Lagoon, or in the area of Meeker Slough and Meeker Creek, project applicants shall determine the presence or absence of western pond turtle by conducting a preconstruction survey in areas of suitable habitat. If western pond turtle is present, the following measures shall be implemented: a) A qualified biologist shall supervise the installation of exclusion fencing along the boundaries of the work area adjacent to occupied and/or suitable habitat, as the biologist deems necessary to prevent western pond turtles from entering the work area. The construction contractor shall install species exclusion fencing, with a minimum height of 3 feet above ground surface and with an additional 4 to 6 inches of fence material buried such that species cannot crawl under the fence. b) A qualified biologist shall survey the project site within 48 hours before the onset of initial ground-disturbing activities and shall be present during initial vegetation clearing and ground-disturbing activities. (A qualified biologist is an individual who shall have a minimum of five years of academic training and professional experience in biological sciences and related resource management activities with a minimum of two years conducting surveys for each species that may be present within the project site.) The biological monitor shall monitor the exclusion fencing weekly to confirm proper maintenance and inspect for turtles. If western pond turtles are found, the City shall halt activities in the vicinity that pose a threat to the individual turtle or turtles as determined by the qualified biologist. If possible, the turtle or turtles shall be allowed to move out of the project site of their own volition (e.g., if it is near the exclusion fence that can be temporarily removed to let it pass). The qualified biologist shall relocate turtles to the nearest suitable habitat should they not leave the work area of their own accord. Construction shall resume after the turtles are out of harm's way. If western pond turtles occur repeatedly onsite after the exclusion fencing has been installed, a qualified biologist shall initiate preconstruction sweeps of the project site for this species prior to start of construction on a daily basis and thereafter throughout the duration of the project.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	c) During project construction or other ground-disturbing activities, excavations deeper than 6 inches shall have a sloping escape ramp of earth or a wooden plank installed at a 3:1 rise; openings, such as pipes, where western pond turtles might seek refuge shall be covered when not in use; and all trash that may attract predators or hide western pond turtles shall be properly contained each day, removed from the worksite, and disposed of regularly. Following the completion of activities, the construction contractor shall remove all trash and construction debris from the work areas. Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.SP: Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, a project-specific Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training shall be developed and implemented by a qualified biologist and attended by all project personnel prior to beginning work onsite. The WEAP training shall generally include but not be limited to education about the following: • Applicable state and federal laws, environmental regulations, Specific Plan permit conditions, and penalties for non-compliance; • Special-status plant and animal species with potential to occur at or in the vicinity of the project site, avoidance measures, and a protocol for encountering such species including a communication chain; • Preconstruction surveys and biological monitoring requirements associated with each phase of work and at each project site as biological resources and protection measures will vary depending on the land managers; • Known sensitive resource areas in the project vicinity that are to be avoided and/or protected as well as approved project work areas, access roads, and staging areas; and • Best management practices (BMPs) and their location at various project sites for erosion control, species exclusion, in addition to general housekeeping requirements. Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.SP: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area, the City shall require the project applicant to conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys in areas containing, or likely to contain, habitat for nesting birds as a condition of approval for any development-related permit. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts on nesting birds include, but are not limited to, those described below. • To the extent practicable, construction activities including building demolition, vegetation and tree removal, and new site construction shall be performed between September 1 and January 31 in order to avoid the avian nesting season.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	• If construction activities cannot be completed between September 1 and January 31, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. During the avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall survey construction areas within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area for nesting raptors and passerine birds not more than 30 days prior to any ground-disturbing activity or vegetation removal. All accessible potential nesting habitat, including bare ground, in the Plan Area and within a 500 feet (for raptors) and 250 feet (for all other species) around any construction activity will be surveyed. • If active nests are found either within the project site or within the 500-foot survey buffer surrounding the project site, “no-work” buffer zones shall be established around the nests by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW as necessary depending on the specific species encountered. No demolition, vegetation removal, or ground-disturbing activities shall occur within the no-work buffer zone until young have fledged or the nest is otherwise abandoned as determined by the qualified biologist. If work during the nesting season stops for 14 days or more and then resumes, then nesting bird surveys shall be repeated, to ensure that no new birds have begun nesting in the area. • Typically, the size of individual buffers ranges from a minimum of 250 feet for raptors to a minimum of 50 feet for other birds but can be adjusted based on an evaluation of the site by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the USFWS and/or CDFW as necessary (i.e., in the case of protected species). Buffer distances may also be modified if obstacles such as buildings or trees obscure the construction area from active bird nests, or existing disturbances create an ambient background disturbance similar to the proposed disturbance. • Birds that establish nests after construction starts are assumed to be habituated to and tolerant of the indirect impacts resulting from construction noise and human activity. However, direct take of nests, eggs, and nestlings is still prohibited and a buffer must be established to avoid nest destruction. • Results of the surveys shall be forwarded to CDFW (if required by state law based on the species observed) and avoidance procedures shall be adopted, if necessary, on a case-by-case basis. These may include construction buffer areas (up to several hundred feet in the case of raptors) or seasonal avoidance. • A construction lighting plan for each project under the Specific Plan shall be prepared detailing measures to minimize light spillover outside of each project site.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	• Burrowing Owls: The following measures shall be implemented to address construction or other ground-disturbing activities that could take place within burrowing owl nesting habitat in Sub-Area 4. All accessible potential nesting habitat, including bare ground, in the project site that could be affected by construction activity will be surveyed per guidance provided in Appendix C of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012). These guidelines shall determine timing and survey methodology, and reporting requirements. Preconstruction surveys to determine absence or presence of active burrowing owl nesting sites within the project site shall generally be completed as follows, or as modified by any subsequent approved protocol: a) Two surveys shall occur no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbing activity: one no less than 14 days prior to ground disturbing activity, and one within 24 hours prior to ground disturbing activity. Habitat assessments shall be conducted per guidelines provided in Appendix C of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, 2012). If no burrows are observed during the first survey, the second survey is not required. b) Conduct the survey/s between morning civil twilight and 10:00 AM and two hours before sunset until evening civil twilight to provide the highest detection probabilities. c) A survey for burrows and owls shall be conducted by walking through suitable habitat in the project site and in areas within 150 meters (approximately 500 feet) of the project site. This 150-meter buffer zone is included to account for adjacent burrows and foraging habitat outside the project site and impacts from factors such as noise and vibration due to heavy equipment which could impact resources outside the project site. d) Pedestrian survey transects shall be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (approximately 100 feet), and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. To efficiently survey projects larger than 100 acres, it is recommended that two or more surveyors conduct concurrent surveys. Surveyors should maintain a minimum distance of 50 meters (approximately 160 feet) from any owls or occupied burrows. It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons. e) A report of the burrow survey stating absence or presence of burrows shall be prepared and submitted to the City and, if results are positive for birds, CDFW.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP: Building Design and Lighting Strategies to Address Biological Resources Impacts. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, and prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each new building, the City of Richmond (City) shall require that the project applicant retain a qualified biologist experienced with bird strike issues to review and approve the design of the building windows and lighting to ensure that it sufficiently minimizes the potential for bird strikes. The City may also consult with applicable resource agencies with jurisdiction such as CDFW, USFWS, or others, as it determines to be appropriate during this review. Building Design. Prior to issuance of a building permit, The project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the Planning Director identifying the measures and features of the building design that are intended to reduce potential impacts on birds. The building design may include, but is not limited to, some of the following measures: • Employ design techniques that create “visual noise” via cladding or other design features that make it easy for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake buildings for open sky or trees; • Decrease continuity of reflective surfaces using “visual marker” design techniques, which may include: a) Patterned or fritted glass, with patterns at most 28 centimeters apart; b) One-way films installed on glass, with any picture or pattern or arrangement that can be seen from the outside by birds but appear transparent from the inside; c) Geometric fenestration patterns that effectively divide a window into smaller panes of at most 28 centimeters; and/or d) Decals with patterned or abstract designs, with the maximum clear spaces at most 28 centimeters square. • Up to 60 feet high on building facades facing the shoreline, decrease reflectivity of glass, using design techniques such as plastic or metal screens, light-colored blinds or curtains, frosting of glass, angling glass towards the ground, UV-A glass, or awnings and overhangs; • Eliminate the use of clear glass on opposing or immediately adjacent faces of the building without intervening interior obstacles such that a bird could perceive its flight path through the glass to be unobstructed; • Mute reflections in glass using strategies such as angled glass, shades, internal screens, and overhangs; and • Place new vegetation sufficiently away from glazed building facades so that no reflection occurs. Alternatively, if planting of landscapes near a glazed building façade is desirable, situate trees and shrubs immediately adjacent to the exterior	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
