



LEAD AGENCY:  
**CITY OF PITTSBURG**  
Civic Center, 65 Civic Avenue  
Pittsburg, CA 94565  
Telephone: (925) 252-4920 • FAX: (925) 252-4814

## CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. **Project title:** Marine Express Site Improvements
2. **Contact person and phone number:** Alexandra Endress, Associate Planner  
City of Pittsburg, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA 94565  
Phone No.: (925) 252-4920
3. **Project location:** 695 East 3rd Street, Pittsburg, Contra Costa County. APN: 073-020-004.
4. **Project proponent's name and address:** Randall M. Esch,  
Marine Express, Inc.  
P.O. Box 4008  
Walnut Creek, CA 94956
5. **General plan designation:** Industrial      6. **Zoning:** IG (General Industrial)
7. **Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

Randall M. Esch of Marine Express has requested entitlements for site improvements to a 2.86 acre parcel located at 695 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in Pittsburg, California. Marine Express is a deep draft vessel support company that operates a fleet of tug and work boats to support interstate and foreign commerce shipping throughout California. Marine Express maintains a fleet of roughly 20 vessels (four tug boats, three utility boats, five crew boats, eight barges) at three sites throughout California, including Stockton, Alameda, and Long Beach. Marine Express intends to use this property as their home dock and contractor yard to support marine operations. The objective of this project is to install site improvements that will facilitate the storage, building, repair, waste processing, loading, modifications, overhauls, and demolition of marine equipment and vessels and associated hazardous materials. Marine Express anticipates up to 30 employees, who would travel to and from work via personal vehicles. In addition, Marine Express anticipates not more than five trips to and from the site per day via flat bed and utility trucks necessary for daily operations. Completion of the improvements would require design review and use permit approval from the City's Planning Commission; and building and grading permits from the City. The improvements would also require approval from various regulatory agencies identified in Item Ten, below.

The property is currently unimproved and is occupied by Marine Express for small scale

contractor operations that facilitate the docking of boats up to 115 feet long and related crew changes. The property owner is currently leasing the tidal and submerged Trust Lands north of the upland property line, including several dolphins facilitating barge and other vessel docking. There are no proposed changes to the dolphins or lease area at this time. The upland property that is proposed to be flooded for the creation of the inlet slip and slip way would not require a modification to the existing Trust Lands Lease.

Proposed site improvements would be conducted in two phases. Phase One would include landscaping, two paved driveways, an eight-foot tall masonry wall, a 12-stall parking lot, the creation of a 60-foot by 80-foot slipway, and the creation of a 40-foot by 80-foot inlet slip for the moorage of marine vessels. Phase One would also include the installation of new utilities to facilitate Marine Express' needs to pump sewages from marine vessels into the Delta Diablo Sanitation District sewer system, pump potable water from the City of Pittsburg into storage tanks in vessels, and allow connections to existing utilities to meet Marine Express' electrical and gas, water, and sewer, needs. The slip way and inlet slip would be finished with a sheet pile wall measuring 12 feet tall at mean low water, and measuring 21 feet tall from riverbed, in order to allow five feet for tide changes and three feet for flood protection. The sheet pile wall would extend straight across the northern property line, requiring approximately 51 cubic yards of fill to extend the existing shoreline at the northeast corner. Storm water runoff at the Project site would be collected and conveyed via catch basins and drain pipes to the City storm water system in East 3rd Street, and shown in the project plans. The improvements identified in the Project Plans, attached hereto as Exhibit A would facilitate the use of the property as a contractor yard supporting Marine Express' marine operations and the storage, repair, and building of marine equipment.

Phase Two of the project would include the installation of 168 square foot prefabricated guardhouse, a 70-foot by 150-foot concrete slab with a similarly-sized two-story metal warehouse structure, and a 40-foot by 80-foot concrete slab with a similarly-sized metal warehouse structure, and paving of the site with asphaltic concrete. Renderings of the structures can be seen in Exhibit B. Both prefabricated structures will be required to receive design review approval from the city's Planning Commission, building permits from the city's Building Division, and Improvement Plan/National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits from the city's Engineering Department.

The project proponent is proposing to locate up to seven movable structures on site, including portable restrooms on wheels, shipping containers repurposed as a staff break room, equipment sheds, tool sheds, an engineering shop, paint storage, and a hazardous waste container. These movable structures are critical to the operation of the business. Marine Express crews perform work on vessels and projects throughout the contractor yard. To ensure efficiency, crews need immediate access to the items listed above. The portable nature of these structures allows crews to keep needed tools and facilities close by.

The site improvements proposed would facilitate the docking of vessels within the inlet slip for in-water maintenance, vessel support, building, fueling, loading, and offloading. They would also facilitate out-of water maintenance, overhaul, building, and demolition. In addition, they would facilitate outdoor storage of large marine equipment, the covered storage of hazardous materials, the covered storage of tools, a movable break room, two movable portable

restrooms, and the installation of new utilities to facilitate Marine Express' water, sewer, gas, and electrical needs. The uses and activities that are proposed to take place on the property are detailed below:

*Hazardous Materials Storage and Use:*

A small scale covered shipping and receiving area for the storage of commercially available hazardous materials products related to vessel support is essential to the function of the business, and is a necessary component of Phase 1 of the project. As a marine contractor, Marine Express requires the frequent use of consumable products for the repair and maintenance of marine vessels and equipment. These include hydraulic oil, lube oil, degreasers, paint, paint thinners, universal waste, batteries, cleaning supplies, and similar commercial products. These materials would be stored in a movable shipping container, complete with a secondary containment area, and would be used and replenished by Marine Express as needed.

The hazardous waste shipping container would be used for the temporary storage of hazardous materials that are offloaded from vessels serviced by Marine Express. For example, a Marine Express operated barge may offload used oil from a ship moored in the San Francisco Bay. The oil, or similar petroleum products would be stored in the hazardous waste shipping container inside 55 gallon drums, with not more than 10 drums stored at a given time. Offloaded materials would be stored for a period not exceeding ten days from the date of vessel offload. A Use Permit from the City of Pittsburg would be required prior to the handling of hazardous materials on site.

The installation of above-ground fuel storage tanks capable of holding up to 9,999 gallons of diesel or up to 5,000 gallons of oil is proposed for Phase Two of the project. A Use Permit from the City of Pittsburg would be required prior to the installation of any above-ground fuel tanks.

Marine Express could also offload sewage at the project site. For example, a Marine Express operated barge may offload sewage from a large ship moored in the San Francisco Bay. The barge would then transport the raw sewage to the Project Site, where it would be pumped into the Delta Diablo Sanitation District sewer lines for processing.

Garbage Sterilization would take place during phase two of the project. This is a process in which garbage from marine vessels is offloaded onto the project site, where it would be treated and sterilized with steam in accordance with United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulations. These operations require federal permits and weekly inspections by the USDA. The byproducts of this process are water, which would be diverted into the sanitary sewer, and solid waste, which would be trucked to the Keller Canyon Landfill as needed. In addition, non-hazardous recyclable materials would be offloaded from marine vessels and hauled to a transfer station or landfill by Marine Express trucks. This is anticipated to occur not more than two times per day, depending on loads.

*Shipping and Receiving Area:*

The site improvements would facilitate small scale uncovered shipping and receiving area for the temporary storage of items for vessel support. These items would be stored for a short time of less than one week and would include food, beverages, bottled water, ship parts, life safety



equipment, and similar non-hazardous material

*Maintenance and service of marine vessels:*

Maintenance and service of marine vessels, including Marine Express' own vessels and the service and support of other commercial vessels, would take place at and surrounding the inlet area. This includes: 1) Offloading sewage using diesel air compressor pumps to pump sewage from a barge or ship to the sewer system for disposal; 2) Providing a potable water connection to the Pittsburg Water system to allow the pumping of water from an upland water main into a clean, coated barge, then loaded onto ships off site; 3) Filtering bilge water; and 4) Processing vessel garbage by treating and sterilizing it with steam per USDA regulations, disposing of the water run-off via an upland sewer connection to the sanitary sewer system, and trucking remaining solid waste to the Keller Canyon Landfill. The vessel maintenance described above would take place as needed, likely for five to 20 vessels per month. Recyclable Materials and Garbage would be off-hauled to the Pittsburg Transfer Station or Keller Canyon landfill by Marine Express trucks up to two times per day or once per week, depending on loads.

Marine express is also proposing to maintain, overhaul, build, and demolish marine vessels at the project location. This involves: 1) maintenance (e.g., painting, welding, repair of navigation systems, cleaning, and similar maintenance efforts); 2) demolition of decommissioned barges, boats, and equipment (in which the vessels are cut into small parts then separated for recycling); 3) upgrades; and 4) overhaul of marine equipment (this includes structural changes, barge modifications, and conversion of barges and vessels for new marine purposes, including addition or removal of storage tanks, walls, masts, gangways, navigational equipment, or similar equipment; this also includes replacement or installation of slip equipment such as fenders, gangway, platform, pier rigs, or similar equipment).

**Short term docking:**

The inlet slip is also proposed to be used for short term docking of vessels. For example, if a vessel was working at the Concord Naval Weapons Station, the subject property would serve as a place to dock the boat each night during non-working hours.

**Storage and staging:**

The site itself would facilitate the storage, staging, and sorting of marine equipment or supplies prior to delivery, or after removal from vessels. Examples of items to be stored, sorted, and staged include recyclables, scrap metal, and old or unused supplies that have the potential for reuse.

**Use of Equipment:**

Large and small scale equipment would be used throughout the site daily. Vehicles that would be used and stored on site include two 18-ton cranes, two flatbed trucks, two tanker trucks, one garbage bin truck, one small boom truck, four golf carts, one yard truck, one mobile boom truck (Phase Two), and six diesel forklifts. Portable electrical equipment such as six welding units, six electrical air compressors, and 3 welding machines would be stored and used onsite, as well. Six transformers with separate electrical meters would be installed at various locations throughout the site to accommodate work being done on several vessels at once throughout the property. These would be stored outdoors but would be screened from upland public view by a masonry wall. Marine equipment such as fenders, gangways, emergency equipment,



safety equipment, buoys, ropes, nets, and similar items would also be stored outdoors on the property when not in use.

8. **Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):**

The facility is located in the Northeast Industrial Area of the city, north of East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and a vacant 20-acre parcel, south of the Sacramento/San Joaquin River, east of the vacant property owned by Tesoro Corporation, and west of the Isle Capital property leased to Koch Carbon, a Petroleum Koch storage and export facility. Heavy industrial uses, including USS Posco (a steel products manufacturer) and the Dow Chemical Company, currently operate east of the site, with smaller industrial operations such as Praxair (compressed gas facility) in the general vicinity to the south. Neighborhoods of single-family detached units are approximately 1,300 feet west and southwest of the proposed project site.

9. **Existing Conditions:**

The project site is located at 695 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in Pittsburg, Contra Costa County, California (Exhibit C). The 2.85-acre lot is rectangular with about 200 feet fronting the New York Slough. The project site is across from Brown's Island, near the confluence of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River. It is within the Antioch North 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle. The site is relatively flat, ranging in elevation from approximately seven feet to ten feet above mean sea level.

The project site was first developed in the late 1800's and early 1900's for use as a lumber mill storage yard by Redwood Manufacturers Company. Union Oil Company occupied the site in the late 1940's and used it for above ground fuel storage tanks, two storage buildings, a "dispenser island," and an unloading platform that extended offshore into the slough. The aboveground storage tanks were removed between 1974 and 1978. Enrico Dredging used the site in the early 1980's for a 10,000-gallon underground diesel-fuel storage tank, a conveyor belt, and truck scale. The site was covered with gravel and used for parking by employees of a nearby power plant in 1990 (Wolfe 2011).

The area surrounding the Project site and the City of Pittsburg is a diverse environment that ranges from river to land, to marshes and wetlands, to fully developed industrial, residential, and commercial areas, to hill and mountain habitats south of the City. There is also an existing landfill to the south of City limits (Keller Canyon Landfill)

The Project site is an existing industrial site owned by Marine Express, Inc., that is surrounded by developed industrial land. The property has been under industrial activity for over 100 years (Wolfe 2011).

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

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)  
Contra Costa County Health Services Department (CCCHSD)  
California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB)  
United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Dredged Materials Management Office (DMMO)  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3 (DFW)  
Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA and Cal-OSHA)  
California Office of Emergency Services (OES)  
Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD)

### **Regulatory Framework**

#### City of Pittsburg General Plan:

The City of Pittsburg General Plan is a long-range, comprehensive document required by State law, adopted by the City in 2001, and since amended. The General Plan addresses issues related to physical development, growth, and conservation of the City's resources. The General Plan's Resource Conservation Element provides regulatory framework for the protection of natural resources within the City's planning area.

#### East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (Plan):

The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy is a joint exercise of powers authority formed by the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley and Pittsburg, and Contra Costa County to implement the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (Plan). The Plan provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County, while improving and streamlining the environmental permitting process for impacts on endangered species.

The Plan would allow Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the East Bay Regional Park District, the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, and the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservancy (collectively the Permittees) to control endangered species permitting for activities and projects in the region that they perform or approve (ECCCCHCP 2009). Impacts related to species and habitats in the area are measured in terms of compliance with this Plan.

