AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, May 2, 2018
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Ben Chuaqui, Patrick Riley, John Thompson, and Glenn Wood.

1. Comments from the Public
   (Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Approval of the minutes of the April 4, 2018.

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   This time on the agenda is reserved for Board Members to disclose communications from individuals regarding specific agenda items or to state a potential conflict of interest in relation to a specific agenda item.

4. Public Hearing – 10963 San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL17-0084
   Applicant: Buddy Williams, Studio KDA Architects
   Location: 10963 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 509-110-015, 017
   Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of a Tier II Design Review proposal of a five story residential building containing 50 units, and 34 new garaged parking spaces. A public plaza is proposed along the Jefferson Street elevation.
   CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION
To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Margaret Kavanaugh-Lynch, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530  Tel: (510) 215-4330
E-mail: mkavanaugh-lynch@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
Public Hearing – 10167 San Pablo Avenue
Application: PL17-0006
Applicant: Charles Oewel
Location: 10167 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 501-034-003
Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 6-story building containing 62 residential units.
CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

5. Staff Communications
   • Election of Chair and Vice Chair

6. Adjournment
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Ben Chuaqui, Patrick Riley, John Thompson, and Glenn Wood.

1. Comments from the Public
   No comments were received.

2. Approval of Minutes
   Motion to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2018 meeting: Thompson; 2nd Wood
   Vote:
   Ayes: Groch, Thompson, Wood
   Noes: None
   Abstain: Chuaqui, Riley
   Absent: None

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   This time on the agenda is reserved for Board Members to disclose communications from individuals regarding specific agenda items or to state a potential conflict of interest in relation to a specific agenda item.

4. Public Hearing – 10810 San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL16-0119
   Applicant: Mauricio De la Pena, Trachtenberg Architects
   Location: 10810 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 503-010-015
   Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION
To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Margaret Kavanaugh-Lynch, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530  Tel: (510) 215-4330  E-mail: mkavanaugh-lynch@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
City of El Cerrito
Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Request: Design Review Board consideration of a Tier IV Design Review proposal of a four story residential building containing a total of 40 units, and 32 new garaged parking spaces. Rooftop open space is proposed on the Kearney Street elevation.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.

Consulting Planner, Elizabeth Dunn, presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

Mauricio De la Pena, applicant and architect for the project, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

Howdy Goudy, 653 Elm Street, El Cerrito, CA

The public hearing was closed.

The Design Review Board provided revisions to the project to: 1) Add construction joints on all cement plaster walls that work with the placement of the windows; and 2) Consider adding additional glazing in front of the Amenity Center along the Kearney Street elevation to the extent feasible, as determined by a Structural Engineer.

Motion to approve the item with the revisions: Wood, 2nd: Thompson.

Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson, Wood
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

Public Hearing – 10963 San Pablo Avenue

Application: PL17-0084
Applicant: Buddy Williams, Studio KDA Architects
Location: 10963 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 509-110-015, 017
Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of a Tier II Design Review proposal of a five story residential building containing 50 units, and 34 new garaged parking spaces. A public plaza is proposed along the Jefferson Street elevation.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.
Consulting Planner, Elizabeth Dunn, presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

Buddy Williams, applicant and architect for the project, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

- Blair Akey, PO Box 11, Alamo, CA
- Frank Biafore, El Cerrito resident, and employee of Playland Not At The Beach
- Howdy Goudy, 653 Elm Street, El Cerrito, CA

The public hearing was closed.

The Design Review Board continued the project to May 2, 2018 in order to see the proposed project with the following revisions to the project: 1) create a level entry into the commercial spaces along San Pablo Avenue, and further engage the ground floor commercial space; 2) revise the public open space along Jefferson Avenue and create more landscaping; 3) create more articulation along the roofline of the southern elevation; and 4) warm up the southern elevation with addition colors.

Motion to continue the item to May 2, 2018: Riley, 2nd: Thompson.
Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson, Wood
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

5. Staff Communications
None

6. Adjournment
9:40pm
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier II Design Review project, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The project was originally considered by the Design Review Board on April 4, 2018, where these specific comments were provided to: 1) create a level entry into the commercial spaces along San Pablo Avenue, and further engage the ground floor commercial space; 2) create more articulation along the roofline of the southern elevation; 3) warm up the southern elevation with additional colors; and 4) revise the public open space along Jefferson Avenue to create more landscaping, and remove the parcours feature. The proposed plans have been revised to reflect the comments of the Design Review Board. The project was continued to a specific date, of May 2, 2018, therefore, re-noticing is not required.

The project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board, and includes authority over the following elements only:
- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities

The building features a mixture of traditional and contemporary design elements along the San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue elevations consisting of white and gray ceramic tile, and board formed concrete for the ground floor, and a combination of wood siding, and cement plaster with standing seam metal on the upper floors. Balcony railings are to be of wood, metal or a polycarbonate panel. Black anodized aluminum windows and lack vinyl windows (VPI Quality Windows) will be installed. The landscape design features several native, drought-tolerant species.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is approximately 0.43 acre (18,259-square-foot lot) and is located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue, on the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The project site is generally level and consists of two parcels between the City of El Cerrito (APN 509-110-015-5), and the City of Richmond (APN 509-110-017-1). Together, these two parcels comprise a 0.49 acre site. The El Cerrito parcel is on the eastern portion of the site and is an approximately 0.35-acre parallelogram shaped parcel of land with an approximately 9,360-square-foot one-story commercial building and associated paved and landscaped areas. The Richmond portion of the site is 3,092 square feet and approximately 0.070 acre bordering Jefferson Avenue to the west, and is used for parking.

There is a “no build” easement on the southern edge of the property limits that is approximately 140 feet long and 10 feet wide.

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The overall site is bounded by two streets: San Pablo Avenue, and Jefferson Avenue. Vehicular access is proposed from a new off-street garage on Jefferson Avenue. The Jefferson Avenue frontage is 175 feet in length, and the frontage along San Pablo Avenue is 101 feet in length. San Pablo Avenue features an existing AC Transit bus stop (Lines 72 and 72M).
Existing/Previous Land Use

The existing one-story commercial building is currently occupied by three businesses, including a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade/museum. A total of 20 striped parking spaces are currently on the site. A concrete access ramp is located on the south side of the building, and a wooden access ramp is located on the building’s west side. Approximately 1,700 square feet of landscaped area is primarily on the site’s western perimeter of the building. The sparse vegetation on the site consists of street trees lining the sidewalks and patches of grass and shrubs around the perimeter and throughout the site.