	• glass walls, at a distance of less than 3 feet from the glass. Such close proximity will obscure habitat reflections and will minimize fatal collisions by reducing birds' flight momentum. • A construction lighting plan for each project under the Specific Plan shall be prepared detailing measures to minimize light spillover outside of each project site. Lighting Design. The project applicant shall ensure that the design and specifications for buildings implement design elements to reduce lighting usage, change light direction, and confine light exposure. These may include, but are not limited to, the following general considerations that should be applied wherever feasible throughout the proposed project to reduce night lighting impacts on fish, marine mammals, and avian species: - Avoid installation of lighting in areas where not required for public safety; - Examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting when interior lights would be visible from the exterior or exterior lights must be left on at night, including: - Installing motion-sensitive lighting; - Installing task lighting; - Installing programmable timers; and, - Installing fixtures that use lower-wattage, sodium, and yellow-red spectrum lighting; and, - Where exterior lights are to be left on at night, install fully shielded lights to contain and direct light away from the sky. Educating Residents and Occupants. The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that the project applicant agrees to provide educational materials to building tenants, occupants, and residents encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing window coverings at night. The City Planning and Building Services Division shall administratively review and approve the educational materials prior to building occupancy. Documentation. The City shall document undertaking the activities described in this mitigation measure and maintain records that include, among others, the written descriptions provided by the building developer of the measures and features of the design for each building that are intended to address potential impacts on birds, and the recommendations and memoranda prepared by the qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes who reviews and approves the design of any proposed projects to ensure that they sufficiently minimize the potential for bird strikes.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure BIO-1e.SP: Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse and Salt Marsh Wandering Shrew Measures. The following measures shall be implemented within occupied, or presumed-occupied, salt marsh harvest mouse and/or salt marsh wandering shrew habitat to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to these species and their habitat. 1. A qualified, CDFW and/or USFWS-approved biological monitor will be present during all project-related activities within habitat determined suitable for salt marsh harvest mouse and/or salt marsh wandering shrew, or within 100 feet of such habitat. The biological monitor will present supplemental Worker Environmental Awareness Program information as needed for construction personnel to provide guidance about listed species and their habitats. The biological monitor will monitor all activities to ensure that no salt marsh harvest mouse or salt marsh wandering shrew is harassed, killed, or injured, and to ensure that the project conforms to the conservation measures outlined in the EIR. The biological monitor will notify the construction management lead when any aspect of the project might result in unauthorized take of special-status wildlife. 2. Vegetation within 100 feet of potential salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wandering shrew habitat shall be removed using hand-tools prior to the installation of the exclusion fencing under the supervision of the qualified biological monitor. If animals of either species are observed within the work area, a biologist, with the appropriate federal and state permits, will remove and relocate the species to the nearest appropriate habitat. 3. To avoid potential impacts to salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wandering shrew, exclusion fencing shall be installed by hand in all locations containing pickleweed, fat hen, and alkali heath vegetation or suitable foraging or nesting habitat and all natural/undeveloped uplands within a minimum of 100 feet of these habitats to prevent these species from entering the active work area, to protect habitat from earthmoving activities or accidental spills, and to exclude workers from sensitive habitat. The fence shall be made of a heavy plastic sheeting material that does not allow salt marsh harvest mouse and salt marsh wandering shrew to pass through or climb, and the bottom shall be buried to a depth of at least four inches so that the mouse and shrew cannot crawl under the fence. Fence height shall be at least 12 inches higher than the highest adjacent vegetation with a maximum height of four feet. All supports for the exclusion fencing shall be placed on the inside of the work area. A two-foot buffer will be maintained clear of vegetation along the outside of the exclusion fencing. Exclusion fencing shall be installed above the maximum high tide to prevent trapping animals between the fencing and rising tide waters. The fencing shall be installed under the supervision of the qualified biological monitor. Installation shall not occur during winter high tides, as determined by the biological monitor, when marsh habitats are submerged and these species are pushed to upland habitats.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure BIO-1g.SP: Special-Status Bat Protection Measure. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that would involve the removal of trees or buildings or the renovation of buildings, a preconstruction survey for special-status bats shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in advance of tree and structure removal to characterize potential bat habitat and identify active roost sites. Should the preconstruction survey find no bat habitat or bat roosting sites, then no further action is required. Should potential roosting habitat or active bat roosts be found in trees and/or structures to be removed under the project, the following measures shall be implemented: a) Removal of trees and structures shall be initiated when bats are active, approximately between the periods of March 1 to April 15 and August 15 to October 15; outside of bat maternity roosting season (approximately April 15 – August 31) and outside of months of winter torpor (approximately October 15 – February 28), to the extent feasible. b) If removal of trees and structures during the periods when bats are active is not feasible and active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes are found on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site where tree and structure removal is planned, a no disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be established around these roost sites until they are determined to be no longer active by the qualified biologist. The extent of this buffer may be modified by the qualified biologist depending on existing screening around the roost site (such as dense vegetation or a building) as well as the type of construction activity which would occur around the roost site. c) The qualified biologist shall be present during tree and structure removal if potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roosts are present. Trees and structures with active roosts shall be removed only when no rain is occurring or is forecast to occur for 3 days and when daytime temperatures are at least 50°F. d) Removal of trees with potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roost sites shall follow a two-step removal process: i. On the first day of tree removal and under supervision of the qualified biologist, branches and limbs not containing cavities or fissures in which bats could roost, shall be cut only using chainsaws. ii. On the following day and under the supervision of the qualified biologist, the remainder of the tree may be removed, either using chainsaws or other equipment (e.g. excavator or backhoe). e) Removal of structures containing or suspected to contain potential bat roosting habitat or active bat roosts shall be dismantled under the supervision of the qualified biologist in the evening and after bats have emerged from the roost to forage. Structures shall be partially dismantled to significantly change the roost conditions, causing bats to abandon and not return to the roost. Removal of structures shall occur within the allowed construction hours detailed under the City's Municipal Code (Section 9.52.110) weekdays between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and between 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. If demolition/removal activities are expected to occur outside	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	of the City's allowed construction hours, the applicant shall apply for a conditional use permit from the City of Richmond Planning and Building Division. All demolition/removal activities shall implement all feasible measures outline in Mitigation Measure NOI-1a.SP in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this EIR. Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP, NOI-1b.SP, and NOI-4b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could have an adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-2a.SP: Restoration of Northern Coastal Saltmarsh, Riparian, and Wetlands. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that may remove the habitat functions and services of northern coastal saltmarsh, riparian habitat, or freshwater emergent wetlands, these habitats shall be restored in-place to pre-project conditions, if possible, or an equivalent area of these habitats shall be established (ratio of 1:1) at suitable off-site locations along the Richmond shoreline. A habitat-specific Restoration and Monitoring Plan shall be prepared by the project applicant for each development project that removes the respective habitat, and shall contain the same principles as the existing Berkeley Global Campus Wetland Restoration Monitoring Plan for affected areas, subject to approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies, and shall generally include, but not be limited, to the following: • A final grading plan for the affected northern coastal saltmarsh, riparian habitat, and/or wetlands, which would restore the topography of the affected habitat areas to pre-project conditions, or to conditions that will achieve long-term stability, and will support site-appropriate habitat; • A planting plan, composed of native plant species appropriate to the target restored habitat; • A management plan, including provisions for weed control to prevent the spread of invasive non-native plant species in the restoration area; • Performance criteria for the revegetated areas that establish success thresholds over a specific amount of time (typically five years) as determined by the regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over the affected areas; • A monitoring and reporting program under which progress of the revegetated areas shall be tracked to ensure survival of the mitigation plantings. The program shall document overall health and vigor of mitigation plantings throughout the monitoring period and provide recommendations for adaptive management as needed to ensure the site is successful, according to the established performance criteria. An annual report documenting monitoring results and providing recommendations for improvement throughout the year shall be provided to the regulatory agencies; and • A best management practices element describing erosion control measures to be installed around the affected areas following mitigation planting in order to avoid sediment runoff into adjacent waters.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure BIO-2b.SP: Restoration of Coastal Terrace Prairie. For the Lark Avenue Variant, road construction within the coastal prairie that removes this sensitive plant community shall be restored according to UC Berkeley's Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan (Stromberg, 2014). To facilitate construction of the Lark Avenue Variant on UC land, the City would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UC, and would adopt and implement the Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan, which would result in net ecological benefit for the prairie community. Implementation of the Plan in conjunction with UC would include the following (adapted from the LRDP FEIR): • UC shall commence initial phase implementation of the 2014 Richmond Bay Campus Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan (Appendix G of the LRDP FEIR) that addresses exotic plant removal, tree and coyote brush removal, weed management, and programs for native plant stock preservation to aid in preservation and enhancement of the grassland portion of the Natural Open Space area. • When the Lark Avenue Variant is constructed, proactive (not passive) measures to improve the quality of the native grasslands in the Natural Open Space area shall be funded and undertaken. This may take the form of support for research and education into effective restoration. Possible fund sources would be established as part of the MOU between the City and UC. • Once the Lark Avenue Variant is constructed, UC shall update its Coastal Terrace Prairie Management Plan to guide conservation and enhancement efforts, as well as the siting of boardwalks and minor access roads and structures in a resource-sensitive manner. The plan shall include weed management actions, annual monitoring and reporting, and adaptive management sufficient to maintain or improve the quality of the grasslands preserved in the designated Natural Open Space. The effectiveness of the plan shall be continually evaluated and the plan adjusted as needed. • Prior to the commencement of the construction of the Lark Creek Variant in high, medium, or low quality grasslands outside of the Natural Open Space land use zone, UC shall conduct a site-specific native plant survey. All survey results would be published to the UC environmental website for the Berkeley Global Campus/Richmond Field Station. UC would apply the results of such surveys to implement a program that would use the native plant stock from such area to aid enhancement and restoration in Natural Open Space grassland areas, and to develop or restore meadow acreage elsewhere. Possible locations include formal landscaped open areas of the Richmond Field Station, rooftops of buildings at the Richmond Field Station, demonstration meadows at UC Berkeley or in the city of Richmond that help explain the former extent of regional coastal terrace prairie grasslands. Mitigation Measures BIO-1a.SP through BIO-1f.SP, and NOI-1a.SP, NOI-1b.SP, BIO-3.SP, and NOI-4b.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact BIO-3.SP: Development proposed under the Specific Plan could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and state protected wetlands. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-3.SP: Wetland Protection. For any project proposing development within or adjacent to wetlands within the area of the Specific Plan, wetland protection measures shall be applied to protect identified state and federal jurisdictional wetlands. These measures shall include the following: a) To the extent feasible, construction projects that might affect jurisdictional drainages or wetlands shall be scheduled for dry-weather months. Avoiding ground-disturbing activities during the rainy season would further decrease the potential risk of construction-related discharges to jurisdictional waters b) A protective barrier shall be erected around any wetland feature designated for complete avoidance in project construction plans and regulatory permits to isolate it from construction or other ground-disturbing activities; c) Signage shall be installed on the fencing to identify sensitive habitat areas and restrict construction activities; d) No equipment mobilization, grading, clearing, or storage of vehicles, equipment or machinery, or similar activity shall occur at each project site until a City representative has inspected and approved the wetland protection fencing; and e) The City shall ensure that the temporary fencing is continuously maintained until all construction or other ground-disturbing activities are completed. A fencing material meeting the requirements of both water quality protection and wildlife exclusion may be used, such as heavy plastic sheeting material. Fences must be properly installed with final approval by a City representative, including adequate supports or wire backing for use in windy sites, and with the lower edge keyed in to the soil to ensure a proper barrier. Mitigation Measures BIO-2a.SP and HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not likely 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. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures BIO-1d.SP and BIO-2a.SP	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-5.SP: Implementation of the Specific Plan could conflict with existing plans, policies, or ordinances, including the City of Richmond's Tree Ordinance (City of Richmond Municipal Code Chapter 10.08). (Criterion e.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a.SP, BIO-1b.SP, BIO-1c.SP, BIO-1d.SP, BIO-1e.SP, BIO-1f.SP, BIO-2a.SP, BIO-2b.SP, and BIO-3.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Biological Resources (SA4)		