## **11. Synopsis of Proposed Mitigation Measures.**

The following is a list of the mitigation measures identified in this document by topical area.

Section	Mitigation Measure	Mitigation Measure Title
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1	Secure written approval from the RWCB prior to the excavation of soil greater than five feet in depth.
Noise	Mitigation Measure NOI-1	Install noise-reducing improvements before any cranes are used within 100 feet of the property lines.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Check marks are indicated by the following symbol: ☒

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources           | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or



CEQA Initial Study  
Marine Express Site Improvements  
May, 2014

NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are  
imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared By: Alexandra Endress, Project Planner

	
_____ Signature	_____ Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project were to introduce incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista, or if it were to substantially block views of a scenic vista. Scenic vistas are described as panoramic views (visual access to a large geographic area, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance) or focal views (visual access to a particular object, scene, or feature of interest).</i></p> <p><i>The existing visual character of the surrounding locale is primarily industrial, and the Project site is not located within or along a designated scenic corridor. Views in the vicinity of the Project site are largely constrained by adjacent structures, storage domes, and office buildings at Koch Carbon to the east, and Tesoro, to the west. The relatively flat topography of the subject site and distance between the water and East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street do not provide valuable public views of the water. The existing project site is unimproved, and includes unscreened equipment and containers associated with the Marine Express contractor yard. The proposed Project would include the removal of the chain link fence at the property, and extensive frontage improvements including two paved driveways, two decorative wrought iron gates, a block wall, and a 25-foot deep landscaped area. Several small structures and contractor equipment would occupy the site behind the wall, including a 12-foot by 14-foot guard shack, and portable restrooms, as well as portable offices and storage sheds that would be housed in shipping containers. The guard shack would be a metal structure finished with tan walls and dark green trim. It would feature a small overhanging roof and a window, and articulation that is appropriate to the industrial nature of the neighborhood. Additionally, in Phase Two of the project, Marine Express would install two prefabricated metal structures, one single-story, and one double-story. These would match the guard shack and would be visually appropriate to the industrial character of the neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>From East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, the small structures and shipping containers would be screened from view by the block wall, while the large metal structures would be visible over the top of the wall, much like the buildings to the east at Koch Carbon. The metal guard shack would also be visible. The proposed metal buildings and the smaller structures and contractor equipment would be visible from the designated scenic waterway, Suisun Bay. However, the Project site does not contain any scenic vistas nor would construction of the proposed facilities adversely affect views from Suisun Bay, due to the existing industrial character of the Project Site.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, compliance with the City of Pittsburg Zoning Ordinance requires the City Planning Commission to review the design of the proposed structures and buildings to protect the</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>aesthetic and visual character of the area. Therefore, impacts related to scenic views from Suisun Bay would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Project Renderings; Staff observation and visit to Project site; Site Visit to Marine Express Contractor Yard, Alameda, California)</i></p>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur only if scenic resources would be damaged and/or removed by development of the proposed Project.</i></p> <p><i>Scenic resources refer to historic buildings, urban skylines, or natural resources, such as mountain ridgelines, trees, or rock outcroppings. There are no scenic resources within the Project site. The closest highway to the Project Site, State Route 4, is approximately one mile south of the Project but is not a designated scenic highway through Pittsburg. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact on scenic resources.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Staff observation and visit to Project site; Google Earth)</i></p>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project were to introduce on the Project site incompatible visual elements or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the Project site.</i></p> <p><i>Existing industrial equipment is present on the Project site, as well as an unsightly fence and an unimproved street frontage. As discussed above in Section I.a, the Project would result in a cumulative improvement to the street frontage through the removal of the chain link fence and the installation of an eight-foot tall concrete block wall, decorative gates, and landscaping along the front of the property at East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project would store various industrial-type pieces of equipment on the property; however, this equipment would be stored behind the 25-foot deep landscaped setback and eight-foot tall concrete block wall. Furthermore, the surrounding land uses are industrial. Thus, with the redevelopment of existing industrial land uses with new industrial land uses, there would be a less than significant impact on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings with operation of the proposed use.</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>(Project plans; Project Renderings; Staff observation and visit to Project site; Site Visit to Marine Express Contractor Yard, Alameda, California)</i>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if a project introduces new sources of light or glare on the Project site, which would be incompatible with the areas surrounding the Project site or would pose a safety hazard to motorists utilizing adjacent streets. Furthermore, an impact might occur if introduction of light is inconsistent with the existing lighting level in proximity.</i></p> <p><i>The Project site is located within the City's Northeast River Sub Area, which is characterized by large-scale industrial operations. There are no light- or glare-sensitive land uses within close proximity of the Project Site.</i></p> <p><i>The closest public road way is East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, which is adjacent to the Project site. The installation of lighting would take place in Phase Two, along with the installation of the large metal buildings on the property. Although additional lighting would be introduced to the Project site, the proposed Project would be required to comply with Title 18, section 18.82.030, of the Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC), which prohibits installation of security or parking lot lighting that would directly illuminate a street. As a result, the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on day or nighttime views of the area.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Project Renderings; Staff observation and visit to Project site; PMC Title 18)</i></p>				
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed site improvements would be constructed on land designated in the California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as "urban and built up land." No prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance would be converted to non-agricultural use with the construction and operation of the proposed Project.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program website: <a href="ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf">ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf</a>)</i></p>				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed site improvements would be constructed on land designated as "Urban and Built up Land" and that is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The zoning of the property is industrial (IG District), with a General Plan land use designation of Industrial. Neither the zoning nor General Plan land use designation is identified for agricultural land use purposes.</i></p> <p><i>(Pittsburg General Plan, figure 2-2 and page 2-21; Pittsburg Municipal Code section 18.54.005; Williamson Act Program website: <a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx</a> and <a href="ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/contra_costa_12_13_WA.pdf">ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/contra_costa_12_13_WA.pdf</a>)</i></p>				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				
<p><i>The city's zoning ordinance includes a zoning district (the Open Space District) that fosters agricultural land use, including crop production and grazing, but does not have any zoning district exclusively dedicated to forest or timberland, as forests are not a prominent land cover type in the city, and timber production is not one of the city's local industries. As referenced in section II.b above, the zoning and General Plan land use designations of the proposed site improvements are intended to support industrial and manufacturing uses rather than forestry.</i></p> <p><i>(Staff determination; Pittsburg Municipal Code section 18.54.005)</i></p>				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Properties located within the city's urban limit line are not forest lands. As described in section II.c above, the zoning and General Plan land use designations of the location of the proposed site improvements are intended to support industrial and manufacturing uses rather than forestry.</i></p> <p><i>(Staff observation; Pittsburg General Plan, figure 9-1; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection website, <a href="http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/map-data-index.php">http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/map-data-index.php</a> and <a href="http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b_map.pdf">http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b_map.pdf</a>)</i></p>				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>As described in the discussion in sections II.a through II.d above, properties within the city's urban limit line—including the proposed site of the site improvements—are not forest lands. The site is not located within an agricultural zoning district of the city and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.</i></p>				
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.				
<p><i>Regulatory Setting –</i></p> <p><i>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the public agency responsible for assuring that the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) are attained and maintained in the nine counties that surround San Francisco Bay, including Contra Costa County. The Air District's responsibilities in improving air quality in the region include: preparing plans for attaining and maintaining air quality standards; adopting and enforcing rules and regulations; issuing permits for stationary sources of air pollutants; inspecting stationary sources and responding to citizen complaints; monitoring air quality and meteorological conditions; awarding grants to reduce mobile emissions; implementing public outreach campaigns; and assisting local governments in addressing climate change.</i></p> <p><i>The BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act - Air Quality Guidelines (updated May 2011) reflect BAAQMD risk and hazard screening thresholds and procedures, and include updated CEQA thresholds of significance adopted by the BAAQMD's Board of Directors on June 2, 2010. On March 5, 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment that the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the June 2010 BAAQMD CEQA thresholds of significance (Thresholds). The BAAQMD was ordered to set aside the Thresholds and is not currently recommending that they be used as a general measure of project's significant air quality impacts. The court did not, however, determine whether the Thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the Thresholds was a "project" under CEQA, requiring a CEQA review prior to their implementation.</i></p> <p><i>On August 13, 2013, the First District Court of Appeal reversed the Alameda County Superior Court judgment, holding that BAAQMD's promulgation of the thresholds was not a project subject to CEQA review. Pending possible appeal of the Alameda County Superior Court judgment, the BAAQMD has not yet updated its current recommendations on implementation of their CEQA guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>The 2011 BAAQMD CEQA Guidance adopted the June 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds that were more conservative than those included in the December 1999 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, and they included a first-time threshold for greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions. Thresholds of significance for project operations for reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) were reduced from 15 tons per year and 80 pounds per day to 10 tons per year and 54 pounds per day. The thresholds of significance for respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM10) increased from 80 to 82</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>pounds per day and remained at 15 tons per year.</p> <p>The BAAQMD 2011 Guidelines include screening criteria based upon existing and proposed land use. The screening criteria identified in the BAAQMD 2011 Guidelines are not thresholds of significance, but were developed to provide CEQA lead agencies with a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. These screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield (undeveloped) sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration. These screening criteria were developed based upon the CEQA thresholds of significance adopted by the BAAQMD's Board of Directors on June 2, 2010.</p> <p>On the CEQA Guidelines section of their website (updated August 6, 2013) the BAAQMD recommends reliance on the BAAQMD's 1999 Thresholds of Significance, and notes that "lead agencies may rely on the Air District's CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2011) for assistance in calculating air pollution emissions, obtaining information regarding the health impacts of air pollutants, and identifying potential mitigation measures".</p> <p>Therefore, for the purpose of making Significance Determinations, this Initial Study will draw upon the 2011 Guidelines for conservative methodologies for calculating potential project related air pollution emissions and impacts. Because the June 2010 Thresholds are more conservative than the 1999 Thresholds, relying upon the BAAQMD 2011 Guidelines for this proposed Project represents a conservative approach to the analysis.</p>				
a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants</u></p> <p>The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2013.2.1 was used to estimate Construction related emissions for the proposed Project. The BAAQMD currently recommends the use of CalEEMod for CEQA related development emissions estimates.</p> <p>Construction-related criteria pollutants were modeled conservatively, assuming no mitigation measures were implemented, using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.1. A detailed summary of the assumptions made for the proposed Project construction-related pollutant emission modeling are included as Appendix E, together with the CalEEMod reports for Annual and Peak Summer emissions. Table 1 summarizes the results of the Peak Summer unmitigated overall construction emissions.</p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Table 1: Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants

	Construction-Related	Significance Threshold
Pollutant	Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)	Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)
ROG	26.8	54
NOx	50.0	54
PM-10 (Exhaust)	3.2	82
PM-2.5 (Exhaust)	3.0	54

*The proposed Project is below BAAQMD screening levels for Construction Related Criteria Pollutants, and therefore results in a less than significant impact. Though not required in order to achieve compliance with the identified thresholds, in order to further reduce construction related emissions of the Project, the proposed Project applicant should implement BAAQMD approved criteria air pollutant-reducing Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed in Table 8-1 (see below) of the BAAQMD 2011 Guidelines. The proposed Project applicant should use the best management practices that are in place at the time of development.*

<i>BAAQMD 2011 Guidelines: Table 8-1</i>
<i>Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for ALL Proposed Projects</i>
<i>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.</i>
<i>2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</i>
<i>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.</i>
<i>4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</i>
<i>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.</i>
<i>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, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</i>
<i>7. 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.</i>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

#### Operational-Related Criteria Pollutants

Operational-related criteria pollutants were also modeled using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.1, conservatively assuming no mitigation measures will be implemented. A detailed summary of the assumptions made for the proposed Project operational-related pollutant emission modeling are included as Appendix E, together with the CalEEMod reports for Annual emissions. Table 2 summarizes the results of the Annual unmitigated overall operational emissions for the proposed Project.

Table 2: Operational-Related Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Operational-Related		Significance Threshold	
	Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)	Max Annual Emissions (tpy)	Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)	Max Annual Emissions (tpy)
ROG	6.3	0.9	54	10
NOx	29.1	2.9	80	15
PM-10 (Exhaust)	1.5	0.2	80	15
PM-2.5 (Exhaust)	1.4	0.1	54	10

The proposed Project is below BAAQMD screening levels for Operational-Related Criteria Pollutants, and therefore results in a less than significant impact.