Site Photo

Adjacent Land Uses

North: A four-story, 64 unit senior assisted-living facility.

East: An apartment complex, consisting of six three-story buildings, with related covered parking; to the south of this site is land owned by the City of El Cerrito, and the future temporary location of the El Cerrito Senior Center.

South: A mixed use development with ground floor commercial uses, and 22 apartment units.

West: A six-unit multi-family apartment building (within the City of Richmond).
Analysis

Project Description

The proposed project is to construct a new five-story building, consisting of approximately 2,700 square feet of ground floor commercial space, a 34 space off-street parking garage, and 50 residential units consisting of 4 studio, 20 one-bedroom, 20 two-bedroom, and 6 three bedroom units. The proposed building includes ground floor bicycle storage, an outdoor rear yard area of approximately 2,000 square feet, and a roof deck of approximately 748 square feet at the western side of the proposed building, as well as four separate amenity areas on the second through fifth floors. All of these spaces are proposed to be 453 square feet in size and include a gym on the second floor, a yoga room on the third floor, and a shared office space on the fourth and fifth floors. Each of these spaces contains a full bath. There are two stairways, and one elevator to serve the residents of this building.

Design Review Board Comments and Revised Plans

The project was originally considered by the Design Review Board on April 4, 2018, where these specific comments were provided by the Board.

Architecture:

1) Create a level entry into the commercial spaces along San Pablo Avenue, and further engage the ground floor commercial space; 2) create more articulation along the roofline of the southern elevation; 3) warm up the southern elevation with addition colors; and 4) revise the public open space along Jefferson Avenue to create more landscaping, and remove the parcour feature.

The proposed plans have been revised to reflect the comments of the Design Review Board; see Attachment 7. There is now a flush entry into the commercial space along San Pablo Avenue; additionally, there is an inset door near the northeast corner of the building and an outset window box near the middle of the ground floor frontage along San Pablo Avenue. A new wood material has been added around the inset door and outset window box which adds warmth and depth to the San Pablo Avenue ground floor elevation. The “gold yellow” color of the hardie panel that is on the north and east elevations has been added to the southern elevation. There’s a lowered parapet roof on this elevation to add more articulation along the southern exposure of this proposed building.

Public Open Space:

The Design Review Board felt the parcour area was physically separated from the building’s ground floor management office to be effectively monitored for any inappropriate activity. This discussion point resulted in a recommendation for the parcour area to become landscaping. Staff feels that both the parcour area and bocce court are amenities in the public plaza area and are important at this location to activate the street. For this reason, staff asked the architect to create two options to share with the Board. Option A has landscaping and no parcour; Option B retains the parcour and doesn’t have landscaping. If the DRB chooses Option A, there is a deficit of 594.15 square feet of required public open space for the proposal, and results in an in-lieu fee of $60,603.30 for this deficiency. Option B results in a deficit of 270.15 square feet, and requires an in-lieu fee of $27,555.30 for the required public open space for the project.

The project was continued to a specific date, of May 2, 2018, therefore, re-noticing the project is not required.
Unique Considerations

This project is a few unique issues which are addressed in greater detail, below.

**Bisected, two city development site.**

The site is bisected by the boundary line between the cities of El Cerrito, and Richmond. Language in Section 2.03.02.04, Parcels in both Jurisdictions, of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, establishes an entitlement process for the jurisdiction in which has the most land acreage when parcels lie across jurisdictional boundaries. The other jurisdiction remains a responsible agency, and projects may be subject to additional design review. As this is the situation with this proposal, the City of El Cerrito is the jurisdiction with regulatory control, and has been coordinating with the City of Richmond regarding this proposal. Attachment 4 is the comment letter from the Design Review Chair of the City of Richmond.

A condition of approval has been prepared that requires the project applicant to submit an application for a Lot Merger (LM) to combine these two parcels prior to the issuance of a building permit from the City of El Cerrito. The Lot Merger combines these two parcels so a building permit can be issued, and does not affect the existing jurisdictional boundaries between the cities of El Cerrito and Richmond.

**Comments from the City of Richmond**

Attachment 4 is the comment letter from the City of Richmond Design Review Chair about the project. The Design Review Chair is very supportive of the project, and Form Based Codes, and provides recommendations about specific design details:

1. The possibility for additional landscaping along Jefferson Avenue, and softening the transition along the western elevation of the building to the residential units along this street.

   Staff notes installing additional landscaping along Jefferson would require the public plaza area to be redesigned. These public spaces are encouraged by the Specific Plan, and staff and the applicant worked to create an inviting public plaza area for the project.

2. The potential to install an espalier (landscaping against a building) along this elevation to address the proposed stucco wall adjacent to the apartment building to the west.

   Staff notes an espalier feature along the proposed building would have little visual impact to soften the appearance of the western elevation of the proposed building. There is a 5 foot setback between the existing and proposed building, with a pathway that wraps around the western and southern elevations of the project. Staff does not believe that this additional landscaping feature is appropriate at this location.

3. Reducing the boxy feel of the building with more artful roof overhangs.

   Staff notes that the art piece above the entry on Jefferson is a distinguishing feature on the building for the shape, color and materials to be used. There are no other overhangs proposed for the building. There are many aspects of articulation along the building elevations with the recessed area along Jefferson Avenue, and recessed areas along the southern elevation. Additionally, there is a variety of materials and colors along all elevations to created visual interest on the building.
4. Making the art/entry structure warmer and more organic, and of a human scale design. Use IPE wood that is shown on the balconies at this location.

Staff notes that the wood balconies are to be either a cedar/redwood or similar acetylation wood material, and not IPE. There is a variety of colors and materials proposed for the building, with a wood or similar grain material that adds warmth to the proposed building. The scale and design of the art/entry overhang is meant to shield residents and patrons from the weather, and be the interface between public and private space. Staff appreciates the interesting use of a sleek material at this location for the public art for the project as well as a distinctive accent element that identifies the residential entry to the building.