Impact BIO-1. SA4: Development facilitated by the Sub-Area 4 project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a.SP, BIO-1b.SP, BIO-1c.SP, BIO-1d.SP, BIO-1e.SP, BIO-1f.SP, NOI-1a, NOI-1b, and NOI-4b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-2. SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 project could have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-2a.SP, BIO-2b.SP, and BIO-3.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-3.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 project could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and state protected wetlands. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-2a.SP, BIO-3.SP, and HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-4.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 project would not likely 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 (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP, BIO-2a.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact BIO-5. SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project could conflict with existing plans, policies, or ordinances, including the City of Richmond's Tree Ordinance (City of Richmond Municipal Code Chapter 10.08). (Criterion e.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.SP, BIO-1b.SP, BIO-1c.SP, BIO-1d.SP, BIO-1e.SP, BIO-1f.SP, BIO-2a.SP, and BIO-3.SP.	Less Than Significant
Biological Resources (C)		
Impact C-BIO-1.SP: The Specific Plan, in conjunction with other past, current, or foreseeable development, could result in cumulative impacts on special-status species, habitats, wetlands and other waters of the U.S. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.SP, BIO-1b.SP, BIO-1c.SP, BIO-1d.SP, BIO-1e.SP, BIO-1f.SP, BIO-2a.SP, BIO-2b.SP, BIO-3.SP, HYD-1.SP, and NOI-1b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-BIO-1.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project, in conjunction with other past, current, or foreseeable development, could result in cumulative impacts on special-status species, habitats, wetlands and other waters of the U.S. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.SP, BIO-1b.SP, BIO-1c.SP, BIO-1d.SP, BIO-1e.SP, BIO-1f.SP, BIO-2a.SP, BIO-3.SP, and HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
	Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.SP: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP)		
Impact CUL-1.SP: Implementation of the Specific Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Criterion a.) (<i>Significant; Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historic Resources Evaluation. During the preliminary design for each project proposed for development within the Plan Area, and prior to submittal of a project application to the City of Richmond Planning Division, the project applicant shall undertake the following: 1. Historic Resources Survey. The historic resources survey shall include, at a minimum: a. An updated records search at the Northwest Information Center; b. An intensive historical resources survey, documenting and evaluating resources within the project footprint (area of ground disturbance) and located on adjacent parcels within 200 feet of the project footprint, that are 45 years or older for listing in the California Register and local Richmond Historic Inventory; c. Recommendations for any additional measures that are required to resolve adverse impacts to recorded historical resources; and d. A report documenting the results of this research and recommendations, for submittal to the City. The survey shall be carried out by a qualified historian or architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural History. Site-specific surveys and evaluations that are more than 5 years old shall be updated to account for changes which may have occurred over time. For all historic resources identified as a result of site-specific surveys and evaluations, the project applicant shall undertake the following: 2. Historic Resources Treatment Plan. The historic resources treatment plan shall be prepared by a qualified historian or architectural historian, and shall discuss, but not be limited to, the following options for the resource: a. <i>Avoidance.</i> The City shall ensure, where feasible, that all future development activities allowable under the Specific Plan, including demolition, alteration, and new construction, would avoid historical resources (i.e., those listed on federal, state, and local registers). b. <i>Adaptive Reuse.</i> If avoidance is not feasible, adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of historical resources shall occur in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.	Significant (if avoidance is achieved or if adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, or relocation may also be sufficient to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level); Significant and Unavoidable (if demolition occurs, or if adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, or relocation is not sufficient to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level).

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact CUL-1.SP (cont.)	c. <i>Appropriate Relocation.</i> If avoidance or adaptive reuse in situ is not feasible, the project applicant shall make a good faith effort to relocate the affected building(s) to a site acceptable to the City. Projects that relocate the affected historical property to a location consistent with its historic or architectural character could reduce the impact less than significant, unless the property's location is an integral part of its significance, e.g., a contributor to a historic district. For all historic resources identified as a result of site-specific surveys and evaluations which cannot be feasibly avoided (and including resources that would be adaptively reused, or appropriately relocated) the project applicant shall undertake the following: 3. Recordation and Public Interpretation. A qualified historian or architectural historian shall evaluate the feasibility and appropriateness of recordation and public interpretation of identified resources prior to any construction activities which would directly affect them. Should City staff decide recordation and or public interpretation is required, the following activities would be performed: • <i>Recordation.</i> Recordation shall follow the standards provided in the National Park Service's Historic American Building Survey (HABS) program, which requires photo-documentation of historic structures, a written report, and/or measured drawings (or photo reproduction of original plans if available). The photographs and report would be archived at the Richmond Planning Department and local repositories, such as public libraries, historical societies, and/or the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University. The recordation efforts shall occur prior to demolition, alteration, or relocation of any historic resources identified in the Plan Area. Additional recordation could include (as appropriate) oral history interviews or other documentation (e.g., video) of the resource. <i>Public Interpretation.</i> A public interpretation or art program shall be developed by a qualified historic consultant or local artist in consultation with City staff, based on a City-approved scope of work and submitted to the City for review and approval. The program could take the form of plaques, commemorative markers, or artistic or interpretive displays which explain the historical significance of the properties to the general public. Such displays would be incorporated into project plans as they are being developed, and would typically be located in a publicly accessible location on or near the site of the former historical resource(s). Public interpretation displays shall be installed prior to completion of any construction projects in the Plan Area. Photographic recordation and public interpretation of historically significant properties does not typically mitigate the loss of resources to a less-than-significant level (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4[b][2]).	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact CUL-2.SP: Implementation of the Specific Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure CUL-2a.SP: Archaeological Resources Evaluation. During the preliminary design for each project proposed for development within the Plan Area and the Lark Drive Variant, and prior to submittal of a building permit application to the City of Richmond Planning Division as needed, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall undertake the following: 1. Archeological Resources Survey. The archeological resources survey shall be completed by a qualified archeologist, and shall include, at a minimum: a. An updated records search at the Northwest Information Center (per Mitigation Measure CUL-1.SP); b. A cultural resources survey of the project site that meets industry standards, including subsurface presence/absence studies; c. Recommendations for any additional measures that are required to resolve potential adverse impacts to recorded and/or undiscovered archaeological resources, with a preference for preservation in place for historical resources of an archaeological nature, where feasible; and d. A report documenting the results of this research and recommendations, for submittal to the City. If the results of the initial survey indicate the presence of or high likelihood for archaeological resources, the City shall require additional measures as outlined below. If the archeologist determines that a significant archaeological resource that could be adversely impacted by a project is present at the site, the project applicant shall undertake the following: 2. Preservation in Place. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Planning Director or designee at the City of Richmond, the project applicant, and the appropriate Native American representative, where applicable, shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Consistent with CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4(b)(3), this may be accomplished through: planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If the archeologist determines that preservation in place is not feasible for the resource and another type of mitigation would better serve the interests protected by CEQA, mitigation shall include data recovery through archaeological investigations and the project applicant shall undertake the following: 3. Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP). If avoidance/preservation in place is not feasible for the identified resource, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall hire a Secretary of the	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact CUL-2.SP (cont.)	Interior-qualified archaeological consultant who shall prepare a detailed ARDTP that shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The ARDTP shall identify a proposed data recovery program, and how the data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim of targeting the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The ARDTP shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context; reporting of results within a timely manner and subject to review and comments by the appropriate Native American representative, where applicable, before being finalized; curation of artifacts and data at a local facility acceptable to the City and appropriate Native American representative, if applicable; and dissemination of final confidential reports to the appropriate Native American representative, if applicable, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System and the City. Mitigation Measure CUL-2b.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources. During construction of each project proposed for development within the Plan Area and/or the Lark Drive Variant, if prehistoric or historic-era cultural materials are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt and the City shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. The project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall ensure that a Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist shall inspect the find within 24 hours of discovery. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, shall follow the guidelines provided in Mitigation Measure CUL-2a.SP above.	