#### Carbon Monoxide Impacts

The BAAQMD preliminary screening methodology for Carbon Monoxide (CO) provides a conservative indication of whether the implementation of the proposed Project would result in emissions that exceed the CEQA Carbon Monoxide Threshold of Significance. The proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact to localized CO concentrations because the following screening criteria are met:

1. The proposed Project is consistent with an applicable congestion management program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, regional transportation plan, and local congestion management agency plans.
2. Traffic from the proposed Project would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour.
3. Traffic from the proposed Project would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, below-grade roadway).</i></p> <p><i>Marine Express would generate and add to existing intersections a maximum of 70 trips per day. Sixty of these trips would be generated by up to 30 Marine Express employees traveling to and from work via personal vehicles. Work hours are 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. In addition, Marine Express anticipates not more than ten trips to and from the site per day via flat bed and utility trucks necessary for daily operations. The majority of these trips would take place in the middle of the day, during off-peak hours. The proposed Project is consistent with Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Congestion Management Program (CMP) for internal and adjacent roadways, the Regional Transportation Program (RTP), and the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan.</i></p>				
b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>As outlined in the section III.(a), Operational-Related Criteria Pollutants emissions for the proposed Project are below Thresholds of Significance screening levels. Short-term Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants, modeled conservatively and assuming no mitigation measures were implemented, are below Thresholds of Significance. Short-term Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants would be further mitigated reduced by following BAAQMD guidance.</i></p>				
c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>As outlined in the section III.(a), Operational-Related Criteria Pollutants and Carbon Monoxide emissions for the proposed Project are below Thresholds of Significance screening levels. Short-term Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants are below Thresholds of Significance, and would be further mitigated by following BAAQMD guidance.</i></p>				
d) Would the project expose sensitive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
<p><i>As discussed above, for the purpose of making Significance Determinations, this Initial Study relies on the Thresholds included in the BAAQMD's 1999 Thresholds of Significance and, where appropriate, draws upon the 2011 Guidelines for conservative methodologies for calculating air pollution emissions and impacts. The Thresholds of Significance for Toxic Air Contaminants in the 1999 guidance is whether the "probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million," or "Ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants would result in a Hazard Index greater than 1 for the MEI."</i></p> <p><i>The only potential proposed project sources of Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) and PM-2.5 (fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less) emissions are diesel powered off-road equipment at the site (cranes, forklifts, generators and golf carts) and On-Road Trucks. As discussed in section III.(a), Construction- and Operational-Related PM-2.5 emissions for the proposed Project are well below Thresholds of Significance screening levels.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed project will not site any new receptors, defined by the BAAQMD 2011 CEQA Guidelines as residences, schools and school yards, parks and play grounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical facilities, nor is it within a 1,000-foot radius of any existing receptors. Thus, while the operation of the proposed Project would generate some level of air pollutants, the quantity of emissions would be less than significant and would not be within the vicinity of any sensitive receptors.</i></p>				
e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project is a maintenance facility that will not create objectionable odors. Anticipated operations do not include any surface coating or cleaning activities involving solvents that might result in odor emissions. No significant odor related impacts would result from the proposed Project.</i></p>				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
<p><i>A Biological Constraint Assessment (Assessment) was prepared for the proposed project, and a report was issued on May 7, 2013 (B&amp;AP 2013). The report is included herein as Appendix E. The Assessment included a field survey by a qualified biologist conducted on February 7, 2013. The purpose of the field survey was to specifically assess current biological conditions of the site, identify site vegetation communities that could support special status species, and decipher if any special status species were present.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to conducting the field survey, information was collected on the occurrence and status of special status plant and animal species that may be found at the site. The primary data source was the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) (CDFG 2013). The CNDDDB provides an inventory of information on the location and condition of California's rare, threatened, endangered, and sensitive plants, animals and natural communities.</i></p> <p><i>This database was searched for all known sightings of sensitive species within the Antioch North, Antioch South, Honker Bay, and Clayton topographic quadrangle maps. The online database of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition) (CNPS 2013) was searched for plant species within the Antioch North, Antioch South, Honker Bay, Clayton, Jersey Island, Birds Landing, Denverton, Rio Vista, and Brentwood quadrangle maps.</i></p> <p><i>The resulting database reports were reviewed to identify listed species that might potentially occur at the project site, their habitat requirements, and the potential for impact from the proposed Project. A total of six animal species and six plant species were identified (Appendix D).</i></p> <p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project removed or modified habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited above.</i></p> <p><i>The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) search locates species and habitats that are protected, sensitive, or potentially sensitive according to federal, state, regional, and local regulatory agencies. Per the CNDDDB, the species listed in Table 1 have been reported as being within a radius of approximately ten miles of the project site.</i></p>				
<b>Table 1</b>				