5. West elevation needs warmth.

Staff notes that the design of the proposed building anticipates a proposed transition between the adjacent residential properties with balconies on the second floor of the proposed building. These private balconies soften the transition between these adjacent properties with open areas, and add warmth to the proposed building.

6. Any LED lighting needs to be 2500-3000K max, and building lighting shall be indirect (either up or down lighting).

Staff notes that the City has performance standards in the Section 19.21.050(A), General Site Standards, of the Municipal Code that requires that all exterior lights shall be shielded to prevent glare across property lines. This standard must be incorporated on plans that are submitted for building permit issuance.

Transportation Demand Management Plan Required

The proposed building includes 50 new dwelling units and 34 on-site parking spaces; which results in a parking ratio of 0.68 per dwelling unit. The Transit Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) district requires additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures when the proposed parking ratio is between 0-1. The Zoning Administrator required the applicant to prepare a TDM Plan to identify strategies to address the deficit, which is included in Attachment 8. The Plan requires additional TDM measures consisting of: 1) subsidizing the purchase of Clipper Cards for each residential unit of the proposed building for one year. The subsidy is to be $3.00 per day per residential unit; and 2) designating the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) creating TDM marketing materials and providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling. The conclusion of the TDM Plans states, “It is estimated that with the implementation of the strategies described above, the peak parking demand generated by Project residents would be reduced to between 31 and 46 parking spaces. Considering the 34 on-site parking spaces, it is estimated that Project would result in between a parking deficit of 12 spaces and a surplus of three spaces after implementation of the required and additional parking demand reduction strategies.”

Public Open Space: Two Options for Board Consideration

Based upon the total square footage of the building, 1,539.15 square feet of public open space is required of this project. A new public plaza is proposed along Jefferson Avenue. This area consists of an informal seating area (that is adjacent to and outside of a commercial space) which can be used by patrons of this space or the public, a separate seating area that is part of an exterior landscape area, and
a bocce court. Please see Attachment 7, page A101. Depending on which option the Design Review Board chooses for the amenities at this location (Option A without the parcourse area and landscaping at the western end of the ground floor of the building or Option B, which includes the bocce court, and parcourse area, and no new additional landscaping), there will be a shortage of public open space of 594.15 square feet for Option A, and 270.15 square feet for Option B. This shortage of public open space will be addressed with an in-lieu fee for the required square footage of public open space. The table below illustrates the two options for providing public open space, the deficit in public open space in these two options, and the resulting in-lieu fee for the deficit in required public open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Public Open Space</th>
<th>Option A public open space provided (no parcourse and landscaping)</th>
<th>Option B public open space provided (parcourse and no landscaping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1539.15 s.f.</td>
<td>945 s.f.</td>
<td>1,269 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit in Required Public Open Space</td>
<td>594.15 s.f.</td>
<td>270.15 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lieu Fee Required</td>
<td>$60,603.30</td>
<td>$27,555.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarification regarding Daylight Plane

A public comment was raised at the Design Review Board meeting about this proposal and the application of Section 2.05.02.02.06 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan regarding the daylight plane. Staff has reviewed this language of this section of the Specific Plan and has prepared a Zoning Interpretation addressing the intent of this section of the Specific Plan (Attachment 3). The interpretation clarifies that: 1) a project abutting a residential district is to maintain the daylight plane along the elevation (or elevations) of the project that is abutting to a residential district; and 2) any shadow that is created by the building elevation along a Neighborhood Street is captured in Section 2.05.02.02.05, and is not subject to the daylight plane issue in Section 2.05.02.02.06. Therefore, the building height of 55 feet along the Jefferson Avenue elevation is allowed pursuant to the Zoning Interpretation.

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:
- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which includes private, common and public open spaces.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:
- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles - the minimum number of spaces allowed.

This project is located in the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) Transect and meets all of the relevant development standards specified for its location in the Plan Area.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards and the compliance of the project with those standards. The project is located on the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. This section of San Pablo Avenue is designated a Community Street. Jefferson Avenue is a Neighborhood Street.

**Regulation by Street Type:**

**SPA Community Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: Up to 10 ft. for non-residential uses; up to 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
<td>5 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>55 ft. (Meets shadow standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Street facing ground floor units and spaces to have individual entries along front or side streets. Upper floor units and spaces to be accessed along the front or side streets.</td>
<td>2 entries to commercial spaces; 1 building access through a pathway and fence along the southern elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways, minimum 100 feet apart. Side access on corner lots.</td>
<td>(1) 20 ft. driveway on Jefferson Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Form**

| Upper Floor Setbacks | See Shadows | Building is setback in compliance with required |
shadow standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></th>
<th>14 ft. min clear</th>
<th>14 ft. min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
<td>9 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Length</strong></td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
<td>101 ft. along street frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min</td>
<td>80% for Shop Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>30% min</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Min: 50% Flex</td>
<td>Shop Front (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 50% Forecourt (NE side). Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade (NE side SPA) or Ecofront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Placement</strong></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</strong></td>
<td>5 ft. min</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</strong></td>
<td>6 ft. min adjacent to commercial uses, 5 ft. min adjacent to residential uses</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Activity Zone</strong></td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>4 ft., 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Front Setback</strong></td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>12 ft. 2 in. for residential use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Access</strong></td>
<td>Entries on front or side streets</td>
<td>Two (2) new building entries on Jefferson Avenue (one main lobby, one stairway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Access</strong></td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways.</td>
<td>One new curb cut that is 20 ft. wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Form</strong></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Setbacks</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>35 feet on the side setback. Meets shadow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
<td>14 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
<td>9 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Length</strong></td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
<td>175 ft. along Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min.</td>
<td>62% for non-residential; 31% for residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>25% min</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>2 ft. max</td>
<td>2 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Front Yard, Forecourt (NE side), Flex (commercial), Shop Front (commercial)</td>
<td>Forecourt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the purposes of administering the development standards detailed above, the Zoning Administrator has determined that San Pablo Avenue is the front of the project site, and in the event of a conflict, the Community Street standards prevail.