Impact CUL-3.SP: Implementation of the Specific Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, and for each project-level development proposal submitted to the City of Richmond for approval (and for construction of the Lark Drive Variant), the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) shall ensure the following:	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact CUL-3.SP (cont.)	1. In the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, work shall stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find. The Contra Costa County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to their authority, they shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the project applicant shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further ground disturbance. 2. Project construction personnel shall be informed of the potential of encountering human remains during construction, and the proper procedures to follow as described above under 1., in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction.	Less Than Significant
Impact CUL-4.SP: Implementation of the Specific Plan could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Criterion d.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP: Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program. For each project-level development proposal submitted to the City of Richmond for approval and the Lark Drive Variant, and prior to initial ground disturbance, the project applicant (or City, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant) will retain a qualified paleontologist or a California Registered Professional Geologist (California RPG) with appropriate paleontological expertise to carry out all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources. The qualified paleontologist or geologist will be available on-call to the project applicant (or City) throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant (or City) will also ensure the following measures are undertaken: 1. All construction forepersons and field supervisors conducting or overseeing subsurface excavations will be trained in the recognition of potential fossil materials prior to ground disturbing activities. A pre-construction training on paleontological resources will also be provided to all other construction workers, but may include videotape of the initial training and/or the use of written materials rather than in-person training by the qualified paleontologist/California RPG. In addition to fossil recognition, the training will convey procedures to follow in the event of a potential fossil discovery. If potential fossils are discovered during construction, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find will stop until the qualified paleontologist/California RPG can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist/California RPG may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If treatment and salvage is required, recommendations will be consistent with current professional standards. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Cultural Resources (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact CUL-4.SP (cont.)	2. If found to be warranted based on experience during construction, the qualified paleontologist/California RPG, or paleontological monitor working under the supervision of the qualified paleontologist/California RPG, will monitor ground-disturbing activities. This monitoring will consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites. The frequency of monitoring will be determined by the qualified paleontologist/California RPG. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, it will be assessed and recorded or salvaged it as described above.	Less Than Significant
Cultural Resources (SA4)		
Impact CUL-1.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Criterion a.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact CUL-2. SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-2.SP (Archaeological Resources Evaluation).	Less Than Significant
Impact CUL-3. SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Criterion c.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-3.SP (Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains).	Less Than Significant
Impact CUL-4. SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Criterion d.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-4.SP (Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program).	Less Than Significant
Cultural Resources (C)		
Impact C-CUL-1.SP: Construction activity and development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area, would contribute to an adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources, but the contribution would not be considerable. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measures CUL-1.SP, CUL-2.SP, CUL-3.SP and CUL-4.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-CUL-1.SA4: Construction activity and development of the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Project site, would contribute to an adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources, but the contribution would not be considerable. (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure CUL-2.SP, CUL-3.SP, and CUL-4.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Geology (SP)		
Impact GEO-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could expose people or structures to seismic hazards such as ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction, differential settlement, and landslides. (Criteria a.2, a.3, and a.4) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in soil erosion during excavation, grading, and construction activities. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-3.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in on- or off-site slope failure, (lateral spreading), subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse from placement of improvements on unstable geologic units or soils. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-4.SP Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in development on expansive soils, creating risks to life and property. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Geology (SA4)		
Impact GEO-1.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 project could expose people or structures to seismic hazards such as ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction, differential settlement, and landslides (Criteria a.2, a.3, and a.4) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-2. SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 could result in soil erosion during excavation, grading, and construction activities. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-3.SA4: Sub-Area 4 development could result in on- or off-site slope failure, (lateral spreading), subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse from placement of improvements on unstable geologic units or soils. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact GEO-4.SA4: Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in development on expansive soils, creating risks to life and property. (Criterion d) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Geology (CU)		
Impact C-GEO-1: Development of the Specific Plan, in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils or seismicity. <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gasses (SP)		
Impact GHG-1.SP: Construction and operation of development under the Specific Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. (Criterion a.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure GHG-1.SP: GHG Prevention and Control. The City will continue to work proactively with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Air Resources Board, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency to help these agencies implement and enforce GHG prevention and control mandates within the City, and will work with the community to identify and advocate for GHG measures that are within the jurisdiction of these agencies and can and should be implemented to further reduce GHG emissions from the Richmond Bay Specific Plan and Sub-Area 4 Project.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact GHG-2.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an appropriate regulatory agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less than Significant
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gasses (SA4)		
Impact GHG-1.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project would produce greenhouse gas emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment. (Criterion a.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure GHG-1.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact GHG-2.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an appropriate regulatory agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less than Significant
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gasses (C)		
Impact C-GHG-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan, combined with cumulative development, including past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the Plan Area and its vicinity, would result in cumulative impacts regarding GHG emissions and climate change. (Criteria a., b.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure GHG-1.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-GHG-1.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, combined with cumulative development, including past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the vicinity of the Sub-Area 4 Project site, would result in cumulative impacts regarding GHG emissions and climate change. (Criteria a., b.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure GHG-1.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (SP)		
Impact HAZ-1.SP: Construction and demolition associated with development under the Specific Plan as well as operational land uses could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a.SP: Protection of Human Health From Environmental Contamination. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any new project proposed within the Plan Area at a location where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred or resulted in environmental impacts, the City shall ensure the project will be developed under the supervision of an <u>the environmental agency(ies)</u> of applicable jurisdiction (e.g., Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Contra Costa County Department of Human Health Services) such that health-based goals appropriate for the proposed new use are achieved, and soil management plans and/or environmental land use covenants are observed. <u>The City shall not issue a building, use, or other permit for a new use that is inconsistent with any applicable land use covenant(s).</u> Measures to protect environmental health shall include one or more of the following strategies and approaches: removal of environmental contaminants from the subject area (e.g., excavation and off-site disposal, use of soil vapor extraction equipment); separation of site users from contamination (e.g., engineering or institutional controls), or treatment of environmental contamination (e.g., in situ chemical oxidation). Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for such new project, the project proponent shall provide evidence to the City of successful implementation of protective measures through a certificate of completion, finding of suitability for the project's intended use or similar documentation issued by the environmental agency having jurisdiction over the project. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b.SP: Health and Safety Plan. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for a new project proposed within the Plan Area at a location where previous hazardous materials releases have occurred, the City shall document that a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared and will be implemented for the protection of workers, the public and the environment. Such HASP shall be prepared by a California licensed professional of applicable expertise (e.g., certified industrial hygienist, professional engineer). The HASP shall include measures consistent with customary protocols and applicable regulations (including, but not limited to Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations) for the protection of workers, site users, the public, and the environment (e.g., management of impacted soil; use of personal protective equipment; management, use and or treatment of water associated with construction activities; dust mitigation) and to address the discovery of any suspect soils (e.g., petroleum odor and/or discoloration) during construction activities, including notification of appropriate oversight agencies and investigation, removal, and disposal of soils as appropriate under agency directives and local, state, and Federal regulations). Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for activities covered by the grading or building permit, a completion report documenting the implementation of the HASP and any deviations shall be submitted to and approved by the City.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact HAZ-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c.SP: Hazardous Building Material Assessment (ACM, LBP, PCBs, other hazardous building materials). For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area (or in the area of the Lark Drive Variant) that would require building demolition, and prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project applicant (or, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant, the City) shall submit to the City and/or the Contra Costa Health Services Department, according to relevant jurisdiction, a hazardous building material assessment prepared by qualified licensed contractors for any structure intended for demolition indicating whether asbestos containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP) or lead-based coatings, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing equipment, and/or other hazardous building materials are present. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1d.SP: Hazardous Building Materials Removal Plan (ACM, LBP, PCBs). For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area (or in the area of the Lark Drive Variant), if the assessment required by Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c indicates the presence of ACM, LBP, PCBs, or other hazardous building materials, prior to issuance of any demolition permit the project applicant (or, in the case of the Lark Drive Variant, the City) shall submit and implement a hazardous building materials removal plan in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements to protect demolition and construction workers and the public from risks associated with such hazardous materials during demolition or renovation of affected structures.	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could 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. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a.SP: Safety Management Techniques and Practices. The City shall make an additional finding for any use permit for any facility within the Plan Area that may pose a risk to human health or safety to the public due to the potential for an accidental release of hazardous substances, as follows: the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Fire Department that risk of accidental release and any off-site consequences to the public have been minimized to the extent feasible using best safety management techniques and practices and will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public, as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards. Such safety management techniques and practices may include among others: training; emergency notification systems; substitution to equipment subject to less risk of upset condition; substitution of chemicals that pose less risk to members of the public; equipment (e.g., safety shutoff valves, secondary containment) or practices to contain or lessen the off-site effect of any release.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (SP) – (cont.)		
	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b.SP: Review of New Sensitive Uses. Prior to issuance of a use permit, design review approval, or issuance of a building permit for new construction of, major renovation of, expansion of, or addition to a project within the Plan Area that includes sensitive land uses, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Fire Department that the risk to: (1) on-site sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, schools, daycare) from an off-site accidental release of hazardous substances will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public once mitigated (e.g., evacuation and shelter-in-place procedures), as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards; and (2) off-site members of the public from an on-site release of hazardous substances will not result in any unacceptable risk to human health or safety to the public once mitigated, (e.g., best safety management techniques and practices, as described above), as determined by the City of Richmond Fire Department based on accepted industry standards. Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-3.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in the use of hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of a school. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could be located on sites which are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HAZ-4.SP: O&M Plan. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy or similar operating permit for any project within the area of the Specific Plan at a location where a cleanup plan is being implemented, as provided under HAZ-1a.SP, where an operation and maintenance (O&M) plan is required by an agency of applicable jurisdiction, the applicant shall demonstrate that an O&M plan has been approved by the agency and will be implemented to ensure the long-term protection of environmental health of site users. The O&M plan shall ensure the maintenance of health-based goals by periodic inspection of the remedy and taking such actions (e.g., repairing any deficiencies in durable covers that cap residual environmental contamination, performing maintenance on remedial equipment). Evidence of such an O&M plan and its implementation may be demonstrated by a document issued by an agency of applicable jurisdiction. Mitigation Measure HAZ1a.SP and HAZ-1b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-5.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Criterion g.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (SA4)		
Impact HAZ-1.SA4: Construction and demolition associated with development of the Sub-Area 4 Project as well as operational land uses could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a, HAZ-1b, HAZ-1c, and HAZ-1d,	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-2.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could 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. (Criterion b) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact HAZ-3.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could be located on sites which are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a.SP, HAZ-1b.SP and HAZ-4.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HAZ-4.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Criterion g.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (C)		
Impact C-HAZ-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan, combined with cumulative development in the Plan Area and citywide, including past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could contribute considerably to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a.SP, HAZ-1b.SP, HAZ-1c.SP, HAZ-1d.SP, HAZ-2a.SP, HAZ-2b.SP, HAZ-4.SP, and Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-HAZ-1.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, combined with cumulative development in the Plan Area and citywide, including past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could contribute considerably to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a.SP, HAZ-1b.SP, HAZ-1c.SP, HAZ-1d.SP, HAZ-2a.SP, HAZ-2b.SP, HAZ-4.SP, and Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality (SP)		
Impact HYD-1.SP: The Specific Plan could result in an increase of stormwater pollutants due to construction activities and/or the introduction of new impervious surfaces with development but would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP: Water Quality Best Management Practices for All Construction Activities. All applicants for projects proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan shall ensure that best management practices consistent with the most recent version of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Construction BMP Handbook are included in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared in accordance with the NPDES Construction General Stormwater Permit. BMPs may include without limitation: 1. The Straw bales, wattles, fiber rolls, gravel bags, or equivalent devices shall be installed around the perimeter of stockpiled materials and construction sites adjacent to water bodies (i.e., Meeker Channel and Slough, Baxter Creek, and Stege Marsh), to prevent debris from being transported to any receiving waters or open channel via runoff; - The use of hazardous materials during construction shall be minimized to the extent practical, and the amount of hazardous materials stored adjacent to waterbodies shall be limited to what is needed to immediately support construction activities. Hazardous materials shall be centrally stored safely and securely in approved containers, under cover or in an approved storage shed, and in adequate secondary containment. Fueling of generators and other equipment shall be conducted in a central location with secondary containment, and adequate spill cleanup materials shall be provided during all fueling operations; 2. Well-maintained equipment shall be used to perform the construction work, and, except in the case of a failure or breakdown, equipment maintenance shall be performed off site. Equipment shall be inspected daily by the operator for leaks or spills. If leaks or spills are encountered, the source of the leak shall be identified, leaked material will be cleaned up, and the cleaning materials shall be collected and properly disposed; 3. Inactive material stock piles must be covered at all times; 4. Construction material shall be covered in anticipation of any rainfall event; 5. Active debris boxes shall be covered during rain events to prevent contact with rainwater; 6. Non-stormwater discharges to the Bay shall be prohibited unless specified in the SWPPP and approved by the City; and	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact HYD-1.SP (cont.)	7. A Materials Management and Disposal Plan (MMDP) shall be prepared to prevent any debris from falling into waterbodies in the Plan Area during construction to the maximum extent practicable and also ensure the appropriate disposal of all construction-related materials. The MMDP shall be submitted to the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board for review and approval. The measures identified in the MMDP shall be based on Best Available Technology, and will include, but not be limited to, the following: – During construction, in the event that debris does reach the Bay or a tributary, personnel within the work area shall immediately retrieve the debris for proper handling and disposal. All debris shall be disposed of at an authorized upland disposal site; – Construction waste shall be collected and transported to an authorized upland disposal area, per federal, State, and local laws and regulations; and, – All construction material, wastes, debris, sediment, rubbish, trash, fencing, etc., shall be removed from the project site once project construction is completed, and transported offsite in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations.	