CEQA Initial Study  
Marine Express Site Improvements  
May, 2014

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>Summary of Species Listed in CNDDB</b>				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Likelihood of Occurrence	Note	Listing Status
<b>Plant Species</b>				
Hartscale	<i>Atriplex cordulata</i>	Low/Not Observed	Poor habitat	CNPS 1B.2
San Joaquin spearscale	<i>Atriplex joaquiniana</i>	Low/Not Observed	Poor habitat	CNPS 1B.2
Pappose tarplant	<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>parryi</i>	Potential to occur/Not Observed	Low potential to exist	CNPS 1B.2
Delta tule pea	<i>Lathrus jepsonii</i> var. <i>jepsonii</i>	Potential to occur/Not Observed	Site lack suitable habitat	CNPS 1B.2
Eelgrass pond weed	<i>Potamogeton zosteriformis</i>	Potential to occur/Not Observed	Low potential to exist	CNPS 2.2
Sanford's arrowhead rock sanicle	<i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>	Potential to occur/Not Observed	Low potential to exist	CNPS 1B.2
California Native Plant Society (CNPS) 1B: Rare, threatened, and endangered in California and elsewhere 2: Rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere				
<b>Animal Species</b>				
Common Name	Scientific Name	Likelihood of Occurrence	Notes	Listing Status
Ferruginous hawk	<i>Buteo regalis</i>	Moderate/Not Observed	Site lacks nesting habitat	WL, BCC
White-tailed kite	<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	Moderate/Not Observed	Site lacks nesting habitat	FP
Short-eared owl	<i>Asio flammeus</i>	Low/Not Observed	Site lacks nesting habitat	CSC
Saltmarsh common yellowthroat	<i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i>	Low/Not Observed	Site lacks nesting habitat	BCC, CSC
Suisun song sparrow	<i>Melospiza melodia maxillaris</i>	Low/Not Observed	Site lacks nesting habitat	CSC
Delta smelt	<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	Moderate in Slough		FT, SE, CH
<b>Federal Listing</b> FT: Federally listed threatened BCC: Federally listed birds of conservation concern  <b>State Listing</b> CH Critical habitat designation SE: State listed endangered FP: State fully protected CSC California species of special concern WL Watch list				
According to regulatory measures from the Resource Conservation Element of the City of Pittsburg General Plan and the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (ECCCHCP), projects taking place within the Urban Development Area of the ECCCHCP				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>planning area would have a significant impact if they involved the incidental take of sensitive species or habitat, directly or through ground-disturbing activities that removed existing ground cover, or affected marshes, wetlands, and other water bodies through a change of drainage patterns that could negatively impact protected species and lands.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project would not result in the direct or indirect take of any additional lands that are to be protected under the Plan. Construction activities would occur on previously disturbed lands under use for industrial activity. Existing vegetative ground cover is highly disturbed. The site was covered with gravel and used for parking by employees of a nearby power plant in 1990 (Wolfe 2011). The prior industrial uses resulted in the release of petroleum hydrocarbons to isolated areas of the site. Remediation has been completed consisting of the demolition of storage buildings and removal of all hazardous materials, excavation of approximately 300 cubic yards of slag-bearing fill from the southeastern portion of the site and backfill with clean fill, excavation of approximately 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil at the western storage building location and backfill with clean fill, and recovery of groundwater containing dissolved petroleum hydrocarbons that were under the western storage building.</i></p> <p><i>Vegetation at the site consists mostly of ruderal, non-native, herbaceous species. This weedy grassland extends north to a short slope with rock revetment (rip-rap), and then into the water of the New York Slough (see Photo 6 in Exhibit E, Attachment 2). The rocky riprap area provides minimal substrate for plants.</i></p> <p><i>Construction activities are not expected to result in the removal of any existing ground cover or have temporary or permanent impacts on sensitive habitats and species throughout the Project area. The proposed Project is an industrial facility located on an existing industrial site and, thus, would not result in a significant impact to surrounding sensitive species or habitat.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project would not have any substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</i></p> <p><i>The Project Site would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species as it is located on industrial lands that have been under fairly consistent and intensive use for over 100 years.</i></p> <p><i>No special status plant or animal species were observed at the site during the survey. No federally- or state-listed endangered, threatened, or rare species, plants or animals proposed as candidates for state or federal listing as endangered, threatened, or rare, or plants on the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) List 1B and List 2, including animal species listed by CDFW as a Species of Special Concern and species that meet CEQA Guidelines, Section</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>15380 criteria for endangered, rare or threatened species were found on the project site. The project site has been determined to be unlikely or has a low potential to provide habitat for special status plant and animal species.</i></p> <p><i>Vegetation at the site consists mostly of ruderal, non-native, herbaceous species. With only weedy vegetation and a single palm tree at the site, there is little habitat for terrestrial species to exist at the site.</i></p> <p><i>The project site and the surrounding regional lands support heavy industrial uses where such species are not commonly found.</i></p> <p><i>The project site is unlikely to provide habitat for most special status wildlife species due to its industrial setting and disturbed nature. With only one palm tree and little cover, the site does not provide good nesting habitat for most species.</i></p> <p><i>The project site is not within any of the plant or wildlife species' habitats modeled in the ECCCHCP. Furthermore, as with the plant species, most special status wildlife species observed within a radius of approximately ten miles from the proposed project site are unlikely to be found at the site because of lack of appropriate habitat.</i></p> <p><i>The biological assessment found that the site does not contain special habitat features or attractions for wildlife, in that the site has had a long history of industrial uses and significant ground disturbances for soil and groundwater remediation that resulted in displacement of native plants and introduction of several species of non-native grasses.</i></p> <p><i>The biological assessment included herein as Exhibit E, found that there are no sensitive or special status species within the vicinity of the proposed Project site and that the proposed Project would not adversely affect any sensitive or special status species or their habitat.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project is located within the Antioch North 7.5-minute US Geological Survey quadrangle. The site ranges in elevation from approximately seven feet to 10 feet above mean sea level.</i></p> <p><i>Site suitability to listed species was considered in the Biological Assessment including an evaluation of the sites vegetation and wildlife conditions observed onsite.</i></p> <p><i>The Biological Constraint Assessment and onsite survey for the project site concluded the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Plant and animal species observed or expected to occur at the site are those typical of disturbed habitats in urban areas.</i></li> <li><i>The project site is within the area covered by the ECCCHCP/NCCP; however, this</i></li> </ul>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>survey did not identify habitat for any special status species.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The site provides little or no habitat for special status species, none were observed during the field survey, and none are expected to occur on or near the project site.</i></li> <li><i>The site does not provide suitable habitat for special-status species.</i></li> <li><i>Further surveys for candidate, sensitive, or special status species of plants and animals are unnecessary.</i></li> <li><i>There were no wetlands or riparian areas identified at the site, but certain activities that would affect New York Slough would likely require regulatory actions from federal and state agencies.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As presented in the Project description, the proposed Project will consist of the development and use of this property as the home dock and contractor yard to support marine operations as a tugboat facility. The objective of this project is to install site improvements that will facilitate the storage, repair, waste processing, loading, modifications, overhauls, and demolition of marine equipment and vessels. Therefore, is the proposed Project would have no significant impact with regard to removal or modification of habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the State or federal regulatory agencies.</i></p>				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur where riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural communities identified locally, regionally, of by the state and federal regulatory agencies cited were to be adversely effected.</i></p> <p><i>As discussed above in 4a, construction or operation activities are not expected to result in the removal of existing native ground cover or have neither a temporary or permanent impact on sensitive habitats and species throughout the Plan area, including those state, and federally listed species located on the CNDDDB search.</i></p> <p><i>Existing storm water runoff at the Project site is currently collected and conveyed via catch basins and drain pipes to the City storm water system in the right-of-way of East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, and shown in Figure A. The proposed Project would continue to use this storm water collection and conveyance system. (Further information regarding the Project and the issues of storm water and existing drainage patterns are addressed in Section 8: Utilities and Service Systems, of this document.) The proposed Project includes an industrial facility on an existing</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>industrial site and, thus, would not result in a significant impact to surrounding riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have significant impacts on sensitive species, riparian habitats, or other sensitive communities.</i></p> <p><i>There were no wetlands or riparian areas on the project site; therefore, no adverse effects to any riparian habitat will result. The proposed Project would not result in the loss of any jurisdictional streambed or wetland areas.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project includes construction related activities that would affect the New York Slough. Approvals are therefore anticipated from federal, state and local regulatory agencies. As required by these agencies, mitigation may be described for potential impacts to the New York Slough to ensure that the proposed Project does not result in any significant impacts.</i></p> <p><i>No sensitive natural communities exist on the project site or within the region, and with compliance with the permitting requirements of the regulatory agencies, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on sensitive natural communities.</i></p> <p><i>The project site is located within the Urban Development Area (UDA) of the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP) (East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan Association 2006). The purpose of the ECCC HCP/NCCP is to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County to allow streamlining of the environmental permitting process for impacts on special status species.</i></p> <p><i>The ECCC HCP/NCCP provides regional permits in the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg and Contra Costa County to authorize take of 28 listed plant and wildlife species under the Federal Endangered Species Act and the State Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act for future urban development within an approved area. Activities that are covered include "all ground-disturbing activities controlled by permit holders via their land use planning process." Under the ECCC HCP/NCCP guidelines, all projects are required to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• maintain hydrologic conditions and minimize erosion;</i></li> <li><i>• avoid direct impacts on extremely rare plants, fully protected wildlife species, or covered migratory birds;</i></li> <li><i>• establish stream setbacks; and</i></li> <li><i>• avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands, ponds, and streams.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Ten special status plant species and thirteen special status wildlife species reported in the vicinity of the project site are covered under the ECCC HCP/NCCP. The project site is not within any of the plant species' habitats modeled in the ECCC HCP/NCCP. Furthermore, special status plant and animal species observed within a radius of approximately ten miles from the project site are unlikely to be found at the site because of lack of appropriate habitat.</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>New York Slough is a navigable tidal waterway that borders the northern boundary of the project site. The Slough would be considered "other waters" by the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972. The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board and CDFW regulate certain activities on the bank and open water areas of New York Slough. Additionally, the City of Pittsburg has been granted oversight of the adjacent Public Trust Lands, by the California State Lands Commission under Senate Bill 551.</i></p> <p><i>The existing shoreline at the project site was previously improved, and is no longer in its natural state. It currently consists of dilapidated concrete, rebar, and rip rap that once held the earth back from the New York Slough. The riprap is in very poor repair, and is littered with abandoned pilings, broken concrete, and garbage. The proposed Project would improve the existing shoreline with a continuous sheet pile wall in place of the rip rap, and would also modify the shoreline to include a slip way and inlet slip. The creation of the slipway and inlet slip would require the excavation of approximately 2,830 cubic yards of material. The addition of 51 cubic yards of fill on the northeast corner of the property would facilitate a straight, rather than diagonal, sheet pile wall to improve functionality of the site.</i></p> <p><i>While the existing shoreline would be modified to accommodate the straight sheet-pile wall, inlet slip, and slipway, the shoreline is previously improved and does not include wetlands or riparian areas. The primary method of construction during site development would be excavation from the land side of the site outward to the New York Slough. Construction activities related to the aforementioned shoreline improvements and excavation would implement the BMPs described above in section IX.c, and would require regulatory approvals from federal and state agencies.</i></p> <p><i>The modifications to the shoreline will result in a less than significant impact to wetlands or riparian areas, or other sensitive natural communities because of the previously disturbed nature of the shoreline and the lack of habitat thereon, and because the implementation of construction BMPs and any conditions required by the state and federal agencies would ensure that impacts remain less than significant.</i></p>				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means because there are no wetlands on the project</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>site.</p> <p><i>A biological report was prepared for this analysis. Biological field surveys were conducted on February 7, 2013, that included an analysis for the presence of wetlands. That report is included herein as Exhibit D. The Biological Assessment and field site review concluded that no potentially jurisdictional waters or Waters of the U. S. were observed on the Project site.</i></p>				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would interfere with or remove access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The proposed Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The proposed Project would be an industrial facility located on an existing industrial site and, thus, would not result in a significant impact to surrounding sensitive species or wetlands. Therefore, no impacts would occur with regards to interference or removal of access to a migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery.</i></p> <p><i>There are no native wildlife or plant nurseries in Pittsburg or Bay Point that would be affected by the proposed Project. The proposed Project site is vacant and surrounded by industrial land uses, and roads, such that the site lacks connection to potential habitat areas along any wildlife corridor. No off-site nurseries or migratory corridors would be impacted by the proposed Project.</i></p>				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project violated local regulations pertaining to biological resources, such as a local tree ordinance. All elements of Project construction and operation would be in conformance with all existing local, regional, State, and national plans, policies, and guidelines regarding the protection and conservation of sensitive species and habitats, including but not limited to plans, policies and guidelines of the Pittsburg Municipal Code, Pittsburg General Plan, the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (ECCCHCP), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Service. The Project's construction and operation would not result in impacts to areas outside the existing industrial facility where it is located. No impact would occur related to violation of local biological regulations.</i></p> <p><i>The City of Pittsburg does not have a tree preservation ordinance, although currently adopted Development Review and Design Guidelines encourage preservation of existing, healthy, mature trees within areas of new development. With the exception of the one fan palm (<i>Washingtonia</i> sp.), to be retained on-site there are no mature trees on the proposed Project Site.</i></p>				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would be inconsistent with policies in any drafted or adopted conservation plan.</i></p> <p><i>The Pittsburg City Council adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (ECCCHCP) on April 16, 2007 (Resolution No. 07-10745), thereby formalizing the city's participation in a regional conservation and mitigation program for biological resources in eastern Contra Costa County and authorizing the city manager to execute agreements with the appropriate resource agencies to implement the ECCCHCP. The ECCCHCP became effective in August 2007, when the state Department of Fish and Game and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service signed the agreements. The city's method for implementing the HCP was subsequently formalized by ordinance and was incorporated into the Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC) as chapter 15.108.</i></p> <p><i>The area in which the proposed Project is located is under the regulatory jurisdiction of the ECCCHCP, but the proposed Project is identified as "urban land cover" by the ECCCHCP. The ECCCHCP requires no further mitigation for "urban" lands, which are determined to be already disturbed, and the further development of which would not result in the take of sensitive species or sensitive habitat lands. Therefore, no impact would occur regarding inconsistency of the proposed Project with policies in a drafted or adopted conservation plan.</i></p> <p><i>(B&amp;AP, 2013. Biological Constraint Assessment at 695 East 3rd Street, Pittsburg, CA. &lt;arch 7, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2011. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), Rarefind 3.1.0. Data collected February 2, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2013. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>California (online edition, v8-01a).</i>  Online: <a href="http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/advanced.html">http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/advanced.html</a>. Accessed on February 4, 2013.  East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan Association. 2006. Final East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan.  Prepared by Jones &amp; Stokes with assistance from Economics and Planning Systems Resources Law Group. October 2006.  Staff Observation.  Wolfe, Bruce H. 2011. Letter from Bruce H. Wolfe, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, to Randall Esch, Marine Express, Inc. regarding "No Further Action – 695 East Third Street, Pittsburg, Contra Costa County" with Site Closure Summary attachment. September 7, 2011.)</p>				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>There are no identified historical resources within the footprint or vicinity of the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource.</i>  <i>(Project plans; Environmental Impact Report for the Pittsburg General Plan, figure 4.10-2)</i></p>				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>No archeological resources are known to have previously been identified on the proposed project site as a result of prior ground disturbance related to construction of the Koch Carbon facilities; however, the site's location adjacent to the New York Slough waterfront does not preclude the possible presence of archeological resources. Although not anticipated based on past disturbances in the area, if in the course of construction of the improvements, any archeological resources are found during grading or construction activities, all construction activities must be halted and an archeological investigation to document and collect all valuable remnants would be required, in accordance with General Plan policy 9-P-41.</i>   <i>(Pittsburg General Plan, page 9-32; Pittsburg General Plan Update, Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, pages 178 through 181; Project Plans)</i></p>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
<p><i>City records indicate that no unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features have been identified on the proposed project site.</i></p> <p><i>(City of Pittsburg General Plan, Chapter 10.1 [Geology and Seismicity] and Chapter 9.5 [Historic and Cultural Resources])</i></p>				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Although excavation of the site will be necessary to accommodate the slip way, inlet slip, and foundations for the metal structures, no human remains are believed to be present on the Project site because the site has been previously developed and graded with no such findings to date. In the event that human remains are discovered in the course of construction or grading for the project, state law requires that construction or grading be stopped in the vicinity of the human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American and to ensure the remains are handled in accordance with the law; therefore, no project specific mitigation is deemed necessary.</i></p> <p><i>(Pittsburg General Plan Update, Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, pages 178-181; California Health and Safety Code section 7052)</i></p>				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>There are no established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones located within the city of Pittsburg, and no faults on or in the vicinity of project site. Installation of the site improvements would require a building permit application and architectural plans that must demonstrate how the Project would comply with adopted building codes intended to ensure seismic stability of</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>the structures in the event of an earthquake along a regional fault; therefore, no project-specific mitigations are deemed necessary.</i></p> <p><i>(Pittsburg General Plan Update, Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, page 285; Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg, April 18, 2014)</i></p>				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>There are no known fault lines on the site of the proposed Project site; however, there is a low to medium potential for liquefaction. As noted above in section VI.a.i, the proposed Project must comply with standard seismic codes and building codes to ensure that new construction would not expose people or structures to potentially significant adverse effects from seismic ground shaking. Specifically, compliance with California Building Code (CBC) regulations (i.e., standards that specify the minimum acceptable level of safety for constructed objects such as buildings or other structures, including specifications on components, installation methodologies, exit sizes and locations, and maximum occupancy for building size/square footage) and completion of the City Building Permit review would reduce the potential impacts of ground shaking on the proposed structures in a manner that is consistent with the prevailing engineering standard. The design of the buildings will be required per the California Building Code (CBC) to incorporate appropriate measures to address the soil conditions prior to the issuance of a building permit, therefore, no project-specific mitigation is deemed necessary.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg, April 18, 2014; Pittsburg General Plan, page 10-8; Pittsburg General Plan Update, Existing Condition and Planning Issues, page 285-287; Contra Costa County GIS <a href="http://gismap.ccmmap.us/imf/imf.jsp?site=ccmap">http://gismap.ccmmap.us/imf/imf.jsp?site=ccmap</a>; ABAG website, Modified Mercalli Scale, <a href="http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/doc/mmi.html">http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/doc/mmi.html</a>)</i></p>				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project would be in an area identified in the Contra Costa County GIS website as having medium to low liquefaction susceptibility, and is therefore subject to liquefaction. See sections VI.a.i and VI.a.ii, above. The building designs will be required to incorporate appropriate measures to address the soil conditions prior to the issuance of a building permit; therefore, no project-specific mitigation is deemed necessary.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg (April 18, 2014) Project plans; United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, "Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California"; Contra Costa County GIS map, <a href="http://gismap.ccmmap.us/">http://gismap.ccmmap.us/</a>)</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The Project site is on relatively flat land, and the City of Pittsburg General Plan does not designate the Project site within a potential landslide hazard area. As a result, there would be no impact associated with landslide.</i></p> <p><i>(Staff Observation; Contra Costa County GIS map, <a href="http://gismap.ccmmap.us/">http://gismap.ccmmap.us/</a>)</i></p>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The Project site is currently graded. Compliance with the NPDES and PMC Titles 15 and 18 would minimize the potential of erosion. As a result, the potential for substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg, April 18, 2014; Project Plans; Staff Observation).</i></p>				