### Open Space Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min 50x80=4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Open Space</strong></td>
<td>25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings &gt;25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 1,539.15 sq. ft. required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Parking</strong></td>
<td>Up to 1.5 spaces/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>Min 1 short-term space/20 units 50/20=2.5 (3) Residential 2,989 sq. ft. = 2 short term Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>55 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Height</td>
<td>3 stories residential,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 stories commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design Review Process**

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.B of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, Tier II Design Review is the entitlement process for new projects that have been designed in full-compliance with the design standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The Design Review Board is the body of decision for Tier II Design Review. The discretionary scope of Tier II Design Review includes the following components:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

**Architectural Design**

The building’s architecture incorporates a strong contemporary aesthetic. The building will feature a traditional-looking ground floor and street presence along the San Pablo and Jefferson Avenue elevations. The upper floors feature balconies that express a more contemporary aesthetic. The materials for the balconies on the north, west and east elevations are varied – using either a true cedar/redwood or a similar wood material, or an exterior grade polycarbonate semi-translucent panel in lime green or metal railings (on the southern elevation) to create visual interest for the balconies. There are also a variety of colored Hardie panels which area used vertically on the San Pablo and Jefferson Avenue frontages to add interest to the building. The other materials of the building will be two different grey colors of the cement plaster, and vertically installed grey standing metal seam panels. The southern elevation also uses an orange and bright blue colored cement plaster and standing seam metal panel to accentuate this elevation. There is articulation at the roof line and with some balconies on the southern elevation to add depth and dimension along this elevation. The same bright blue colored cement plaster will be installed as the background color for the exterior stairway on the Jefferson Avenue elevation. The project features a flat roof. The ground floor would be clad in an exterior grade ceramic tile that is to be white and grey. Board formed concrete will also be used on the ground floor. The project proposes to use black anodized aluminum windows for the ground floor commercial spaces, and black vinyl windows (VPI Quality Windows) for the residential units. The building integrates differing window shapes and sizes at appropriate locations to create a consistent architectural language.
Project Renderings

East Elevation- San Pablo Avenue

North Elevation- Option A- Jefferson Avenue
Southern Elevation

Landscape Design

Seven street trees exist along the San Pablo and Jefferson Avenue elevations. Four of these trees – three Chinese Hackberry and one Sweet Gum – are to be removed as part of the project. Additionally, two smaller Ornamental Pear trees along Jefferson Avenue are to be removed as they interfere with the site work that is required for the project. Eight new 24 in. box Maidenhair trees are to be planted along the two streets. Eight new 15 gallon Red Maples are to be planted along the southern (rear) elevation. The two existing Ornamental Pear trees along this elevation will remain. A climbing vine, Boston Ivy, is proposed along the western and southern property lines to provide screening and to enhance the perimeter landscape. Additional species to be installed on the ground floor are Fern Pine, New Zealand Flax, Bulbine, Berkeley Sedge, and Mat Rush. The ground floor flow through planters are to have Dwarf Coffeeberry, Berkeley Sedge, Barberry, Deer Grass, Black Elderberry, and Yarrow. With the exception of Berkeley Sedge, and Barberry, the same four species described above are to be installed on the second floor through planter. The rooftop planting is to be Bamboo and grass.

The majority of the landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the building, and along the western and southern property lines. The rooftop area of the proposed building illustrates an outdoor cooking area, and three outdoor seating areas. There is a shed roof at the western end of the fourth floor outdoor roof area and an additional landscaping area, consisting of bamboo, to create a physical buffer to the adjacent residential use.

Art in Public Places

The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50, Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The applicant will be constructing a sculptural element above the entryway into the building along Jefferson Avenue. This sculptural element is to be of exterior grade polycarbonate semi-translucent panels in Lime Green. This same lime green polycarbonate material is used as the railing feature on some of the balconies of the proposed building.
Monetary Contributions to the Community

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that will be made by the applicant related to this project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These contributions are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to the Complete Streets component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.

1. An in-lieu fee of either $60,603.30 for Option A or $27,555.30 for Option B is required in order to meet the required public open space that is not being provided by the project. While this is a development standard, since it is being paid as an in-lieu fee, the money will be given to the Public Works Department to further enhance existing and proposed public open space.

2. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project (61,566 sq. ft. x 5.02= $309,061.32). This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

3. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (50 du x $1,648= $82,400). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $452,064.62 for Option A (without the parcourse and new landscaping is installed) or $419,016.62 for Option B (with the parcourse and no new landscaping at the western end of the ground floor along Jefferson Avenue).

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

Complete Streets Plan

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. These improvements will be made as funds become available. For San Pablo Avenue, which is a Community Street, the improvements include installing landscaped pedestrian bulb-outs, creating a crosswalk which decreases the crossing distances for pedestrians, and providing a new bicycle lane.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site and posted at the site on March 14, 2018.

Staff received written correspondence from two parties. Copies of the correspondence are attached to this staff report and staff summary responses are included below.
RANC Comment Letter (Attachment 5)

Staff received a comment letter from the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC) dated February 5, 2018. These comments are related to the proposed project (10963 San Pablo Avenue), and a project that is under review at 10919 San Pablo Avenue. Thematically, the letter was separated into three parts:

1. It recommends the inclusion of items such as site plan, elevations, parking, photo simulations, and a traffic impact analysis.
   
   Staff notes all of these items are included in the development proposal’s plan set and supporting documentation.

2. It notes how neighboring municipalities approach the integration of a taller building next to a residential neighborhood with lower building heights.
   
   Staff notes that the project is fully compliant with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the building stepping back to meet the required daylight plane and to avoid unacceptable shadow impacts.

3. It recommends that the project provide at least one vehicle parking space per unit; differentiation of parking ratios between intensive commercial uses and less intensive commercial uses; and the inclusion of guest parking.
   
   Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of parking. The Plan does not require guest parking to be accommodated on site, it also does not require parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square feet. Staff agrees that the residential parking ratio is less that one vehicular space per dwelling unit. However, the applicant has agreed to measures listed in the Transportation Demand Management Plan, included in Attachment 2, which was prepared by a registered transportation engineering firm. The TDM Plan notes that with these measures, the project should be able to accommodate its parking requirements on site. A detailed discussion regarding the issue of vehicular parking is included in this staff report.

Akey Comment Letter (Attachment 6)

This correspondence is also related to the proposed project (10963 San Pablo Avenue), and a project that is under review at 10919 San Pablo Avenue. Thematically, the letter was separated into six parts:

1. Private property lines and drainage;

   Staff notes that private property line issues and private drainage agreements between properties are a civil matter.