Impact HYD-3.SP: The Impact HYD-2.SP: The Specific Plan could increase impervious surfaces which would incrementally increase the amount of stormwater runoff available for recharge but not to the extent that it would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. (Criterion b) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-3.SP: The Specific Plan would not alter the drainage pattern of the Plan Area such that it would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-4: Development under the Specific Plan would not alter the drainage pattern of the site such that it would result in a flooding on- or off- the Plan Area. (Criterion d.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-5.SP: The Specific Plan would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. (Criterion e.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality (SP) -- (cont.)		
Impact HYD-7.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding related to sea level rise. (Criterion i.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-7a.SP: Sea Level Rise Measures. All applicants for projects proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan will ensure that the project design includes the installation of appropriate stormwater inlet infrastructure, and/or the installation of back flow prevention devices on storm drain lines, and/or the design of the stormwater infrastructure to accommodate the future installation of back flow prevention devices on an as-needed basis. Stormwater infrastructure shall be designed to address up to 3 feet of sea level rise, as well as include capacity to adapt to up to 5.5 feet of sea level rise. Mitigation Measure HYD-7b.SP: Sea Level Rise Adaptation. Prior to issuance of building permits, all projects proposed for development within areas of the Plan Area shown on Figure 4.8-32 of the EIR to be affected by up to <u>greater than</u> 3 feet of sea level rise, including the 100-year flood event and wave overtopping, shall submit an Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan to the City for approval. The City shall require implementation of such plan as a condition of approval for entitlement approvals and/or building permits as applicable. The Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan shall be consistent with City efforts to plan for sea level rise under General Plan Action Item EC6.g and Specific Plan Action Item A1.8, and shall include an Adaptive Flood Risk Management Strategy to address 100-year flood impacts associated with a rise in sea level of greater than 3 feet including the 100-year flood event and wave overtopping. Adaptive flood risk management strategies may include development setbacks, regrading, construction of raised berms or a wall, or other measure to protect future development from a rise in sea level above 3 feet. Consistent with General Plan Action Item EC6.g, the Adaptive Flood Risk Management Plan shall include discussion of financing mechanisms for sea level rise adaptations.	Less than Significant
Impact HYD-8.SP: The Specific Plan could result in or cause inundation by tsunami, seiches, or mudflows. (Criterion j.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality (SA4)		
Impact HYD-1.SA4: The proposed Project could result in an increase of stormwater pollutants due to construction activities and/or the introduction of new impervious surfaces with development but would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-2.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project could increase impervious surfaces which would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff available for recharge but not to the extent that it would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality (SA4)		
Impact HYD-3.SA4: The project would not alter the drainage pattern of the site such that it would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site. (Criterion c.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	Mitigation Measure HYD-3.SA4: Pre-project stormflow levels. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, project applicants shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Richmond Director of the Public Works Department, one the following: 1. Upon completion of construction activities, there will be sufficient detention capacity on the Project site to detain the incremental increase in stormflow volume that occurs during the 24-hour, 10-year design storm, which incremental increase is due to the increase in impervious surface above pre-project levels. This standard could be met with one or more detention vaults, tanks or other facilities, or through other means; 2. Upon completion of such construction, the total square footage of impervious surface area throughout the Project site will remain at or below pre-project levels; or 3. The proposed development has met the requirements of Provision C.3.g by demonstrating through compliance of CCCWP that any increases in stormwater flows are unlikely to cause downstream erosion or off-site siltation. Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-4.SA4: The Project would not alter the drainage pattern of the site such that it would result in a 100-year flood event on- or off- the site. (Criterion d.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-5.SA4: The Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. (Criterion e.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure HYD-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-6.SA4: The project could place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map; or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. (Criteria g., h.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-7.SA4: The Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding related to sea level rise. (Criterion i.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure HYD-7a.SP and HYD-7b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact HYD-8.SA4: The Specific Plan could result in or cause inundation by tsunami, seiches, or mudflows. (Criterion j.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Hydrology (CU)		
Impact C-HYD-1.SP: Development of the Specific Plan, in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology, water quality, or sea level rise and flooding. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-HYD-1.SA4: Development of the Project, in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology, water quality, or sea level rise and flooding. <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Land Use and Planning (SP)		
Impact LU-1.SP: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan would not result in the physical division of an established community. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact LU-2.SP: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Land Use and Planning (SA4)		
Impact LUP-1.SA4: Impact LUP-1.SA4: Adoption and development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not result in the physical division of an established community or conflict with adjacent or nearby land uses. (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact LUP-2.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project would not conflict with applicable land use plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Land Use and Planning (C)		
Impact C-LUP-1.SP: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area, would not result in significant cumulative impacts to land use and planning. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-LUP-1.SA4: Adoption of and development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Sub-Area 4 Project site, would not result in significant cumulative impacts to land use and planning. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SP)		
Impact NOI-1.SP: Construction of development under the Specific Plan could result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the Plan Area. (Criteria a. and d.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure NOI-1a.SP: Construction Noise Control Measures and Noise Control Plan. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, the applicant shall employ site-specific noise attenuation measures during project construction to reduce the generation of construction noise, including pile-driving noise. These measures shall be included in a Noise Control Plan that shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Richmond Planning and Building Services Department to ensure that construction noise is consistent with the standards set forth in the City's Noise ordinance and other standards as appropriate. Measures specified in the Noise Control Plan and implemented during project construction shall include, at a minimum, the following noise control strategies: • Equipment and trucks used for construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds); • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to approximately 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures, such as use of drills rather than impact tools, shall be used; • Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or include other measures; and • Noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be performed as specified in Mitigation Measure NOI-1b.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact NOI-1.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure NOI-1b.SP: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that would require pile-driving during construction, noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be employed. These techniques shall include: • Limiting pile driving or other impact-related noise-generating activity to 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday. No pile driving or other extreme noise-generating activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; • Installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile-driving equipment; • Vibrating piles into place when feasible; • Installing shrouds around the pile-driving hammer where possible; • Implementing “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as drill and cast-in-place methods), where possible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • Implementing the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration, where possible; • Using cushion blocks to dampen impact noise, if feasible based on soil conditions. Cushion blocks are blocks of material that are used with impact hammer pile drivers, and placed atop a piling during installation to minimize noise generated when driving the pile. Materials typically used for cushion blocks include wood, nylon and micarta (a composite material); and • At least 48 hours prior to pile-driving activities, the applicant shall notify building owners and occupants within a minimum of 600 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact NOI-2.SP: Construction of development under the Specific Plan could result in exposure of persons to or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the Plan Area above existing levels without the Specific Plan. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure NOI-2.SP: Construction Vibration. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan, and prior to the issuance of any building permit for each phase of project development, the project applicant shall conduct a historic survey of the project site, and a 200-foot buffer extending around the project site, to determine the locations of historic structures. If historic structures are identified, the project applicant shall develop a Vibration Reduction Plan (Plan) in coordination with an acoustical consultant, geotechnical engineer, and construction contractor, and submit the Plan to the City Chief Building Official for approval. The Plan shall include measures and/or controls to ensure that buildings within 200 feet of the project site will be exposed to less than 80 VdB and 83 VdB where people sleep and work, respectively, and less than 0.25 PPV for historic buildings to prevent building damage. Measures and controls shall be identified based on project-specific final design plans, and may include, but are not limited to, either or both of the following: 1. Implementation of buffers and the use of specific types of equipment to minimize vibration impacts during construction at nearby receptors in order to meet the specified standards. 2. Implementation of a vibration, crack, and line and grade monitoring program for identified historic buildings located within 50 feet of construction activities, in coordination with a geotechnical engineer and qualified architectural historian. The following elements shall be included in this program: a) Prior to construction, a qualified architectural historian shall conduct a thorough survey of identified historic resources to identify, measure the dimensions of, and document (photographs and text) any existing cracks in the historic buildings. b) During construction activities: i. The construction contractor shall identify, and regularly inspect and photograph, crack gauges and include records of these inspections in construction reporting. Gauges shall be inspected every two weeks, or more frequently during periods of construction activity in close proximity to identified crack gauges. ii. The construction contractor shall collect vibration data from receptors and report vibration levels to the City Chief Building Official on a monthly basis. The reports shall include annotations regarding project activities as necessary to explain changes in vibration levels, along with proposed corrective actions to avoid vibration levels approaching or exceeding the established threshold. iii. With regards to historic buildings, if vibration levels exceed the threshold and monitoring or inspection indicates that the project may damage or is damaging the building, the building shall be provided additional protection or stabilization. If necessary and with approval by the City Chief Building	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact NOI-2.SP (cont.)	iv. Official, the construction contractor shall install temporary shoring or stabilization to help avoid permanent impacts. Stabilization may involve structural reinforcement or corrections for deterioration that would minimize or avoid potential structural failures or avoid accelerating damage to the historic structure. Stabilization shall be conducted following the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. This treatment shall ensure retention of the historic building's character-defining features. Stabilization may temporarily impair the historic integrity of the building's design, material, or setting, and as such, the stabilization must be conducted in a manner that will not permanently impair a building's ability to convey its significance. Measures to shore or stabilize the building shall be installed in a manner that when they are removed, the historic integrity of the building remains, including integrity of material. Post-construction: i. The applicant (and its construction contractor) shall provide a report to the City Chief Building Official regarding crack and vibration monitoring conducted during demolition and construction. In addition to a narrative summary of the monitoring activities and their findings, this report shall include photographs illustrating the post-construction state of cracks and material conditions that were presented in the pre-construction assessment report, along with images of other relevant conditions showing the impact, or lack of impact, of project activities. The photographs shall sufficiently illustrate damage, if any, caused by the project and/or show how the project did not cause physical damage to the historic and non-historic buildings. The report shall include annotated analysis of vibration data related to project activities, as well as summarize efforts undertaken to avoid vibration impacts. Finally, a post-construction line and grade survey shall also be included in this report. ii. The project applicant (and its construction contractor) shall be responsible for repairs from damage to historic and non-historic buildings if damage is caused by vibration or movement during demolition and/or construction activities. Repairs may be necessary to address, for example, cracks that expanded as a result of the project, physical damage visible in post-construction assessment, or holes or connection points that were needed for shoring or stabilization. Repairs shall be directly related to project impacts and will not apply to general rehabilitation or restoration activities of the buildings. If necessary for historic structures, repairs shall be conducted in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Preservation. The project applicant shall provide the City Chief Building Official and City Preservation Officer for review and comment both a work plan for the repairs and a completion report to ensure compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact NOI-2.SP (cont.)	Mitigation Measure NOI-2b.SP: Exposure to Rail Vibration. For any project proposed for development within the area of the Specific Plan that involves new residential buildings or new dwelling units located adjacent to or within 200 feet of an active rail line, and prior to the approval of a construction-related permit, the project applicant shall submit a Vibration Reduction Plan (Plan) prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant for City review and approval that contains vibration reduction measures to reduce groundborne vibration to acceptable levels per Federal Transit Administration guidance (Federal Transit Administration, 2006, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006). The applicant shall implement the approved Plan during construction. Potential vibration reduction measures include isolation of foundation and footings using resilient elements such as rubber bearing pads or springs, such as a “spring isolation” system that consists of resilient spring supports that can support the podium or residential foundations. The specific system shall be selected so that it can properly support the structural loads, and provide adequate filtering of groundborne vibration to the residences above. Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP; Mitigation Measure NOI-1b.SP;	Less Than Significant