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project were to be built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for Project buildings, thus posing a threat to life and property.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to Sections VI.a.iii and VI.a.iv above for discussions relating to liquefaction and landsliding. Compliance with the CBC and City review of the engineering drawings and calculations would ensure that lateral spreading, liquefaction, and seismic impacts would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg, April 18, 2014; Project Plans; Staff Observation).</i></p>				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The soils may have moderate expansive potential. Compliance with CBC regulations and City review of the engineering drawings and calculations would reduce the potential impacts of expansive soils on the proposed structures, consistent with prevailing engineering standards.</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Furthermore, the proposed Project site does not include construction of residential housing or commercial development that would house or serve large populations on a daily basis. The closest sensitive receptor (being a single family neighborhood) is approximately 1,300 feet away, and the closest school is nine-tenths of one mile away. The risks of exposure of human life to hazards related to expansive soils is considered to be minor because the site is located in a heavily industrial area, the number employees at the site would be less than 30, and buildings and structures that employees would work in and around would be required to comply with CBC regulations. Therefore, the potential impact of expansive soils on life and property is considered to be less than significant.</p> <p>(Phone Call with Curtis Smith, Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg, April 18, 2014; Project Plans; Staff Observation).</p>				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project was located in an area not served by an existing sewer system. The proposed Project would not require the utilization of a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The proposed Project would tie into the existing Delta Diablo Sanitation District sanitary sewer system as shown on the Project plans. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact related to septic system siting.</p> <p>(Project Plans)</p>				
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act - Air Quality Guidelines (updated May 2011) include updated CEQA thresholds of significance adopted by the BAAQMD's Board of Directors on June 2, 2010, as well as screening criteria based upon proposed land use. As discussed in detail in Section 1.3, the BAAQMD has set aside the June 2010 CEQA Thresholds and is not currently recommending that they be used as a general measure of project's significant air quality impacts. The 1999 BAAQMD CEQA guidance does not include Thresholds of Significance for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>For the purpose of making a conservative Significance Determinations with respect to GHG emissions, however, this Initial Study relies on the Thresholds and methodologies included in the BAAQMD's 2011 Guidelines.</p> <p>The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2013.2.1 was used to estimate Operational related GHG emissions for the proposed Project. Operational-related GHG pollutants were modeled conservatively, assuming no mitigation measures were implemented, using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.1. A detailed summary of the assumptions made for the proposed Project facility construction-related pollutant emission modeling are included as Appendix E, together with the CalEEMod report output for Annual emissions.</p> <p>The analysis conservatively estimated the proposed Project GHG emissions to be 500.7 metric tons Carbon Dioxide Equivalent per year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr). The BAAQMD recommended Threshold of Significance is 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr for projects other than Stationary Sources, and 10,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr for Stationary Sources. The proposed Project will therefore result in a less than significant impact related to generation of greenhouse gas emissions.</p>				
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>As discussed in section VII.(a) Operational GHG emissions for the proposed Project are below Thresholds of Significance screening levels, and therefore do not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</i></p>				
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project would be subject to standard regulations related to the routine transportation, storage and dispensing of hazardous materials; compliance with this regulation is intended to avoid a significant hazard to the public or environment. The businesses is required by Contra Costa County Health Services to submit an annual hazardous materials business plan to the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) as well as prepare a site</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>map, develop an emergency response plan, and implement a training program for employees.</i></p> <p><i>The above-ground storage tanks envisioned in Phase Two of the project would require approval of a Conditional Use Permit from the City of Pittsburg Planning Commission, permit approval from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and an update to the hazardous materials business plan noted above. With compliance with these regulations, all hazardous materials would be handled in accordance with local requirements, and the impact to the environment would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>(Project description; Planning staff determination; Letter from CCCFPD dated July 24, 2013)</i></p>				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
See section VIII.a above.				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>There are no existing or proposed schools located within one-quarter mile of the site. The nearest school, Marina vista Elementary, is located west approximately one mile from the proposed project site.</i></p> <p><i>(Google Earth/Aerial photo of site; Staff observation)</i></p>				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed development site is not currently included on the Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List.</i></p> <p><i>Previous analyses at the site identified the presence of isolated hydrocarbons, mainly diesel (TPHd) and the presence of elevated concentrations of selected metals. TPHd was detected</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>in soil at concentrations of up to 1,900 mg/kg (parts per million, or ppm) and 3,800 ug/L (parts per billion, or ppb) in groundwater. In addition, metals concentrations were detected in concentrations of up to 3,900 ppm for chromium. Remedial activities were completed to address the on-site release of metals and petroleum hydrocarbons, including the targeted removal of contaminated soil within the project site. The remedial actions were successful in addressing the releases of chemical concern, namely metals and petroleum hydrocarbons, by reducing concentrations below the remedial goals. Additionally, the analytical results of the confirmatory soil samples from the targeted areas did not exceed the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWCB's) Environmental Screening Levels for industrial uses. A covenant and Environmental Restriction on the property was recorded on June 16, 2011, prohibiting sensitive land uses and restricting soil excavation activities greater than five feet in depth, unless expressly permitted in writing by RWCB. A "No Further Action" letter for the project site was received from the RWCB on September 7, 2011. Mitigation Measure HAZ 1 would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><b>IMPACT HAZ 1:</b> <i>Excavation work greater than five feet in depth on the Property that is not routine construction has the potential to bring contaminated soils to the surface, creating a potential hazard to the public or the environment.</i></p> <p><b>MITIGATION MEASURE HAZ 1:</b> <i>The project applicant shall secure written approval from the RWCB prior to the excavation of the slip way, inlet slip, and any other excavation activities that would result in excavation of soil greater than five feet in depth. Any contaminated soils brought to the surface by grading, excavation, trenching, or backfilling shall be managed in accordance with all applicable provisions of local, state and federal law.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; DTSC website: <a href="http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/">http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/</a>; Letter from RWCB Dated September 7, 2011)</i></p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Not applicable to this proposal. There are no public airports located within the city of Pittsburg, and no public airports are located within two miles of city limits. Buchanan Airfield, the closest airport to Pittsburg, is approximately five miles west of the site and westerly city limits.</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>(City of Pittsburg map; Google Earth)</i>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Not applicable to this proposal. There are no public or private airstrips in the City of Pittsburg.</i>				
<i>See VII.e above.</i>				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The city of Pittsburg Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) was last updated in 2005 (Resolution No. 05-10223). The EOP outlines procedures for educating the public about emergency preparedness and also establishes procedures for responding to emergency situations, including management of communication systems, provision of medical assistance, and maintenance of local financing structures and government leadership roles in the aftermath of a significant emergency event. The proposed project would not modify any provision of the EOP. There are no structures currently on the property, and as such, no existing or planned emergency shelter or evacuation facility would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would therefore have no impact on implementation of the EOP when necessary.</i></p> <p><i>(Project description; City of Pittsburg EOP, adopted by Resolution No. 06-10223)</i></p>				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire.</i></p> <p><i>The Project site has been previously developed and is industrial in nature and does not contain, nor is adjacent to, any wildlands. No impact would occur.</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
<p><i>Environmental Setting –</i></p> <p><i>Climate: The climate in the City of Pittsburg is generally characterized by warm, dry summers and mild, wet winters. Based on Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (CCCFCWCD) Mean Seasonal Isohyets Compiled from Precipitation Records 1879 to 1973 (1977b), average annual precipitation in the proposed project area is approximately 12.4 inches, with over 80 percent occurring between November and March. Based on CCCFCWCD Precipitation Duration Frequency Depth Curves (1977a), the 25-year, 24-hour storm event and the 100-year, 24-hour storm event precipitation levels in the vicinity of the project site are approximately 3.09 inches and 3.89 inches, respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Drainage – Suisun Bay: The proposed Marine Express Terminal Site is situated along the southern shore of Suisun Bay fronting New York Slough. Suisun Bay is a shallow embayment between Chipps Island, at the western boundary of the Sacramento River Delta, and the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. It covers approximately 36 square miles, has a mean depth of 14 feet, and a mean salinity of approximately 7 parts per thousand (USACE et al., 2001a). The bottom of Suisun Bay is predominantly fine silt and clay, crossed by channels scoured by tidal and riverine flows (Schoellhamer, 2001).</i></p> <p><i>Tides in Suisun Bay are semi-diurnal with two flood and two ebb phases per day. This tidal action produces a turbulent, well-mixed body of water. Suisun Bay is strongly influenced by freshwater flows from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers through the Delta, which drains about 40 percent of California's rainwater (Thompson et al., 2000). This freshwater inflow produces a longitudinally stratified, seasonal variation in salinity (Schoellhamer, 2001).</i></p> <p><i>Kirker Creek Watershed: The project is located within the Kirker Creek Watershed in eastern Contra Costa County. The watershed includes parts of the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch, the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve at its source, and the Dow Wetlands Preserve at its outlet to Suisun Bay.</i></p> <p><i>The 11,300-acre Kirker Creek Watershed consists of both upper and lower watersheds. The upper watershed consists primarily of open space and rangeland. The East Bay Regional Park District owns about 870 acres as the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve, that includes the headwaters of Kirker Creek. The lower watershed is highly urbanized and includes a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses.</i></p> <p><i>The length of the largest branch of Kirker Creek is 9.43 miles. Though most of Kirker Creek runs as an open channel, culverts direct the creek underground at road crossings and through</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>urban areas. Rainfall is the primary source of water for the creek. The creek flows during the rainy season (November through April) and generally dries out in the summer though irrigation and urban runoff do keep areas of the creek wet throughout the year. The estimated mean daily flow is 6.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Pittsburg, 2008).</p> <p><i>Groundwater Hydrology:</i> The proposed project is located within the Pittsburg Plain groundwater basin (Basin), along the south shore of Suisun Bay (DWR, 2004a). The Pittsburg Plain basin lies within the two major drainage basins of Kirker Creek and Willow Creek, both of which discharge into Suisun Bay. The water-bearing units in the basin are Pleistocene to Quaternary alluvium deposits that have a maximum thickness of 400 feet. Aquifers in the basin area are hydrologically connected to the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers (DWR, 2004a). Beneficial uses of the basin include agricultural, industrial, and municipal supplies. The City completed a Groundwater Management Plan for the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin in 2012 (Pittsburg, 2012). The Groundwater Management Plan provides a long term strategy to maintain the quality, reliability, and sustainability of groundwater resources within Basin.</p> <p><i>Sediment Quality:</i> San Francisco Bay (Bay) sediments have been influenced by natural and anthropogenic influxes of toxic chemicals over time. Sediments in the Bay are both sources and sinks of pollutants. The overall influx of pollutants can cause increases in sediment pollutant levels. These pollutants are not distributed evenly in the Bay, and localized areas are highly contaminated. The proposed project is not within any known toxic hot spots identified by the SFRWQCB.</p> <p><i>Storm Water Management and Discharge:</i> The topography of the existing site is essentially flat, but drainage is maintained to Suisun Bay through storm drains. Storm water runoff currently collects and drains via a storm drain system prior to discharging to Suisun Bay.</p> <p>The proposed Project would incorporate stormwater best management practices (BMPs) pursuant to Municipal Stormwater requirements including the construction of drainage swales for stormwater retention and treatment. The proposed Project also includes the construction of a stormwater pipeline to collect and convey flows from the proposed Project site to East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. A project hydrology report would be required prior to the issuance of any building or engineering permits on the project site.</p> <p><i>Drainage and Flooding:</i> FEMA is responsible for administering the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that provides flood insurance for properties located within floodplains. The NFIP requires properties located within mapped 100-year floodplains to purchase flood insurance (FEMA, 2009). A 100-year flood refers to a flood level with a one percent or greater chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The elevation of the 100-year floodplain in the vicinity of the project is 10 feet above mean seal level (reference to National</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Geodetic Vertical Datum 1929).</p> <p><i>Regulatory Setting –</i></p> <p><i>The Clean Water Act Section 402 establishes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the discharge of any pollutant into waters of the United States. In California, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency has delegated administration of the NPDES program to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards. The project is located within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Region, Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB). The SWRCB has developed and issued a statewide NPDES permit to regulate storm water discharges from construction sites one acre in size or larger. This project would have a construction area greater than one acre and thus would fall within the NPDES Construction Permit and would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).</i></p> <p><i>San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan: The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Section 17.1.1.2) requires the development and periodic review of Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) that designate beneficial uses of California's major rivers and groundwater basins and establish numerical water quality objectives (WQOs) for those waters. Various agencies, including the SFRWQCB, are actively working toward developing numerical sediment objectives.</i></p> <p><i>Basin Plans are implemented primarily within the NPDES permitting system to regulate waste discharges. The San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan (2011) includes the San Francisco Bay region and portions of the San Joaquin Delta. The 2011 version of the Basin Plan and associated amendments were approved by the SWRCB, the Office of Administrative Law, and the EPA on December 31, 2011. Resolution R2-2007-0042 amended the Basin Plan to adopt a site-specific objective for copper for the San Francisco Bay Basin. This amendment contained non-regulatory provisions for control of copper-based marine antifouling coatings. The RWQCB relies on the authority of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to regulate the pesticidal use of copper in antifouling paints to attain WQOs (SFRWQCB, 2008).</i></p> <p><i>Municipal Regional Storm water NPDES Permit: The RWQCB's Municipal Stormwater Permitting Program regulates stormwater discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4). Under the program, the RWQCBs have adopted NPDES stormwater permits for municipalities; most of these permits are issued to a group of co-permittees encompassing an entire metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>The City of Pittsburg (City) is a permittee under the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (Order No. R2-2009-0074), which was adopted by the RWQCB in 2009. The City has joined together with multiple other municipalities to form the</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Contra Costa Clean Water Program, which operates as the Contra Costa Permittees entity under the MS4 permit. The MS4 permit outlines stormwater effluent prohibitions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented during specific public works operations (e.g., road repair). A regional water quality monitoring program is also part of the permit.</i></p> <p><i>Provision C.3 of the permit applies specifically to projects undergoing development. Certain projects creating and/or replacing at least 10,000 square feet of impervious surface are required to implement stormwater management facilities that are designed and sized to provide treatment to remove pollutants from stormwater runoff. Projects creating and/or replacing at least 1 acre of impervious surface must design stormwater management facilities to provide both stormwater treatment and flow-control functions.</i></p> <p><i>Long-term Management Strategy for Dredging: The San Francisco Bay Long-term Management Strategy (LTMS) is a cooperative effort of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), USACE, RWQCB, and Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) to develop an economically and environmentally sound approach to dredging and dredged material disposal in the San Francisco Bay Area. The LTMS established an interagency Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO), which serves as a central regulatory location for dredging permit applications. The purpose of the DMMO is to review sediment quality sampling plans, analyze the results of sediment quality sampling, and make suitability determinations for material proposed for disposal in the San Francisco Bay Area.</i></p> <p><i>City of Pittsburg General Plan: The City of Pittsburg General Plan (2001, as amended) Resource Conservation Element outlines several goals and policies related to the preservation of natural drainage systems and erosion control. These include but are not limited to: (1) minimizing runoff and erosion during earthmoving activities by requiring the use of BMPs, (2) evaluating and implementing appropriate measures for creek-bank stabilization to reduce erosion and sedimentation, (3) assessing downstream drainage and stormwater facilities impacted by potential runoff, and (4) ensuring that soil and groundwater pollution is addressed during redevelopment and reuse projects.</i></p> <p><i>Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC): Title 13, Chapter 13.28 (Stormwater Management and Control) of the Municipal Code is designed to protect and enhance water quality in the City's watercourses by compliance with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, federal CWA, and MS4 NPDES permit. PMC Section 13.28.050 requires a Stormwater Control Plan with every application for a development project that is subject to provision C.3 in the MS4 permit. PMC Section 13.28.060 prohibits the release of non-stormwater discharges into the City stormwater system, and PMC Section 13.28.090 requires the implementation of BMPs and compliance with State and federal stormwater runoff requirements. PMC Title 15, Chapter 15.80 (Floodplain Management) protects against flood damage. Development and</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>construction sites within floodplains must comply with specific building codes to prevent and minimize losses due to flooding.</i>				