2. Fencing between the properties. Specifically that the project’s fence be contained completely on its own property, that it be seven feet in height and be made of materials specified for a project proposed at 10919 San Pablo Avenue.

   Staff notes that the proposed fence for the project shall be required to be located completely on its own property. The fence is currently proposed to be six feet in height and made of wood, however, if the Board prefers, the fence could go up to eight feet in height and could be made of masonry, stucco or plaster. Staff recommends that the aesthetic of the proposed fence should reflect the proposal on the subject property.
3. Proposed tree planting along the southern property line could provide maintenance concern.

Staff notes that the trees proposed along the southern property line serve as a buffer between the two properties and provide color, shade and privacy during the spring and summer months. The proposed planting plan shows leaving two ornamental pear trees and adding a line of eight Red Maples.

4. Site security during construction.

Staff notes that security fencing is allowed/required during the construction process. Further, the El Cerrito Police Department will work with the development team to help identify ways to secure the site, to the extent possible as issues are identified.

5. Parking should be set at one space per dwelling unit.

Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of parking. Staff agrees that the residential parking ratio is less that one vehicular space per dwelling unit. However, the applicant has agreed to measures listed in the Transportation Demand Management Plan, included in Attachment 2, which was prepared by a registered transportation engineering firm. The TDM Plan notes that with these measures, the project should be able to accommodate its parking needs on site. A detailed discussion regarding the issue of vehicular parking is included in this staff report.

6. Noise and dust control; and

Staff notes that noise and dust control is addressed in the environmental document. Additionally, conditions of approval that are mitigation measures of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the review of the Specific Plan area included in the draft Resolution.

7. Hours of construction.

Staff notes that the El Cerrito has citywide regulations limiting the duration of construction activities. This information is also included in the draft Resolution. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

Lastly, a member of the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council came to the Front Counter on April 24, 2018, and spoke with City staff about her reasons for opposing the proposed project, namely, the height of the building, the proximity of the proposed building to the adjacent residential neighbors, and the lack of elevation drawings and height information about the existing residential structures on the plans. She also disagreed with the language in the Specific Plan, Section 2.03.02.04, Parcels in Both Jurisdictions, about how projects are to be processed that are in the Cities of El Cerrito, and Richmond. Staff articulated that the project was in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, and that the project would return to the Design Review Board on May 2, 2018.

Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 2). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensures that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

Intent of the Specific Plan

The project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

*The project addresses San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenues with entries onto these two streets and landscaping improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will continue to enhance the San Pablo Avenue corridor, as a place, by bringing more residential units to this location of El Cerrito. A new public plaza area along Jefferson has been created to activate pedestrian activity on this street, and to create a gathering spot for residents of the proposed building as well as the existing Jefferson Avenue residents.*

**Strategy A.4:** Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.

*The project site fronts onto San Pablo Avenue, a Community Street, and Jefferson Avenue, a Neighborhood Street. The project creates a relationship to the variety of small retail uses, and personal services (United States Post Office, personal services consisting of a bank, and veterinary service to the north of the proposed building), and two local churches in the immediate neighborhood. The proposed project will enhance the existing commercial environment along this area of San Pablo Avenue.*

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

*The project will provide 50 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the two El Cerrito BART stations. The project includes 82 bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will provide a pleasant pedestrian environment along Jefferson Avenue.*

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.
The project is located on an under-utilized site that contains a one-story commercial building. It is currently 7,000 square feet with a surface parking lot containing 20 parking spaces. The proposed project will provide 50 new housing units, a 2,700 square foot commercial space and 38 vehicle parking spaces and 82 bicycle parking spaces in close proximity to public transit.

**Strategy B.3:** Build on recent and planned private and public investments.

*The applicant proposes to add 50 new residential units to an underdeveloped parcel with existing businesses, and a surface parking area into housing. Additionally, a new outdoor public plaza area and public art, both proposed for Jefferson Avenue, will enhance the proposed project. Private open space is proposed with balconies and a fourth floor roof deck.*

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

*The project will provide 50 new residential units by converting an existing underdeveloped commercial building and surface parking area into a new building in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.*

**General Plan Compliance**

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

*The project will provide 50 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses.*

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

*In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.*

**LU4.1: Mixture of Uses.** Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

*The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, public transit and the Ohlone Greenway. The design of the project will allow for surveillance of the street, enhancing public safety.*

**LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives.** To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many
constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the two El Cerrito BART stations. The location also provides convenient walking access to local businesses.

**CD1.9: Building Design.** A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and is compatible with the existing residential uses to the south, east and north of the site.

**CD2.1: Street Frontages.** Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue (and a portion of Jefferson Avenue) and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto both streets. A main door onto Jefferson Avenue provides lobby access to the residential units. Commercial space is located along San Pablo Avenue; the Manager’s Office for the proposed building and the public plaza, with its variety of active uses, is along Jefferson Avenue. These different commercial and active uses allow residents of the proposed building, existing residents of the neighborhood, and patrons of the commercial space to assemble at this location. Residential units are above the ground floor and allow surveillance of the street from the units within the project.

**CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements.** Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements. The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

The project features an open rooftop deck for common/private open space on the fourth floor of the proposed building. Private common open space is being created with balconies on many of the units. Shared common internal recreational spaces are proposed within the building with a gym and yoga room on the second and third floors. Two separate shared work spaces are proposed for the fourth and fifth floors.

**CD3.3: Site Landscaping.** Improve the appearance of the community by requiring aesthetically designed screening and landscaping on public and private sites. Ensure that public landscaping includes entry areas, street medians, parks, and schools. Require landscaping for all private sites, yard spaces, parking lots, plazas, courtyards, and recreational areas.

The project has provided landscaping in conformance with the standards in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. New street trees will be installed Jefferson and San Pablo Avenues, at the
ground floor level, along the western and southern property lines, and on the fourth floor roof deck area.