Impact NOI-3.SP: Operational activities associated with the Specific Plan would not increase long-term noise levels in the Plan Area to levels in excess of standards established in the Richmond General Plan. (Criteria a., c.) (<i>Less than Significant, with Required</i>)	Improvement Measure NOI-3.SP: Project-Specific Noise Study. For any project proposed for development within the Plan Area, applicants shall conduct a project-specific noise study to determine compatibility of the proposed use with the existing noise environment based on land use/noise compatibility guidelines in the City's General Plan. If the noise environment is found to be “conditionally acceptable” or “normally unacceptable” for the proposed use, a detailed acoustical analysis shall be conducted to specify the noise insulation measures needed to reduce noise exposure to “normally acceptable” levels, and these measures will be implemented. Measures may include, but are not limited to, appropriate site design to achieve maximum sound attenuation, use of enhanced noise insulation features in the form of appropriate sound-rated assemblies and/or other features/measures to reduce interior noise levels to meet Title 24 requirements.	Less Than Significant
Impact NOI-4.SP: Traffic generated by development under the Specific Plan could substantially increase traffic noise levels in the Plan Area. (Criterion c.) (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Noise (SA4)		
Impact NOI-1.SA4: Construction activities associated with the Sub-Area 4 Project would result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the Project site vicinity (Criteria a., d). (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP and NOI-1b.SP.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact NOI-2.SA4: Construction activities associated with the Sub-Area 4 Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project. (Criterion b.) <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP, NOI-1b.SP, NOI-2a.SP, and NOI-2b.SP	Less Than Significant
Impact NOI-3.SA4: Operational activities associated with the Sub-Area 4 Project would not increase long term noise levels in the Project vicinity to levels in excess of standards established in the Richmond Noise Ordinance and General Plan. (Criteria a., c.) <i>(Less Than Significant, with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure NOI-3.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact NOI-4.SA4: Traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project would not substantially increase traffic noise levels in the Project vicinity (Criterion c.). <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Noise (C)		
Impact C-NOI-1.SP: Construction noise levels generated by development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future developments could contribute considerably to cumulative noise impacts. (Criteria a. and d.) <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP and NOI-1b.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-NOI-2.SP: Construction vibration levels generated by the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future developments could contribute to cumulative vibration impacts. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP, NOI-1b.SP, and NOI-2.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-NOI-3.SP: Traffic generated by development under the Specific Plan in combination with traffic from cumulative development could contribute considerably to cumulative noise impacts. (Criterion c.) <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact C-NOI-1.SA4: Construction noise levels generated by development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future developments could contribute considerably to cumulative noise impacts. (Criteria a. and d.) <i>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP, and NOI-1b.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-NOI-2.SA4: Construction vibration levels generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future developments could contribute to cumulative vibration impacts. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measures NOI-1a.SP, NOI-1b.SP, and NOI-2.SP	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Noise (C) – (cont.)		
Impact C-NOI-3.SA4: Operational noise including traffic generated by development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with cumulative development could contribute considerably to cumulative noise impacts. (Criterion c.) <i>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Population, Housing, and Employment (SP)		
Impact POP-1.SP: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan could induce substantial population growth, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Population, Housing, and Employment (SA4)		
Impact POP-1.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Criterion a.) <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Population, Housing, and Employment (C)		
Impact C-POP-1.SP: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area, would not result in a significant effect to population, housing, and employment. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-POP-1.SA4: Development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Sub-Area 4 Project site, would not result in a significant effect to population, housing, and employment. <i>(Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Public Services (SP)		
Impact PUB-1.SP: The Specific Plan would not 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. (Criteria a., b., c.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation [Fire Protection]</i>)	Mitigation Measure PUB-1.SP: Fire Protection Services and Facilities. Not later than achieving 20 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout of the Specific Plan, the City of Richmond shall document the scope of additional fire protection services and facilities necessary to maintain a six minute response time required at the complete buildout of the Specific Plan. The City shall issue no building permits for new or expanded projects after 20 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout has been achieved unless an analysis with conclusions regarding the scope of these additional fire protection services and facilities has been prepared and approved by the City of Richmond Fire Department. The City shall also identify a fair share funding mechanism to support the cost of completing the identified improvements, and shall establish a program to collect funds and guarantee they are used for these improvements. Not later than achieving 50 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout of the Specific Plan, the City shall document the implementation of fire protection services and facilities necessary to maintain a six minute response time. The City shall issue no building permits for new or expanded projects after 50 percent implementation of the foreseeable maximum theoretical buildout has been achieved unless such implementation has been certified by the City of Richmond Fire Department.	Less Than Significant
Public Services (SA4)		
Impact PUB-1.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 project would not 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. (Criteria a., b., c.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure PUB-1.SP.	Less Than Significant
Public Services (SP)		
Impact C-PUB.SP: Construction activity and operations for development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects with the vicinity of the Plan Area, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact to public services and recreation. (<i>Less than Significant</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-PUB.SA4: Construction activity and operations for development under the Sub-Area 4 Project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects with the vicinity of the Project site, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact to public services and recreation. (<i>Less than Significant</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP)		
Impact TRF-1.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South intersection (#7) would deteriorate due to traffic generated under the Specific Plan, and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SP: Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Signalize intersection and provide warning lights and gates for the at-grade railroad crossing. b) Restripe the southbound Harbour Way South approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. Signalization of the intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the <i>Richmond Ferry Terminal Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration</i> (May 2014). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 55 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 50 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 55 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation.<u>in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS A during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-2.SP: Operations at the signalized Wright Avenue/Marina Way South intersection (#9) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SP: Wright Avenue/Marina Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Restripe the westbound Wright Avenue approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane within the current right-of-way. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 40 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 40 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). <u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u>. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. <u>In such case,</u> the City may <u>continue to</u> collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, <u>in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-3.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street intersection (#17) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. The proposed signalization of this intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the <i>Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR</i> (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 45 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 35 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 45 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation., in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-3.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-4.SP: Operations at the signalized Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection (#18) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Restripe westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane. b) Upgrade signal to actuated operations, convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> <u>It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may would be required when about approximately 25 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout). At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 25 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> The implementation of this measure would improve conditions at the intersection; however, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second left-turn lane on the southbound Regatta Boulevard approach and a second through lane on the northbound Regatta Boulevard approach. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
	be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-4.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-5.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street intersection (#19) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP: Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. Coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/ Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. The proposed improvements at this intersection are consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the <i>Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR</i> (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required by the Specific Plan developments. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 25 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 15 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). <u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u>). At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 25 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-6.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection (#25) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP: Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected left-turn phasing on all approaches. b) Restripe southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. The proposed improvements at this intersection are consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the <i>Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR</i> (November 2013). If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 35 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City shall either fully fund or implement</u> cause<u>the mitigation measure to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may<u>will</u> implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 35 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation.<u>in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-6.SP (cont.)	After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as an additional through lane on the northbound Bayview Avenue and southbound 51st Street approaches. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-6.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
Impact TRF-7.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Central Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection (#36) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-7.SP: Central Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install a signal at the intersection. The proposed improvement at this intersection is consistent with the planned and funded project to signalize the I-580/Central Avenue ramp intersections. If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-7.SP (cont.)	It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 40 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. <u>In such case</u>, the City may <u>continue to collect</u> fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, <u>in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure</u>. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS A during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-7.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
Impact TRF-8.SP: Operations at the unsignalized Central Avenue/Westbound I-580 Ramps intersection (#37) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-8.SP: Central Avenue/Westbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Install a signal at the intersection. The proposed improvement at this intersection is consistent with the planned and funded project to signalize the I-580/Central Avenue ramp intersections. If this improvement is implemented prior to the trigger identified in this mitigation measure, then it would not be required as a mitigation measure for the Specific Plan. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-8.SP (cont.)	It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 40 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed (which corresponds to 20 percent of Specific Plan development excluding the Sub-Area 4 Project). Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may <u>continue to</u> collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, <u>in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-8.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-9.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Cutting Boulevard/Harbour Way South (#5) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-9.SP: Cutting Boulevard/Harbour Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the <i>Cutting Boulevard</i> improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of both Cutting Boulevard and Harbour Way South to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Convert the signal phasing for the north and south intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and coordinate signal timings with adjacent signals along Cutting Boulevard. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 40 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure to be implemented<u>.</u> Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs,<u>the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation,</u> in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.	Significant or Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-9.SP (cont.)	After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Cutting Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