a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project would be required to comply with stormwater quality requirements (provision C.3) of the countywide, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, so as to minimize runoff of storm water from the project site that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed Project would implement Low Impact Development (LID) design and appropriate drainage design standards.</i></p> <p><i>There may be short term impacts to water quality during construction, primarily from siltation of storm water runoff. During project construction, lubricants, fuels, and other chemicals used for construction machinery could be spilled during normal usage or during refueling. Spilled material could run off into nearby watercourses or storm drains. Project construction activities would involve trenching, grading, and excavation. Such soil-disturbing activities could cause erosion. If eroded soil were to come in contact with stormwater, runoff may have increased levels of turbidity, and subsequently, additional sedimentation could potentially occur in the Kirker Creek Watershed and Suisun Bay.</i></p> <p><i>To prevent violations of storm water quality standards, best management practices employed during project construction would ensure that impacts to water quality would be minimized and no violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would occur (see response to question IX.c., below).</i></p> <p><i>The following plans and report will be required to be submitted to the City of Pittsburg Building Division and Engineering Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building or engineering permits to prevent violation of water quality standards pre- and post-construction:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Grading and Drainage Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Landscaping and Irrigation Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Stormwater Control Plan and Report;</i></li> <li><i>• Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Geotechnical Report.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Runoff of sediment and contaminants during construction activities would be minimized</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>through compliance with the State General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity (Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ) and a project-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would comply with current SFRWQCB guidelines and would incorporate acceptable BMPs for control of sediment and stabilization of erosion in the project area. BMP provisions may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of hazardous or contaminated soil-handling procedures such as placing materials into lined bins and covering soils with plastic sheeting;</li> <li>• Designation of appropriate parking and fueling areas;</li> <li>• Deploying applicable sediment and runoff-control measures such as wattles;</li> <li>• Minimizing new land disturbance during the rainy season, and avoiding disturbance of sensitive areas where site improvements would not be constructed;</li> <li>• Providing temporary stabilization of disturbed soils whenever active construction is not occurring on a portion of the site;</li> <li>• Delineating a site perimeter to prevent disturbing areas outside the project limits;</li> <li>• Implementing handling and storage procedures for water generated during construction dewatering;</li> <li>• Implementing hazardous materials storage, containment, and control measures such as secondary containment berms; and</li> <li>• Diverting upstream run-on safely around or through the construction project.</li> </ul> <p>To prevent violations of storm water quality standards, best management practices employed during construction would ensure that impacts to water quality during construction would be minimized and no violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would occur (see response to question c., below). The potential impact to water quality from project construction would be less than significant.</p>				
b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed Project would be served by the municipal water supply and would not require the installation of any new groundwater wells, nor would the proposed Project impede the recharge of groundwater. The Project would increase impervious area that would decrease</p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>direct rainfall infiltration on the proposed Project Site. However, as explained above, the proposed Project must comply with NPDES permit requirements that specify that post-project runoff must not exceed pre-project rates (Stormwater C.3 Guidebook, 8), such that groundwater infiltration, most likely downstream of the proposed Project Site, would remain unchanged.</i></p> <p><i>During project construction, lubricants, fuels, and other chemicals used for construction machinery could be spilled during normal usage or during refueling. Spilled material in unpaved areas could infiltrate the soil column, impacting groundwater quality and groundwater supplies. Measures to avoid and mitigate releases such as requirements for secondary containment, spill kits, and regular equipment inspections would be outlined in the Hazardous Materials Business Plan and the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan, which would be prepared specifically for site construction conditions, as applicable per regulations of the Contra Costa County Hazardous Materials Programs.</i></p> <p><i>Construction of below-grade facilities and pipelines could potentially result in damage to existing underground facilities, pipelines, or other utilities, which could result in subsurface releases that could percolate to groundwater, impacting groundwater quality and supplies. The workers should avoid impacts to other underground facilities during digging or trenching activities. The underground service alert (USA) system would facilitate marking the location, depth and potential hazards of all known underground public utilities and pipelines. A geophysical survey would also be performed prior to subsurface work to identify non-public utility-related subsurface structures and pipelines that may have been installed historically at the site. The potential impact to water quality from project construction would therefore be less than significant.</i></p>				
c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to occur during the dry season. The project would not alter existing drainage patterns or result in erosion or siltation.</i></p> <p><i>Stockpiles of spoils and engineered fill material would be placed in designated staging areas. The staging area and storm water runoff from the staging area would be managed according to the provisions of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). Typical BMPs include installation of silt fences, erosion control blankets, hydroseeding, gravel bags at drain inlets, and storage containers for preventing rain from coming into contact with chemicals. These are sometimes referred as structural BMPs. Non-structural BMPs are good habits, practices, or</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>strategies. Some examples are doing routine vehicle maintenance off-site rather than on a construction site, educating employees on storm water issues upon hire and as jobsite issues arise, scheduling soil disturbing activities for the dry season or between storms, and stabilizing the ground as soon as possible to prevent erosion from rain and wind. The project is subject to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's industrial discharge permit, and may be required to install other permanent measures to minimize erosion and siltation. Such measures are required to be addressed in the permanent Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the operations of the business (Jolan Longway, personal communication, 5/23/2014). The aforementioned BMPs would be required as a part of the project's excavation permits from the Army Corps of Engineers, the RWCB, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Therefore, impacts to water quality from erosion or siltation during construction would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>Pursuant to C.3 provisions, the proposed Project would implement Low Impact Development (LID) design and appropriate drainage design standards. New swales would be constructed to provide treatment and retention of onsite stormwater flows. The proposed Project plan describes the storm water drainage system design. Drainage discharges are anticipated to improve in quality and reduce quantity of stormwater runoff with the addition of the drainage swales, which will allow stormwater from the site to percolate into the soil. Once constructed, the swales would facilitate a less than significant impact of the Project on water quality.</i></p> <p><i>The following plans and report will be required to be submitted to the City of Pittsburg Building Division and Engineering Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building or engineering permits to prevent substantial erosion or siltation on-or offsite:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Grading and Drainage Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Landscaping and Irrigation Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Stormwater Control Plan and Report;</i></li> <li><i>• Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan</i></li> <li><i>• Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Geotechnical Report.</i></li> </ul>				
d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>The proposed Project would include grading and the construction of storm drainage pipelines to convey storm water to drainage swales and to existing drainage outlets. The proposed Project would alter the existing topography and intercept existing drainages to drainage swales, storm drain inlets, collecting storm water in the underground storm drainage network. All storm water flowing onto or originating at the proposed Project Sites would be collected and conveyed through drainage swales or storm drain pipelines and eventually discharged into the public storm drain system in the right-of-way of East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.</i></p> <p><i>Compliance with federal, state and local requirements would ensure that impacts remain less than significant. Therefore, the following plans and report will be required to be submitted to the City of Pittsburg Building Division and Engineering Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building or engineering permits to prevent water quality impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grading and Drainage Plan;</li> <li>• Landscaping and Irrigation Plan;</li> <li>• Stormwater Control Plan and Report;</li> <li>• Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan</li> <li>• Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan;</li> <li>• Geotechnical Report.</li> </ul> <p><i>With required compliance with the flow control standards in the NPDES permit, provision C.3, discussed above, the proposed Project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding.</i></p>				
e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project includes drainage swales and a network of appropriately sized storm water drainage systems to convey storm water from the site and to provide appropriate storm water treatment. The project would not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Neither would the proposed Project provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff with required compliance with the stormwater quality standards in the NPDES permit, provision C.3, discussed in section IX.c above.</i></p>				
f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Impacts to the water quality of storm water runoff during construction would be avoided through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) discussed in section IX.c above.</i></p> <p><i>Compliance with federal, state and local requirements would ensure that impacts remain less than significant. Therefore, the following plans and report will be required to be submitted to the City of Pittsburg Building Division and Engineering Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building or engineering permits to prevent water quality impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Grading and Drainage Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>Landscaping and Irrigation Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>Stormwater Control Plan and Report;</i></li> <li>• <i>Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>Geotechnical Report.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Post-construction impacts to water quality from the non-point source pollutants such as grease and heavy metals may enter New York Slough and ultimately Suisun Bay and the Pacific Ocean. However, the proposed Project is subject to provision C.3, discussed in section IX.c above, which requires pre-treatment of stormwater in order to preserve stormwater quality. The proposed Project includes landscaped drainage swales for treatment and retention. Other pre-treatment BMPs that may be implemented include oil-water separators and appropriate storage of materials in bermed areas.</i></p> <p><i>During construction, there is a potential for spills of construction-related chemicals (e.g., lubricants, solvents) and fuel from construction vessels operating in Suisun Bay.</i></p> <p><i>During construction excavation activities, bottom sediments would be temporarily suspended in the water column, potentially causing increases in turbidity. Turbidity and suspended sediment concentration (SSC) can be much greater than ambient conditions in the immediate vicinity of excavation activities. However, natural physical processes alone can cause the SSC to vary over the course of a day by that is re-suspended during dredging range from 0 to 5 percent (Suedel et al., 2008), and the majority of sediment re-suspended during dredging activities resettles within 50 meters of the dredge site within one hour (Anchor Environmental, 2003).</i></p> <p><i>The primary method of construction during site development would be excavation from the land side of the site outward to the New York Slough. Removal of excavated materials from the New York Slough would be minimized to the amount necessary to connect the new boat slip and ramp to the slough. All of the excavated materials will be dewatered onsite and drained to the sanitary sewer. Excavated materials will be hauled offsite for disposed at the</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Keller Canyon Landfill.</i></p> <p><i>During construction dredging in relation to dock removal and seawall construction, particulate-bound pollutants could become remobilized, dissolved in the water column, and result in potential water quality degradation. However, the contaminants present in sediment in the proposed dredging area (metals, PAHs, PCBs, and pesticides) tend to sorb strongly onto sediment/soil and are not readily mobilized. Chemical concentrations in sediment in Suisun Bay and in the proposed excavation area are generally lower than ambient San Francisco Bay sediment concentrations.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, because the effects of dredging on water quality are expected to be localized and transitory, and because sediment composition has been evaluated and deemed suitable by the DMMO for dredging and disposal at either Winter Island or Montezuma Wetlands, the impacts of construction dredging on water quality would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>Impacts to the water quality of storm water runoff during construction would be avoided through the implementation of a Best Management Practices (BMPs). There would be no permanent impacts to water quality as the project features would be installed underground. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.</i></p>				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project does not include any housing that will be constructed within the 100-year flood plain.</i></p>				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project would be constructed within the 100-year flood plain. The proposed project includes the construction of drainage swales and stormwater pipelines that would have minimal impact on flood flows. All surface drainage would remain on-site, and flood flows would be controlled by the stormwater management system and discharged the public storm drain system in East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The proposed stormwater facilities would be more than adequate to contain the runoff from a 100-year flood.</i></p> <p><i>The following plans and reports will be required prior to project approval to prevent impacts to structures within the 100-year flood plain:</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grading and Drainage Plan;</li> <li>• Landscaping and Irrigation Plan;</li> <li>• Stormwater Control Plan and Report;</li> <li>• Stormwater BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan</li> <li>• Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan;</li> <li>• Geotechnical Report.</li> </ul>				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The potential for flood impacts to project facilities is very minor. There are no levees or dams in the project vicinity. The project would not become inundated by a levee or dam failure. Therefore, there would be no impacts to people or structures as a result of the project due to flooding from levee or dam failure.</i></p> <p><i>As described in section IX.h above, the property is adjacent to New York Slough and within the 100-year floodplain. Flooding of proposed structures could result in damage; however, the structures would be constructed per building code standards. Construction within the floodplain would be in accordance with City of Pittsburg Municipal Code section 15.80.050, which has provisions for flood hazard reduction, including, but not limited to, anchoring, construction with flood-resistant materials, adequate drainage paths to guide waters away from proposed structures, electrical equipment designed and/or located to prevent water accumulation within components, and elevated flooring. The safety of site personnel would be addressed through site specific flood safety protocols which would be detailed in a Facility Response Plan. Compliance with this plan and other provisions of the municipal code would result in a less than significant impact related to risk of damage due to flooding.</i></p>				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The project area is located near but outside a tsunami hazard area as identified on the Contra Costa County Natural Hazards Map.</i></p> <p><i>No other hazards were identified on Contra Costa Hazards Map. The project would not be susceptible to a seiche (a wave in an inland water body) or a mudflow (see Geology discussion).</i></p>				
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project were sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community.</i></p> <p><i>The Project site is currently occupied by and is zoned for industrial uses. The site is surrounded by industrial uses to the east, vacant land uses to the south and west, and the New York Slough of the Suisun Bay to the north. As a consequence, development of the site would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.</i></p>				
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact might occur if the proposed Project is inconsistent with the General Plan designations or zoning currently applicable to the Project site and could cause adverse environmental effects, which the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate.</i></p> <p><i>According to the City of Pittsburg General Plan, the Project site has a land use designation of Industrial, and according to the PMC, the site is zoned as General Industrial (IG) District, which allows for industrial uses. The proposed Project is an industrial facility with storage/handling of hazardous materials, and the Project fits within the specified activities described in the IG zoning district of the PMC, subject to the approval of a use permit for the handling of hazardous materials. The required use permit must be granted by the City before the use can be established as proposed. The proposed Project would be in compliance with all land use plans, policies, and regulations, and thus would have no impact with regard to these issues.</i></p>				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>See section IV.f above. The proposed Project site is designated "urban lands" in the ECCCHCP and is not subject to payment of fees or reporting under that Plan.</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>According to the City of Pittsburg General Plan Resource Conservation Element, there are currently no significant mineral deposits or active mining operations in the City. Furthermore, the Project site is located on a currently developed industrial site. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact related mineral resources.</i>				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>According to the City of Pittsburg General Plan Resource Conservation Element, there are currently no significant mineral deposits or active mining operations in the City. Furthermore, the Project site is located on a currently developed industrial site. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact related mineral resources.</i>				
XII. NOISE - Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The primary purpose of the Noise Element of the City of Pittsburg General Plan is to protect public health and welfare by eliminating or minimizing the effects of existing noise problems, and by preventing increased noise levels in the future (City of Pittsburg 2004). Of the Noise Element policies, the following relate to the Project:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Policy 12-P-1: As part of development review, use Figure 12-3 to determine acceptable uses and installation requirements in noise-impacted areas. [Figure 12-3 is based on land use and noise exposure compatibility levels in Appendix A of the State of California General Plan</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Guidelines. The table is consistent with the provision of State law that requires special noise insulation for residential housing units within 60 dB Ldn noise exposure contours.]</i> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Policy 12-P-7: Require the control of noise at the source through site design, building design, landscaping, hours of operation, and other techniques, for new development deemed to be noise generators.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Policy 12-P-9: Limit generation of loud noises on construction sites adjacent to existing development to normal business hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Policy 12-P-10: Reduce the impact of truck traffic noise on residential areas by limiting such traffic to appropriate truck routes. Consider methods to restrict truck travel times in sensitive areas.</i></p> <p><i>Section 9.44.010 (Prohibitions) of the City of Pittsburg's municipal code sets out a non-exhaustive list of noise-generating sources that have been determined to be unreasonably loud, disturbing and endangering (including pile drivers, hammers and similar equipment, blowers, exhausts and horns). This provision states that it is unlawful for these noises to unreasonably annoy, disturb, injure or endanger the comfort, repose, health, peace of safety of others. In addition, this section prohibits the operation of any pile driver, steam shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, steam or electric hoist (or other appliance) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Section 18.82.040 (Noise) sets out noise level performance standards and states that no construction event or activity occurring on any site adjoining a lot in a residential, planned development or government and quasipublic districts shall generate loud noises in excess of 65 decibels measured at the [receiving noise-sensitive] property line, except between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.</i></p> <p><i>At a distance of approximately 1,300 feet to the nearest single-family residence, noise due to construction of the project, including the addition of an anticipated maximum of 10 construction-related truck trips per day, is not anticipated to result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels above those existing without the proposed Project. Therefore the construction impacts would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</i></p> <p><i>The ongoing operations of the business will generate noise from equipment used at the contractor yard, including air compressors, welding machines, cranes, and similar equipment. The loudest piece of equipment would be a crane. The typical noise level generated by a crane measured at 50 feet from the source is 81 decibels. Sound disperses over distance at a rate of six decibels for each doubling of distance. Over a distance of 1,300 feet, the noise level at the nearest single family homes would measure approximately 53 decibels, which is within the "normally acceptable" range of 50 to 60 decibels for single-family homes. Therefore this impact would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed use is an industrial use in the General Industrial district. The loudest noise-generating piece of equipment that would be used on the site is a crane, as described above. The typical noise level generated by a crane measured at 50 feet from the source is 81</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>decibels. This is considered a "normally unacceptable" noise level for industrial uses in the City of Pittsburg General Plan. Over a distance of 100 feet, the noise level generated by the crane would be reduced to 75 decibels, which is within the "normally acceptable" range of 50 to 75 decibels for industrial and manufacturing uses. If the crane were to be within 100 feet of the property lines, then a potentially significant impact could occur.