**CD3.12: Landscape Species.** Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.

*The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerance plants such as Maidenhair, Red Maples, Fern Pine, New Zealand Flax, Bulbine, Berkeley Sedge, and Mat Rush. Dwarf Coffeeberry, Barberry, Deer Grass, Black Elderberry, and Yarrow, and various succulents.*

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

*The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with residential entry along Jefferson Avenue, and commercial entry along San Pablo Avenue.*

**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

*The proposed project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**T2.1: Land Use Patterns.** Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.
2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.
3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.
4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.
5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

*The project will provide 50 new residences in close proximity to public transportation and local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.*

**T2.2: Project Design.** Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.
The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo and Jefferson Avenues and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto both streets with a main door onto Jefferson Avenue for stairway and lobby access to the residential units.

H2.2: Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides higher-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

H2.3: Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public transit. The project complies fully with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for a Tier IV application, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable Specific Plan design standards;

As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

As discussed in this report, the proposed project will implement the following goals of the El Cerrito General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.3: Site Landscaping, CD3.12: Landscape species; CD4.2 Building Articulation; CD5.1, Design Review Process; T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, Policies H2.2, and H2.3.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL17-0084, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB 18-03 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL17-0084, a project that includes a 5-story residential building containing 50 dwelling units located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue.
Appeal Period
Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments
1. Draft Resolution
2. Initial Study Checklist
3. Zoning Interpretation of Section 2.05.02.02.06
4. Comment letter from Jonathan Livingston, City of Richmond Design Review Board Chair, received by the City of El Cerrito on March 21, 2018
5. February 5, 2018 comment letter from the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC)
6. March 15, 2018 Comment Letter from Blair Akey
7. Updated Project Plans, dated April 24, 2018
8. CEQA Appendices found here http://www.el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/9700
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER II DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 50 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10963 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on a Community Street and a Neighborhood Street;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 509-110-015, and 509-110-017;

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2017, the applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on November 7, 2017, the applicant was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on May 2, 2018, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street type and Neighborhood Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.


Now, Therefore, Be It RESOLVED that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL17-0084, subject to the following conditions:
1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated December 21, 2017. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs the building or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the Applicant/Developer shall record an easement on the part of the property that is designated as privately-owned public open space to identify that area for that use in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The Applicant/Developer shall also affix permanent, durable signage in this open space area educating the community that this area is available for public use from dawn to dusk. The in lieu fee $60,603.30 for Option A, or $27,555.30 for Option B) for the balance of the public open space shall be payable prior to the issuance of the building permit.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of market rate residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

10. A construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees.
This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit to allow this use.

Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:

11. Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2): The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.

12. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1): Implement the following Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

**Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:**

a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.

b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

c. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.

d. Hydroteed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).

e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.

f. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.

g. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

h. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.

i. Post a publically visible sign(s) 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.

**Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:**

j. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
k. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.
l. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
m. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

13. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2): Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall require project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:
   a. Construction equipment selection.
   b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.
   c. Modified construction schedule; and
   d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for control of fugitive dust.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program, for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator, that includes the following elements:
   a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

15. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads, and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

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

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

16. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special
rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

17. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:

   a. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
   c. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

18. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

19. Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.1): Future development would be exposed to outdoor noise levels exceeding acceptable levels as defined in the El Cerrito and Richmond General Plans. Noise levels inside residential structures proposed in such noise environments would exceed 45 dBA Ldn, the local established land use compatibility threshold. In areas where residential developments would be exposed to an Ldn of greater than 60 dBA, El Cerrito General Plan Policy H3.9 requires the evaluation of mitigation measures for specific projects. In Richmond General Plan Action SN4.A, new noise-sensitive uses that are located in an area with day-night average sound levels (Ldn) of 55 or greater require a noise study report; the report shall identify noise mitigation measures that limit noise to an acceptable level compared to existing conditions.

   a. Utilize site planning to minimize noise in residential outdoor activity areas (shared outdoor space in multi-family developments) by locating the areas behind noise barriers, the buildings, in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible. The goal is a maximum noise level of 60 dBA Ldn from roadway traffic and 70 dBA Ldn from BART noise.
b. The City of El Cerrito requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or lower, and the adopted instantaneous noise levels in residential units exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn should not exceed 50 dBA Lmax in bedrooms and 55 dBA Lmax in other rooms. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA Ldn so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn. These treatments include, but are not limited to, sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted to the City, along with the building plans, which shall be revised as necessary or approved prior to issuance of a building permit. Feasible construction techniques such as these would adequately reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or lower and meet instantaneous noise limits.

c. Similar to above, noise insulation features shall be considered on a case-by-case basis for noise-sensitive offices and commercial uses proposed where noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn, in order to meet adopted noise standards.

d. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

20. Noise (Mitigation 13.2): New commercial development proposed in the same building as or adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards.

a. Noise levels at residential property lines from commercial development shall be maintained not in excess of the General Plan and municipal code limits for the Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. The approval of the commercial development shall require a noise study demonstrating how the business--including loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems--would meet these requirements and would be consistent with the respective City's noise standards.

b. Ensure that noise-generating activities, such as maintenance and loading and unloading, are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM.

21. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:

a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.
i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

22. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:
   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.
   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures that may include the following:
      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.
      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.
      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.
      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
      5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
      6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

23. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall submit an application for a Lot Merger to the City of El Cerrito to combine parcels 509-110-015, and 509-110-017.

24. The following interior noise reduction measures shall be included for all west facing (facing San Pablo Avenue) units:
   a. Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38.
   b. Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
c. Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
d. Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
e. Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the applicant may provide a detailed analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis shall be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer and shall outline the specific measures required to meet the City’s 45 dB Ldn and 50-55 dBA Lmax, interior noise level standards. The Zoning Administrator shall approve any substitute measures or alternatives to the measures detailed above.

25. The permanent fence on the west elevation shall all be of wood, and cannot be constructed with chain link. A wood fence shall be illustrated on plans that are submitted for building permit issuance. Chain link fencing is permitted only as construction fencing.

26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and Applicant/Developer shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to implement: 1) Distribution of transit passes (Clipper Cards) to the future tenants of the apartment development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue; 2) designation of the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) the creation of the TDM marketing materials and the details of providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling.

The Applicant/Developer shall deposit the funds for the Clipper cards into an escrow account that is controlled by the City. Yearly compliance and reporting shall be made by the building manager to the City regarding the implementation of the TDM Plan.

Public Works Department:

27. Earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

28. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated April 24, 2018 comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit. Applicant shall use the updated version of the storm water control report as the last submittal was using the old template. See the following links for reference: [http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/](http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/).