Impact TRF-10.SP: Unsignalized intersection operations at Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South (#7) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-10.SP: Wright Avenue/Harbour Way South Intersection Signalization, Channelization, and Safety Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically at this intersection, the Harbour Way South/Wright Avenue intersection improvement would signalize intersection and provide warning lights and gates for the at-grade railroad crossing. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SP, which would consist of signalizing intersection and restriping the southbound Harbour Way South approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-11.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Wright Avenue/Marina Way South (#9) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-11: Wright Avenue/Marina Way South Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the Marina Way South between Cutting Boulevard and Hall Avenue improvement would eliminate one through traffic lane along both directions of Marina Way South to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SP, which would consist of restriping the westbound Wright Avenue approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane within the current right-of-way. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-12.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street (#11) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP: Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street Intersection Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically the <i>Cutting Boulevard</i> improvement would eliminate one through traffic lane along both directions of Cutting Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Update signal to actuated-coordinated operations and coordinate signal timings with adjacent intersection along Cutting Boulevard. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 45 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City shall either fully fund or implement</u>cause the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 45 percent buildout trigger occurs,<u>the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation,</u> in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Cutting Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-13.SP: Signalized intersection operations at <i>Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway</i> (#14) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-13.SP: Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Restripe the eastbound Meeker Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. c) Update signal to actuated-coordinated operations and convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing. Coordinate signal timings with adjacent signal timings along Marina Bay Parkway. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would be required when about</u>approximately<u> 20 percent of the Specific Plan area</u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout<u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact</u>City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause the mitigation measure to be implemented.</u> Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 20 percent buildout trigger occurs,<u> the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case,</u> the City may <u>continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-14.SP: Unsignalized intersection operations at Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street (#17) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-14.SP: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than -significant level. It is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-14.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-15.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/ Eastbound I-580 Ramps (#18) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-15.SP: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP, which would consist of restriping westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane, upgrading the signal to actuated operations, changing the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinating signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/ Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-16.SP: Unsignalized intersection operations at Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street (#19) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-16.SP: Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and coordinating signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-17.SP: Unsignalized intersection operations at Bayview Avenue/ 51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps (#25) would deteriorate due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-17.SP: Bayview Avenue/ 51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected signal phasing (i.e., vehicles turning left do not have to yield to oncoming traffic) on all approaches, and restriping southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-18.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Bayview Avenue/Carlson Boulevard (#26) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-18.SP: Bayview Avenue/Carlson Boulevard intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically the <i>Carlson Boulevard between Broadway and Tehama Avenue</i> and <i>Bayview Avenue Overcrossing I-580</i> improvements would eliminate one through traffic lane along	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-18.SP (cont.)	both directions of both Bayview Avenue and Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities, provide marked pedestrian crossings across all intersection approaches, and replace the northbound slip right-turn with a dedicated right-turn lane. a) Convert the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and provide an overlap phase for the northbound right-turn movement. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 30 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City shall either fully fund or implement</u>cause the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 30 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a second through lane on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-19.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Carlson Boulevard/Westbound I-80 Ramps (#28) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-19.SP: Carlson Boulevard/Westbound I-80 Ramps Intersection Widening and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the <i>Carlson Boulevard between Broadway and Tehama Avenue</i> improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. b) Widen the southbound Westbound I-80 Off-Ramp to provide one right-turn lane and one shared through/left turn lane. The proposed improvement (item b) at this intersection is consistent with the mitigation measure proposed at this intersection by the <i>Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR</i> (November 2013). <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would be required when about approximately 60 percent of the Specific Plan area</u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City shall either fully fund or implement</u>cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 60 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-19.SP (cont.)	After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-19.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
Impact TRF-20.SP: Signalized intersection operations at Carlson Boulevard/Eastbound I-80 Ramps (#29) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-20.SP: <i>Carlson Boulevard/Eastbound I-80 Ramps Intersection</i> Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. Specifically, the <i>Carlson Boulevard between Broadway and Tehama Avenue</i> improvement would eliminate one through lane along both directions of Carlson Boulevard to provide enhanced bicycle facilities. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-20.SP (cont.)	It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 40 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City</u> shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 40 percent buildout trigger occurs,<u>would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-6.SP and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
TRF-21.SP: Signalized intersection operations at MacDonald Way/Harbour Way (#34) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Specific Plan under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-21.SP: MacDonald Way/Harbour Way Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within the Plan Area and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) The multi-modal improvement projects as outlined in the SRTCP and detailed on page 4.13-75, which would reduce the overall automobile trip generation and reduce the project contribution at this intersection. The SRTCP would not make any specific modifications at this intersection. b) Restripe the southbound Harbour Way approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way. c) Upgrade intersection signal equipment to convert the signal phasing for the north and south intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
TRF-21.SP (cont.)	The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure. It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 50 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 50 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may <u>continue to</u> collect fair-share contributions from the projects in the Plan Area to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	
Impact TRF-22.SP: Traffic generated by the Specific Plan would cause a significant impact on the following freeway segments under 2040 Plus Project conditions because they would operate at LOS F and the Specific Plan would increase the freeway segment volumes by more than five percent: Westbound I-580 between Central Avenue and I-80 during both AM and PM peak hours and Eastbound I-580 between I-80 and Central Avenue during the PM peak hour. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-23.SP: Traffic generated by the Specific Plan combined with the implementation of the proposed SRTCP mitigation measures (specifically, eliminating one travel lane in both directions of both Cutting and Carlson Boulevards) would cause the signalized Cutting Boulevard/Carlson Boulevard intersection (#16) to degrade from LOS D during both AM and PM peak hours under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions to LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM peak hour under the 2040 Plus Specific Plan and SRTCP conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-24.SP: Traffic generated by the Specific Plan combined with the implementation of the proposed SRTCP mitigation measures (specifically, eliminating one travel lane in both directions of Cutting Boulevard) would cause the signalized Cutting Boulevard/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp intersection (#20) to degrade from LOS D under 2040 Plus Specific Plan conditions to LOS F during under the 2040 Plus Specific Plan and SRTCP conditions during both AM and PM peak hours. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-25.SP: The Specific Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). (<i>Less Than Significant</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-26.SP: Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would generate substantial multi-modal traffic traveling across at-grade railroad crossings that cause or expose roadway users (e.g., motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists) to a permanent and substantial transportation hazard. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-27.SP: Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would generate automobile traffic that would result in automobile queues on off-ramps extending to the I-580 freeway mainline at the Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street and Bayview Avenue interchanges. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-28.SP: The Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-29.SP: The Specific Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-30.SP and TRF-15.SA-4: Project construction would result in a substantial, though temporary, adverse effect on the circulation system during the project construction period. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Transportation and Circulation (SA4)		
Impact TRF-1.SA4: Unsignalized intersection operations at Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps (#25) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under Existing Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SA4: Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement:	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-1.SA4 (cont.)	a) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would consist of installing an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and restriping southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> <u>It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may would be required when about approximately 60 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 60 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as an additional through lane on the northbound Bayview Avenue and southbound 51st Street approaches. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Mitigation Measure TRF-1.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-2.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street (#11) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-2.SA4: Cutting Boulevard/23rd Street Intersection Signal Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP, item b, which would update the signal to actuated-coordinated operations and coordinate signal timings with adjacent intersection along Cutting Boulevard. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> <u>It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may would be required when about approximately 90 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 90 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-3.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway (#14) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SA4: Meeker Avenue/Marina Bay Parkway Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP, items b and c, which would restripe the eastbound Meeker Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared right/through lane within the current right-of-way, update the signal to actuated-coordinated operations, convert the phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing, and coordinate signal timings with adjacent signal timings along Marina Bay Parkway. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 90 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause the mitigation measure to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 90 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-12.SP	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-4.SA4: Unsignalized intersection operations at Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street (#17) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SA4: Westbound I-580 Ramps/Juliga Woods Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-3.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> <u>It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may would be required when about approximately 10 percent of the Specific Plan area Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 10 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions, and would improve to LOS E during the AM peak hour. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-4.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-5.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/ Eastbound I-580 Ramps (#18) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SA4: Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signal and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-4.SP, which would restripe westbound Meade Street to provide one exclusive right-turn lane and a shared left/through lane, upgrade the signal to actuated operations, convert the signal phasing for east and west intersection approaches from protected phasing to split-phasing, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would be required when about approximately 75 percent of the Specific Plan area</u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact<u>City shall either fully fund or implement</u>cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 75 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the City cannot ensure implementation of this mitigation measure because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-5.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact is conservatively considered significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure its implementation. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-6.SA4: Unsignalized intersection operations at Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street (#19) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SA4: Regatta Boulevard/Meade Street Intersection Signalization. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected phasing on all approaches, and coordinate signal timings with the adjacent Meade Street/Regatta Boulevard/Eastbound I-580 Ramps intersection and the at-grade railroad crossing. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a “nexus” study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a “reasonable relationship” or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a “fair share” contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> <u>It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may/would be required when about/approximately 85 percent of the Specific Plan area/Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement cause the mitigation measure to be implemented. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 85 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure.</u> After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hour with less delay than under 2040 No Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. The mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-5.SP	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-7.SA4: Unsignalized intersection operations at Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps (#25) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project and would warrant the installation of a traffic signal under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-7.SA4: Bayview Avenue/51st Street/Seaport Avenue/Eastbound I-580 Ramps Intersection Signalization and Channelization Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP, which would install an actuated signal at the intersection with protected signal phasing on all approaches, and restripe southbound 51st Street to provide two left-turn lanes and a shared right/through lane. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-6.SP.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-8.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Bayview Avenue/Carlson Boulevard (#26) would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	Mitigation Measure TRF-8.SA4: Bayview Avenue/Carlson Boulevard Intersection Signal Improvements. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvements: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-18.SP, item b, which would convert the signal phasing for the east and west intersection approaches from split-phasing to protected phasing and provide an overlap phase for the northbound right-turn movement. <u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-8.SA4 (cont.)	It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would</u> be required when about<u>approximately</u> 30 percent of the Specific Plan area<u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout</u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause</u> the mitigation measure <u>to be implemented</u>. Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 30 percent buildout trigger occurs, the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case, the City may continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation, in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as a third through lane on eastbound or westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-18.SP.	