</p> <p>IMPACT NOI-1: The property is 200 feet wide. The use of cranes or similar equipment within 100 feet of the property lines could generate noise readings in excess of 75 DBA at neighboring properties. This volume would exceed the "conditionally acceptable" noise level for the adjacent industrial use at Koch Carbon and the vacant Tesoro property.</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURE NOI-1: Noise generated from the operations at the proposed project site shall not result in noise levels exceeding 75 DBA at the property lines. Cranes that generate 81 DBA of noise or more measured at 50 feet from the source shall only be used when sited down the north-south centerline of the property, 100 feet from the property lines at the Project site. Prior to the use of such equipment within 100 feet of the property lines, the developer shall fund the preparation of a noise study by an acoustical engineer to identify the improvements necessary to reduce noise levels to the standard established in this mitigation measure based on the proposed location of equipment use. Such improvements shall be installed and approved by the City before any cranes are used within 100 feet of the property lines. The acoustical engineer shall be hired by the city, and the cost of preparation of the noise study (including staff management of the consultant) shall be borne by the developer in accordance with the adopted city fee schedule in effect at the time the study is commenced.</p> <p>Alternatively, prior to the installation of a crane on the property, the applicant shall provide sufficient evidence to the city that any crane installed would not generate greater than 75 decibels at the source.</p> <p>(Randall M. Esch, Phone call, April 18, 2014: <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm</a> <a href="http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound_Propagation.html">http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound_Propagation.html</a> <a href="http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm">http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm</a>; City of Pittsburg General Plan)</p>				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>A significant impact may occur if the Project would create generally excessive groundborne vibration levels.</p> <p>The operation of heavy equipment during the construction of the two prefabricated metal</p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>structures has the potential to generate groundborne vibration during the 11-week site construction period, particularly due to site grading, and pile driving, if pile driving is determined necessary per the California Building Code for the stability of the structures. The groundborne vibration would be temporary and would take place within acceptable construction hours designated in Title 9 of the Pittsburg Municipal Code. This impact would therefore be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>(Draft Air Appendix, October 10, 2013; Pittsburg Municipal Code chapter 9.44)</p>				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>See XII.a, above. The noise generated from the loudest piece of anticipated equipment at the Project site, a crane, would result in noise levels of 81 decibels measured at 50 feet from the source, or 75 decibels measured at 100 feet from the source. If the crane were to be within 100 feet of the property lines, then a potentially significant impact could occur.</p> <p>If Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is implemented, then this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>(Randall M. Esch, Phone call, April 18, 2014; City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 12-3;  <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm</a>  <a href="http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound_Propagation.html">http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound_Propagation.html</a>  <a href="http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm">http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm</a>)</p>				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>See section XII.b, above. Noise generated from construction would be limited to 11 weeks and would take place within acceptable construction hours designated in Title 9 of the Pittsburg Municipal Code. While noise levels may increase if pile driving is determined to be necessary, the noise generated from such pile driving would be within the Conditionally Acceptable range identified in the General Plan. Furthermore, the noise generated by the loudest equipment onsite, a crane, would only occur intermittently, as described in section XII.c, above. Thus, while there could be a temporary increase in ambient noise levels associated with the project, the temporary nature of the noise would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The business would operate weekdays between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M, when</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>noise sensitivity of occupants of nearby properties would be lowest. Occupants of nearby properties would be more sensitive to noise during nighttime hours when there is less ambient noise in the environment and many occupants are trying to sleep.) Additionally, the property is 1,300 feet from the nearest single family residence. The combination of distance to residences and hours of operation of the facility during regular business hours would result in a less than significant impact related to ongoing operations at the site.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Staff observation; City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 12-3; Pittsburg Municipal Code chapter 9.44; Google Earth)</i></p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Not applicable to this proposal. There are no public airports located within the city of Pittsburg, and no public airports located within two miles of city limits. Buchanan Airfield, the airport closest to Pittsburg, is approximately five miles west of westerly city limits.</i></p> <p><i>(City of Pittsburg map; Google Earth)</i></p>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Not applicable to this proposal. There are no public or private airstrips in the city of Pittsburg. See XII.e above.</i></p>				
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The Project does not include any new residential development; thus, the proposed Project would not result in an increase in population as a result of new housing units in the city. The</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>proposed Project would utilize an existing, currently vacant infill site that was previously used for industrial purposes; no new roads or other public infrastructure would need to be extended to serve the site or proposed use. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Description)</i></p>				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project is an industrial project that does not require demolition of any existing housing units. Thus, no impact would occur.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Description; Project Plans)</i></p>				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Not applicable to this proposed Project. See sections XIII.a and XIII.b above.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Description)</i></p>				
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the CCCFPD could not adequately serve the proposed Project, necessitating a new or physically-altered fire station. Construction and operation of the proposed Project facility would not substantially increase the need for fire protection</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>services. In the unlikely event of a fire or hazardous material release at the proposed Project facility, the CCCFPD would initially respond. Fire Station 84 is located at 1903 Railroad Avenue, and is approximately 1.9 miles from the Project site. This station would serve the Project site, and an expansion of fire personnel or expansion/construction of new facilities would not be required to serve the proposed Project.</p> <p>All Project facilities would be built to current building and fire life safety codes and requirements by CCCFPD. Additionally, through the city's encroachment permit process, CCCFPD personnel would be notified by the Applicant of any temporary and short-term impacts on fire protection services resulting from construction activities, such as street closures. Furthermore, the Applicant is required to comply with the rules and regulations set forth by the CCCFPD, in Pittsburg Municipal Code as they relate to temporary activities. As such, construction and operation of the proposed Project would not create significant fire hazards that would substantially increase the need for fire protection services and would not require the construction of new or expanded facilities to meet that increased need. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services as a result of the proposed Project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>(Letter from CCCFPD, July 24, 2013)</p>				
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction and operation of the proposed Project facility would not substantially increase the need for police services. In the event of an emergency, the Pittsburg Police Department (PPD), operating from City Hall, at 65 Civic Avenue would initially respond. The proposed development would not result in additional population, and so would have no impact on the currently established ratio of residents to sworn police officers or the ratio goal of 1.8 officers per 1,000 residents at buildout, as identified in the General Plan. Therefore, impacts on police protection services as a result of the proposed Project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>				
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Public school services in the Project area are provided by the PUSD. The proposed Project would not include new housing or substantial new employment or directly increase the Project area residential population. Consequently, it would not directly increase student enrollment levels at PUSD schools and therefore, no impacts would occur. Also, see the discussions of air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise above.</p>				
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
See section XV.a, below.				
v. Other public facilities?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>No impacts to other public facilities, such as libraries, cultural centers, or civic centers, have been identified as a result of implementation of the proposed Project, as there are no such public facilities in the vicinity of the proposed Project site.</i></p>				
XV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The Project does not include any new residential development. The construction crew members and future employees associated with the proposed Project would come from the surrounding local labor pool and might utilize existing public park facilities during lunch or other work breaks; however, with roughly 30 employees, the periodic increase in use by facility staff would not substantially accelerate deterioration of local neighborhood parks. Thus, the proposed Project would not significantly increase demand for or use of local recreational facilities.</i></p>				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project does not propose to construct recreational facilities, nor (as described above under Section 1XIV.a) would it indirectly require the expansion of existing recreational facilities. As a result, potential physical effects on the environment from the construction of new or expansion of existing recreational facilities would not occur. Thus, no impact would occur.</i></p>				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
<p><i>If estimated peak hour trip generation of a project is less than 100 peak hour trips, then additional off-site traffic analysis and preparation of a transportation impact analysis is not mandatory per the requirements of the Contra Costa Transport Agency (CCTA). This is consistent with Policy 3-P-9 of the City of Pittsburg General Plan Growth Element. The proposed Project would generate a total of roughly 70 trips per day, well below 100 peak hour trips, and so would have a less than significant impact on the local roadway system.</i></p> <p><i>Pittsburg Municipal Code, Title 18, Section 18.78.040 regulates the number of required off-street parking spaces that are required for new uses. The Project includes 24 vehicular parking spaces where the PMC requires only 20. This complies with the regulations of PMC Section 18.78.040. The project plans do not currently identify the provision of bicycle racks, and are therefore out of compliance with the PMC, which requires racks for four bicycles onsite. Compliance with this section would be required as a part of the Project's entitlement process through the city.</i></p>				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>With fewer than 100 peak hour trips generated by the proposed Project, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority and Pittsburg General Plan do not require preparation of additional off-site transportation analysis, including CMP intersection and freeway analysis. The proposed Project would result in a total of 70 trips per day, well below the threshold of 100 peak hour trips for which a specific traffic study would be required; therefore, impacts to congestion at intersections or freeways would be less than significant.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Description, B&amp;AP, 2013. CalEEMod Emissions Calculations Data Assumptions)</i></p>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>The proposed Project does not include any aviation-related uses and would, therefore, not result in a change in air traffic patterns. Thus, no impact would occur.</i></p> <p><i>(City of Pittsburg map; Google Earth)</i></p>				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project would facilitate ingress/egress off the East Third Street through new at-grade truck and vehicle access points. In addition, the proposed Project would not significantly alter the roadway configuration of the surrounding roadways and would not be located next to incompatible land uses. All improvements are required to be reviewed and approved by the City of Pittsburg Engineering Division for compliance with current standards. Therefore, no impacts from an increase in hazards due to a design feature would occur.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Plans)</i></p>				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project would not create any barriers to travel or hazardous design features, and would be required to comply with the conditions of approval submitted by the CCCFPD on August 8, 2012. Therefore, no impacts to emergency access would occur as a result of the proposed Project.</i></p> <p><i>(Leach, Ted. CCCFPD, Letter dated August 8, 2012).</i></p>				
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project anticipates a 10-foot landscape area to eventually be dedicated to the City for use as a public sidewalk along the north side of East Third Street. This is in accordance with the City's plans to install a sidewalk along East Third Street. There are no other multimodal (bicycle or bus) facilities planned along the segment of East 3rd Street to which the proposed Project would be adjacent. Therefore, no impacts would occur due to a conflict with adopted plans or policies supporting alternative transportation.</i></p> <p><i>(Project Plans)</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project would not be subject to the reporting requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project would discharge wastewater from the site into the sanitary sewer and would not result in wastewater discharge directly to a body of water. Wastewater generated from the proposed project site would be conveyed by underground pipeline system to the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) wastewater treatment plant located near the city of Pittsburg's eastern boundary.</i></p> <p><i>Although the proposed project would not be subject to the Regional Board's wastewater reporting requirements, it would be subject to requirements referenced in the state Water Code intended to prevent pollution of stormwater runoff during and after construction. As proposed, the project includes swales along the eastern and western property lines, which are intended to filter pollutants out of stormwater runoff before the runoff is conveyed off of the property via the storm drain system, consistent with the countywide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Prior to excavation for construction on the property, the project proponent would be responsible for submittal to the city of an erosion and sediment control plan, and during construction of the development, the project proponent would be responsible for implementation of adequate measures to ensure no erosion of soil off of the property. See section IX of this study for additional discussion of the potential water quality impacts of the proposal and compliance obligations of the project proponent.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Pittsburg Municipal Code chapters 13.28 and 15.88; California Water Code, section 13260, subsection a, and Chapter 5.9)</i></p>				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to the city's existing wastewater treatment facilities. As explained in the paragraphs above, wastewater from the site would be conveyed to the DDSD treatment plant located near eastern city limits. DDSD's current permit for the plant allows them to treat up to 16.5 million gallons per day (mgd), and long-term phased expansions would increase that number to 24 mgd to accommodate future buildout in the communities of Antioch, Bay Point and Pittsburg.</i></p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Based on an assumed unit flow factor of 1,000 gallons per day per acre for commercial development, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,716 gallons of wastewater per day. Given the relatively small size of the proposed project, wastewater generated from the contractor yard would not result in an increase in flows to the plant above and beyond which the existing plant can handle.</i></p> <p><i>Conveyance of wastewater from the proposed project site would be through an existing line along the south side of East Third Street, and water from the city's water treatment plant would be transmitted to the site via an existing line on the south side of East Third Street. Both the existing water and sewer lines are capable of accommodating the proposed project, and would not be impacted by the construction of the 2.86-acre proposed project site. No expansion of the existing water transmission or sanitary sewer system would be necessary to accommodate the proposed project.</i></p> <p><i>Also see section XVII.d below, for additional discussion of water treatment facilities.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Engineering records; Pittsburg General Plan, page 11-9; DDSD website, email from DDSD Dated May 21, 2014; <a href="http://www.ddsd.org/info.html">http://www.ddsd.org/info.html</a>; Planning staff determination)</i></p>				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to the city's existing wastewater treatment facilities. As explained in the paragraphs above, wastewater from the site would be conveyed to the DDSD treatment plant located near eastern city limits. DDSD's current permit for the plant allows them to treat up to 16.5 million gallons per day (mgd), and long-term phased expansions would increase that number to 24 mgd to accommodate future buildout in the communities of Antioch, Bay Point and Pittsburg.</i></p> <p><i>Based on an assumed unit flow factor of 600 gallons per day per acre for industrial development, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,716 gallons of wastewater per day. The project would not result in an increase in flows to the plant above and beyond which the existing plant can handle.</i></p> <p><i>Conveyance of water and wastewater from the proposed project site would be through existing lines in the East Third Street right-of-way. Both the existing water transmission and wastewater conveyance systems are capable of accommodating the Project, and so would not be impacted by the construction of the 2.86-acre proposed project site. No expansion of the</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>existing water transmission or sanitary sewer system would be necessary to accommodate the proposed project.</i></p> <p><i>Also see section XVII.d below, for additional discussion of water treatment facilities.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans; Engineering records; Pittsburg General Plan, page 11-9; DDSD website, <a href="http://www.ddsd.org/pdfs/Strategic-Plan.pdf">http://www.ddsd.org/pdfs/Strategic-Plan.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.ddsd.org/info.html">http://www.ddsd.org/info.html</a>; Planning staff determination)</i></p>				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project would add restroom, break room and other facilities that would increase water use and wastewater generation above that which currently occurs on the vacant property; however, as described in the paragraphs above, the Delta Diablo Sanitation District and City of Pittsburg both have the capacity to serve this project and other entitled projects. Expanded entitlements are not necessary at this point.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed project is estimated to use up to 6,000 gallons of water per day for landscaping and daily operations of the business. The city operates and maintains its own water treatment plant, which is currently permitted by the state to treat up to 24 million gallons of water per day, but which has a total capacity of 32 million gallons per day. The plant currently operates at roughly half of its total capacity. Additional water demand created by the proposed project would be insignificant relative to the existing water treatment quantities (less than 0.1 percent of its current operation) and would not increase the demands on the existing plant above that which can be accommodated by the existing permit and treatment facilities.</i></p> <p><i>(Engineering records; Project plans; Conversation with Walter Pease, City of Pittsburg Water Treatment Plant; Planning staff determination; City of Pittsburg 2010 Water System Master Plan, Table 4.2)</i></p>				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>As described in the paragraphs above, based on an assumed unit flow factor of 600 gallons per day per acre for industrial development, the proposed project would each generate approximately 1,716 gallons of wastewater per day. Given the relatively small size of the proposed project, wastewater generated from the contractor yard would not result in an increase in flows to the plant above and beyond which the existing plant can handle.</i></p> <p><i>(Public Works Division; Planning staff determination; Pittsburg General Plan, page 11-3)</i></p>				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The project would function as a contractor yard. Weekly business operations require the off-hauling of waste to the Keller Canyon Landfill. Marine Express maintains a permit with the Keller Canyon Landfill, and must adhere to strict regulations regarding the type and amount of material disposed. If Marine Express operates in accordance with its permits, then the disposal of material by Marine Express at the Keller Canyon landfill will not create a significant impact because the amount of material disposed will be properly regulated.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone Call with Randy Esch, April 7, 2013)</i></p>				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>The proposed Project would function as a contractor yard. Weekly business operations require the off-hauling of waste to the Keller Canyon Landfill. See section XVII, above.</i></p> <p><i>(Project plans and Project description; Pittsburg Municipal Code chapter 8.04 (article III), chapter 8.06 (article I), Phone Call with Randy Esch, April 7, 2013)</i></p>				
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
<p><i>A significant impact would occur only if the proposed Project would have an identified potentially significant impact to any of the above issues, as discussed in the preceding sections.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed Project is located in an industrial area of the City and would have no significant impacts with respect to biological resources, and the Project would result in less-than-significant cultural resource impacts provided that the identified mitigation measures are implemented. The proposed Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce or threaten any fish or wildlife species (endangered or otherwise), or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history.</i></p>				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact may occur if the proposed Project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the Project site, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together.</i></p> <p><i>Although there are other past, present, and probable future projects in the area, including the proposed Dow Modernization Project to the East, and the proposed WesPac Energy Project to the west, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative traffic, air quality, noise, and other impact areas would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.</i></p>				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections.</i></p>				