29. Applicant shall provide drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage is encouraged to stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10ft from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

30. For any work in the Public Right-of-Way, street cuts, street tree, sidewalk, curb & gutter, and driveway work, Applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

31. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.
32. Bike racks to be installed shall meet the current standards and details to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

33. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

34. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed off-site improvements plan.

35. All sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development’s public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards and provide continuous, gradual sidewalk width transition from abutting properties to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

36. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

37. Prior to issuance of a building permit and before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

38. New street trees must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before issuance of the building permit. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

Building Division:

39. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.

Fire Department:

40. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant/Development Team with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Provide code analysis and show on plans how “Emergency Vehicle Access” requirements are met to get within 150 feet of all portions of exterior walls of the first story.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.

c. Fire Riser Locations
   1. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between the two buildings.

d. Gates
   1. All gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   2. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas at all gates and doors.

e. Premises Identification
1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
   1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
   2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.

g. Emergency Egress
   1. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4.
   2. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
   1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
   3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
   4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
   5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
   1. Standpipes shall be wet.
   2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
   3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
   1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
   2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
   3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
   1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
   1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
   2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
   3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
   1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.
   2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
   3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120 v Powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
41. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant/Developer shall submit a plan for construction site security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
42. This applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
43. Construction of the new trash room shall be as illustrated on the plans.
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To: Elizabeth Dunn, AICP, Consulting Planner  
City of El Cerrito, Planning Division  

From: Darcy Kremin, AICP, Bay Area Environmental Practice Leader  

Date: March 30, 2018  

Re: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Documentation for the 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project, El Cerrito, California  

This memorandum and its attachments provide a description of the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project) and substantial evidence to confirm that the project is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR) and would have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its EIR, and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the proposed project does not require any further review under CEQA.  

The project site is an approximately 0.43-acre lot located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, Contra Costa County (APN 509-110-015-5, 509-110-017-1). The project would demolish an existing commercial building and surface parking lot on the site and construct a five-story mixed-use building with 50 market-rate apartment units and approximately 3,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements.  

Attachment A describes the proposed project. This attachment includes a description of the project, location, existing site characteristics, and required approvals and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito is the CEQA lead agency for the project.  

The responses in an environmental checklist (included in Attachment B to this memo) prepared for the project demonstrate for each CEQA topic that because the proposed project was evaluated and impacts were mitigated to the degree possible as part of the SPASP and FEIR, no additional CEQA review is required. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. The responses in the checklist confirm that the project was considered within the scope of the evaluation in the SPASP FEIR; no new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required. This analysis finds that a Notice of Exemption may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.
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The following describes the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project), which is located in the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP). This section includes a summary description of the project location and existing site characteristics, required approvals, and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the lead agency for review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**PROJECT SITE**

The following section describes the location and characteristics of the project site and provides a brief overview of the existing land uses in the project vicinity.

**LOCATION**

The project site is approximately 0.43 acre (18,259-square-foot lot) and is in Contra Costa County at 10963 San Pablo Avenue on the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The site is approximately 1 mile northeast of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay. Regional vehicular access to the project site is via Interstate 80 (I-80) located to the west of the site; the El Cerrito del Norte BART station is 0.7 mile south of the site. AC Transit bus service is available within 0.25 mile of the project site.

The project site’s bordering streets are Jefferson Avenue to the north and San Pablo Avenue to the east. There is a “no build” easement on the southern edge of the property limits, approximately 140 feet long and 10 feet wide.

The general area is surrounded by developed commercial and residential properties. **Figure A-1, Project Regional Vicinity**, shows the site’s regional and local context. **Figure A-2, Project Location**, depicts the project site and surrounding land uses. **Figure A-3** shows the existing site plan for the project site.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS**

The project site is generally level and consists of two adjacent parcels in Richmond (APN 509-110-017-1) and El Cerrito (APN 509-110-015-5). The El Cerrito parcel is on the eastern portion of the site and is an approximately 0.35-acre parallelogram-shaped parcel of land with an approximately 9,135-square-foot one-story commercial building and associated paved and landscaped areas. The Richmond portion of the site is approximately 0.07 acre bordering Jefferson Avenue to the west and is used primarily for parking.

As stated in Section 2.03.04 of the Form-Based Code, a parcel that lies across jurisdictional boundaries is subject to the entitlement process of the jurisdiction in which it has the most land acreage. The other jurisdiction will remain a responsible agency, and projects may be subject to additional design review.

The one-story commercial building is currently occupied by three businesses: a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade/museum. The site is generally flat and slopes west to east and south to north. Approximately 7,000 square feet of asphalt and concrete are used as a parking lot, which is accessible from a driveway along Jefferson Avenue. A total of 20 striped parking spaces are currently on the site. A concrete access ramp is located on the south side of the building, and a wooden access ramp is on the building’s west side. Approximately 1,700 square feet of landscaped area is primarily on the western perimeter of the building.
The sparse vegetation on the site consists of street trees lining the sidewalks and patches of grass and shrubs around the perimeter and throughout the site.

Utilities, including water, electric, natural gas, and sewage service, are readily available.
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EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Medium-Density Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan. In addition, the site is zoned as TOMIMU. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed-use development with a 55-foot height limit. The surrounding properties include multifamily residential buildings to the north, east, and west of the project site, with a mixed-use residential and retail building is to the south of the site.

SAN PABLO AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN

In 2014, the City of El Cerrito adopted the SPASP to provide a guide for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that can be applied along the roadway’s length and to adjacent areas. The SPASP creates a framework for transforming San Pablo Avenue into a multimodal corridor that functions as a place that can provide a multitude of opportunities for living, working, and community life. SPASP key principles are to deepen a sense of place and community identity, attract private investment, strengthen partnerships, enhance the public realm, promote the everyday use of transit, walking, and biking, and foster environmental sustainability.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP were evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR). The SPASP FEIR, certified in 2014, evaluates the environmental impacts of approximately:

- 1,706 units of residential development;
- 3,840 new residents; and
- 243,112 square feet of commercial floor area.