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-9.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Carlson Boulevard/ Westbound I-80 Ramps (#28) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	Mitigation Measure TRF-9.SA4: Carlson Boulevard/ Westbound I-80 Ramps Intersection Widening. All applicants proposing the development of projects within Sub-Area 4 and meeting the trigger and funding criteria specified below shall be responsible for implementing the following improvement: a) Mitigation Measure TRF-19.SP, item b, which would widen the southbound Westbound I-80 Off-Ramp to provide one right-turn lane and one shared through/left turn lane.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact TRF-9.SA4 (cont.)	<u>The City shall commit to preparing and implementing a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program to guarantee funding for roadway and related traffic infrastructure improvements, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the traffic improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u> It is estimated that the mitigation measure at this intersection may<u>would be required when about</u>approximately<u> 80 percent of the Specific Plan area</u>Foreseeable Maximum Theoretical Buildout<u> is developed. At that time, the development project that triggers the impact</u>City shall either fully fund or implement<u>cause the mitigation measure to be implemented.</u> Alternatively, the City of Richmond may implement this mitigation measure prior to or at the time the 80 percent buildout trigger occurs,<u>the mitigation measure would not be required to be implemented by an individual project and. In such case,</u> the City may <u>continue to collect fair-share contributions from the projects in Sub-Area 4 to support implementation,</u> in accordance with the requirements of this Mitigation Measure. After implementation of this measure, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours. Traffic operations at the intersection can be further improved by providing additional automobile travel lanes, such as second through lanes on eastbound and westbound Carlson Boulevard. However, these modifications cannot be accommodated within the available automobile right-of-way and would require additional right-of-way, and/or loss of planned bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, and are considered to be infeasible because they would be in conflict with the Specific Plan and General Plan goals to promote pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips. Furthermore, it is not certain that this mitigation measure could be implemented because the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. The City of Richmond, as lead agency, does not have jurisdiction to implement Measure TRF-9.SA4 and the mitigation would need to be approved and implemented by Caltrans. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. No other secondary significant impacts would result from implementation of this measure. Mitigation Measure TRF-19.SP	
Impact TRF-10.SA4: Signalized intersection operations at Carlson Boulevard/ Eastbound I-80 Ramps (#29) would worsen the already unacceptable LOS F conditions due to traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions. <i>(Significant and Unavoidable)</i>	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (SA4) – (cont.)		
Impact TRF-11.SA4: Traffic generated by the Sub-Area 4 Project would cause a significant impact on the following freeway segments under 2040 Plus Sub-Area 4 Project conditions because they would operate at LOS F and the Sub-Area 4 Project would increase the freeway segment volumes by more than five percent: Westbound I-580 between Central Avenue and I-80 during both AM and PM peak hours and Eastbound I-580 between I-80 and Central Avenue during the PM peak hour. (<i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>)	None Feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact TRF-12.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-13.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-14.SA4: The proposed Sub-Area 4 Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact TRF-15.SA-4 and TRF-30.SP: Project construction would result in a substantial, though temporary, adverse effect on the circulation system during the project construction period. (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems (SP)		
Impact UTL-1.SP: The Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Criteria b.) (<i>Less Than Significant</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-2.SP: The water demand generated by development under the Specific Plan would not exceed water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or need expanded entitlements. (Criteria d.) (<i>Less Than Significant</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Impact UTL-3.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, but could result in a determination that new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. (Criteria a., e.) (<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP: Confirmation of Sanitary Sewer System Capacity. For each project developed within the Plan Area, the project applicant shall ensure that a qualified civil engineer confirm the capacity of the surrounding sanitary sewer system to accommodate the proposed project, prior to the issuance of final certificate of occupancy or equivalent permit to operate or occupy. As part of project plan review, the project applicant shall provide a plan to the City that shows how any necessary stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements would be implemented to accommodate the proposed project, and commit to funding improvements that are not otherwise funded through City programs, and/or to implementing the improvements, which may include onsite treatment of stormwater to reduce demand on the sanitary sewer system due to Infiltration/Inflow. Mitigation Measure UTL-3b.SP: Determine Upgrades to Water Pollution Control Plant. For each project developed within the Plan Area, the City Planning and Building Division shall review the sanitary sewer system capacity study prepared per Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP, and additionally confirm whether improvements planned for the Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) in the most current Wastewater Treatment Plant Facility Plan are required to be operational prior to project operation, and shall ensure that any required improvements are completed prior to issuance of a building permit for the project. The City shall also identify a fair share funding mechanism to support the implementation of the identified required improvements, and shall establish a program to collect funds and guarantee they are used for these improvements. <u>The City shall also commit to preparing and implementing a Water Pollution Control Plant Improvement Fee Program to guarantee funding for upgrades to the WPCP, including implementation of this mitigation measure, that are necessary to mitigate impacts from development projects in the Plan Area. As part of the preparation of the Water Pollution Control Plant Improvement Fee Program, the City shall also commit to preparing a "nexus" study that will serve as the basis for requiring development impact fees under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by California Code Government Section 66000 et seq., to support implementation of the Program. The established procedures under AB 1600 require that a "reasonable relationship" or nexus exist between the amount of the fees charged to each development project and the cost of the WPCP improvements attributable to each development project on which the fees are being imposed (i.e. it must be a "fair share" contribution). The City shall ensure that fees collected pursuant to this mitigation measure are directed towards funding implementation of the measure.</u>	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could result in a determination that new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. (Criterion b.) (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure UTL-4.SP: ICI Pump Station Upgrades. For any development proposed within the Plan Area, prior to the recordation of a Final Map, the issuance of a grading permit, the issuance of a building permit, or utility extension approval, whichever is sooner, the project developer shall submit written verification from the City's Utility Planning Division (or Engineer) that the ICI Pump Station is adequately improved to provide service to the proposed development. Alternatively, project applicants may construct equivalent improvements to ensure the facility's function to the satisfaction of the City Public Works Department.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems (SP) – (cont.)		
Impact UTL-4.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not require or result in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Criterion c.) (<i>Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-5.SP: Development under the Specific Plan could violate applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; or generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of the landfills serving the area. (Criteria f., g.) (<i>Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems (SA4)		
Impact UTL-1.SA4: The Sub-Area 4 Project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Criteria b.) (<i>Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-2.SA4: The water demand generated by development under the Sub-Area 4 Project would not exceed water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or need expanded entitlements (Criteria d.). (<i>Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-3.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project could exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board or result in a determination that new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required (Criteria a., b., and e.). (<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i>)	Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP, UTL-3b.SP, and UTL-4.SP.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-4.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would require or result in construction of new onsite stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Criterion c.) (<i>Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Impact UTL-5.SA4: Development of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not violate applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; or generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of the landfills serving the area. (Criteria g. and h.) (<i>Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required</i>)	None Required.	Less Than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Environmental Impact	Standard Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after application of Mitigation
Utilities (CU)		
Impact C-UTL-1.SP: Construction activity and operations for the development under the Specific Plan in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the Plan Area, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP, UTL-3b.SP, and UTL-4.SP.	Less Than Significant
Impact C-UTL-1.SA4: Construction activity and operations for the development under the Sub-Area 4 Project in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the Plan Area, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems. <i>(Less Than Significant with Mitigation)</i>	Mitigation Measure UTL-3a.SP, UTL-3b.SP, and UTL-4.SP.	Less Than Significant
Energy (SP)		
Impact ENE-1.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not result in wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary use of energy and would not require substantial additional capacity. (Criteria a. and b.) <i>(Less than Significant, No Mitigation Required)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant
Energy (SP)		
Impact ENE-1.SA4: Construction and operation of the Sub-Area 4 Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary use of energy and the Sub-Area 4 Project would not require substantial additional capacity. (Criterion a. and b.) <i>(Less than Significant)</i>	None Required.	Less Than Significant

This page intentionally left blank

RBSP Land Use



Key	
Richmond Bay Specific Plan	Live/Work
Transition Zone Overlay District	Low-Intensity Business/Light Industrial
Hillside Residential	Business/Light Industrial
Low-Density Residential	Marine and Waterfront Commercial
Medium Density Residential	Industrial
Neighborhood Mixed-Use	Port Priority Area
Med. Density Mixed-Use (Res. Emphasis)	Agricultural
Med. Intensity Mixed-Use (Com. Emphasis)	Open Space
Med. Intensity Mixed-Use (Gateway and Comm. Node)	Parks and Recreation
High Intensity Mixed-Use (Major Activity Center)	Public, Cultural, and Institutional
Regional Commercial Mixed-Use	

Figure 7.2: RBSP Land Use

RBSP Land Use	
Richmond Bay Specific Plan	
Richmond Bay Specific Plan Area	320 acres
Density (dwelling units per acre)	25-150
Intensity (floor area ratio)	1.0-5.0 ^{1,2,3}
Building height	15' to 85'
¹ FAR for Civic Spaces shall not exceed .5	
² Density and Intensity may be further specified in a Development Agreement	
³ Floor Area Ratio (FAR) denotes building intensity for non-residential uses and mixed-use buildings	