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
As noted in the evaluations above, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not result in any unmitigated significant impacts. Thus, the proposed Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings.				

### References/Sources Cited

1. B&AP, 2013. Biological Constraint Assessment at 695 East 3rd Street, Pittsburg, CA. March 7, 2013. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, "Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy." (viewable online at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Plans/Bay-Area-Ozone-Strategy.aspx>)
2. B&AP, 2013. CalEEMod Emissions Calculations Data Assumptions.
3. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines (1999) (viewable online at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Current-Guidelines.aspx>)
4. Bay Area Air Quality Management District draft CEQA Guidelines (May 2011) (viewable online at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Updated-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx>)
5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Rules and Regulations (viewable online at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Rules-and-Regulations.aspx>)
6. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Facts on Particulate Matter (viewable online at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/~/.link.aspx?id=506777BDAAB5475AB4E926D523FE9B13&z=z>)
7. California Air Resources Board, "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective." April 2005.
8. California Climate Action Registry, General Reporting Protocol (2009) (viewable online at <http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>)
9. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection website, <http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/select.asp?theme=3> and [http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/statewide/fvegwhr13\\_map.pdf](http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/statewide/fvegwhr13_map.pdf)
10. California Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor List (viewable online at <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>)

11. California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program website:  
<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/FMMPDataLinks.aspx> and  
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf>
12. California Health and Safety Code section 7052.5 (viewable online at  
[www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))
13. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2011. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Rarefind 3.1.0. Data collected February 2, 2013.
14. CDFW. 2011. Special Animals. Online:  
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/spanimals.pdf>. Accessed February 15, 2013.
15. California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2013. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-01a).
16. California Williamson Act Program website:  
<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx> and  
[ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Map%20and%20PDF/Contra%20Costa/ContraCostaWA\\_07\\_08.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Map%20and%20PDF/Contra%20Costa/ContraCostaWA_07_08.pdf)
17. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection website:  
<http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/map-data-index.php> and  
[http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b\\_map.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/data/frapgismaps/pdfs/fvegwhr13b_map.pdf)
18. California Scenic Mapping System, Contra Costa County, website:  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm)
19. City of Pittsburg Emergency Operations Plan, adopted by City Council Resolution No. 06-10223
20. City of Pittsburg, Environmental Impact Report for the Pittsburg General Plan (SCH No. 1999072109)
21. City of Pittsburg, "Existing Conditions and Planning Issues." (1998)
22. City of Pittsburg General Plan (viewable online at  
<http://www.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=228>)
23. City of Pittsburg Municipal Code (viewable online at  
<http://www.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=439>)
24. Contra Costa Clean Water Program, "Stormwater C.3 Guidebook." (viewable online at  
[http://www.cccleanwater.org/Publications/Guidebook/Stormwater\\_C3\\_Guidebook\\_4th\\_Edition\\_9-10-08.pdf](http://www.cccleanwater.org/Publications/Guidebook/Stormwater_C3_Guidebook_4th_Edition_9-10-08.pdf))
25. Contra Costa County GIS Map, Online: <http://gismap.ccmmap.us/>.

26. *Contra Costa Transportation Authority, "2009 Contra Costa Congestion Management Program."* (viewable online at <http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/congestionmngmnt.html>)
27. *Dacy, Tom; Engineering Technician, Delta Diablo Sanitation District. Email Communication Received May 21, 2014.*
28. *Delta Diablo Sanitation District website, <http://www.ddsd.org/pdfs/Strategic-Plan.pdf> and <http://www.ddsd.org/info.html>*
29. *Department of Toxic Substances Control website: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>*
30. *East Contra County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan and Development Fee Zones Map, and associated City of Pittsburg documents related to the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (City Council Resolution No. 07-10745; City of Pittsburg Ordinance No. 07-1293 [part] and Pittsburg Municipal Code section 15.108.030; Planning Commission Resolution No. 9687 and staff report)*
31. *Environmental Protection Agency, Facts on Greenhouse Gas Emissions: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/index.html>*
32. *Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel 114 of 162, June 16, 2009*
33. *Google Earth/Aerial Photos*
34. *Handbook for Acoustic Ecology, online at [http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound\\_Propagation.html](http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Sound_Propagation.html)*
35. *Leach, Ted; Fire Inspector, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Letter dated July 24, 2013.*
36. *Longway, Jolan. Email dated May 23, 2014.*
37. *Lease by and between the City of Pittsburg and Marine Express; December 14, 2009.*
38. *Marine Express Site Visit, Alameda Contractor Yard, October 23, 2010.*
39. *Planning Staff Observation*
40. *Project Application / Proposed Project Plans*
41. *Sengpiel Audio. Dampening of Sound Level vs. Distance. Online: [/http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm](http://sengpielaudio.com/calculator-distance.htm)*
42. *Smith, Curtis. Chief Building Official, City of Pittsburg. Phone Call, April 18, 2014.*
43. *U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Website; Highway Traffic Noise. Online:*



CEQA Initial Study  
Marine Express Site Improvements  
May, 2014

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction\\_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm)

44. Wolfe, Bruce H. 2011. Letter from Bruce H. Wolfe, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, to Randall Esch, Marine Express, Inc. regarding "No Further Action – 695 East Third Street, Pittsburg, Contra Costa County" with Site Closure Summary attachment. September 7, 2011.)