The SPASP includes a Form-Based Code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and infrastructure analysis. The complete streets plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to attract inexperienced users to the area, while proactively mitigating the impacts of future population growth on mobility in the SPASP area. The infrastructure analysis identifies the utility providers for San Pablo Avenue, provides a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and construct a new 39,424-square-foot, five-story, 55-foot-tall podium-style multifamily residential building. The project would include a total of 50 dwelling units and approximately 3,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor along San Pablo Avenue (see Figure A-4, Proposed Site Plan, and Figures A-5, A-6, and A-7, Perspective Project Views). The project would also include private roof decks accessible from the second and fourth floors and from the rooftop. A parking garage with 34
residential parking spaces would be built along Jefferson Avenue. The project would also include 76 spaces for bicycle parking.

Access to the proposed residential units would be via two entrances along San Pablo Avenue and two entrances from the parking lot at the rear of the project site. The proposed residential units include a combination of studios and 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units, as shown in Figure A-4, Proposed Site Plan. Table A-1 lists elements of the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B/1BA</td>
<td>656 SF</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B/1BA</td>
<td>612 SF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>925 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>782 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2B/1BA</td>
<td>742 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>930 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>930 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B/2BA</td>
<td>1,338 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3B/2BA</td>
<td>1,175 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>446 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Area = 39,424 SF
Total Unit Count = 50
Commercial Floor Space = 2,989 SF
Parking
Residential Automobile\(^2\) = 34 units
Bike Parking Short-term = 6 units; Long-term = 76 units
Open Space
Public Space = 1,539 SF
Private Space = 5,588 SF\(^3\)

Notes:
1. Units in square feet
2. All parking unbundled
3. Private balconies, yards, and roof decks

OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING

The proposed project would include a total of 5,588 square feet of private open space area in the form of outdoor balconies, courtyard space, and activity areas for residents. In addition, the project would provide 1,539 square feet of public open space.

The project site includes eight trees; six are to be removed and replaced with new trees planted along Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue.
NO (N) CURB CUT
NO STREET TREE

MAX FIRE HOSE: 150'

NOTE: IT IS ANTIPICAPTED THAT THE (2) APN LOTS WILL BE MERGED INTO ONE EL CERRITO LOT BEFORE BUILDING PERMITS ARE ISSUED.
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ACCESS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

The project would include a parking garage with 31 double-lift parking spaces, 1 individual space, and 2 ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] spaces, for a total of 34 garage parking spaces reserved for residential uses. The parking facility would include three EV charging stations to accommodate electric vehicles. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Avenue. The residential parking would be unbundled from the apartment units, meaning that the spaces would be leased separately from the units.

In addition to vehicular parking, a total of 76 bicycle parking spaces would be included in the interior parking garage and exterior surface lot. Long-term bicycle parking would be in secured corrals in both the southwest corner of the garage and along the south elevation of the building in the southwest corner. Access to long-term bicycle parking would be located along the exterior of the building through side gates located on Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. Bike storage in the garage would be accessible through the lobby or the garage entrance. Short-term parking would be located along the building frontage on both Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. One bicycle stall would be located along Jefferson Avenue and two bicycle stalls would be located along San Pablo Avenue to accommodate a total of six short-term parking spaces.

Pedestrian access to the residences would be provided through a staircase and elevator in the building lobby and a staircase in the garage. The building lobby would be accessible through the main entrance on Jefferson Avenue, through the project garage, and through the walkway on the south side of the project site. The commercial component of the project would be accessible through an entrance along San Pablo Avenue.

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The project site is in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and telecommunications infrastructure. Most of the existing utilities within the project site would be removed and replaced as required by excavation. Existing and proposed utility connections are discussed below.

Water

Water service in El Cerrito is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The project would utilize an existing water main located along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. An existing lateral main provides service to the project site near the southeast corner of the property line.

Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. An existing sewer main runs along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. No existing lateral service is available.

Stormwater

The project would include 13,550 square feet of impervious surfaces. The project would also include approximately 18,620 square feet of drainage management space. Three bioretention areas would be located on the second-floor roof deck and at ground level on the north and south sides of the proposed building. Additionally, the project would provide 2,093 square feet of
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

new water-efficient landscaped areas. A preliminary Stormwater Control Plan for the project is presented as Appendix HYDRO.

APPROVALS/PERMITS

The following approvals and permits would be required for the project:

- City of El Cerrito CEQA review, various entitlements including Tier II Design Review, grading, and building permit approvals
- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) water connections
- Stege Sanitary District (SSD) approval of sewer capacity and connections (per SSD Ordinance 7.2 and California Government Code Section 66013(a))
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) electricity and gas connections
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) stormwater discharge orders R2-2009-0074 and R2-2011-0083
CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in an environmental impact report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project) is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final EIR (SPASP FEIR) and will have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its FEIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project does not require any further review under CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS, Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As described in more detail in the project description (Attachment A), the 0.43-acre project site is currently occupied by a one-story commercial building with associated paved and landscaped areas. The general area surrounding the property is developed with commercial and residential uses. The project site is approximately 1 mile north of the eastern shoreline of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay. The project site is located approximately 0.3 mile east of Interstate 80. There are no designated scenic highways or scenic vistas within 1 mile of the project site.1,2 There would be no damage to scenic resources or scenic highways.

The project would demolish the existing structure and construct a five-story mixed-use residential apartment building as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements. The new building would be constructed on the northeast side of the site.

---


The project would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code and complete streets design and development standards that support and maintain a strong sense of place and visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are consistent with the SPASP FEIR and are located in Chapter 2, Form-Based Code, and Chapter 3, Complete Streets, of the SPASP.

The city’s location between I-80 and the East Bay Hills affords views of the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, and Mt. Tamalpais. The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP FEIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, the East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way, and areas of lower elevation such as hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, the SPASP FEIR requires individual development projects to complete further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan addresses views from the public rights-of-way that run east and west, as well as from BART platforms. The project plans modeled the views from Gladys Court, as shown in Figure B-1. This image shows that that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the San Francisco skyline).

The El Cerrito Zoning Administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required from public rights-of-way of east–west streets for the following reasons:

- The project site is located in the central and western portion of the city, which has a lower elevation and is an area where denser development exists along both sides of San Pablo Avenue.

- Existing conditions on site feature views of Albany Hill, partial views of the East Bay Hills, and Mt. Tamalpais. Upon full buildout, the project would feature a five-story residential building that would afford partial views of the San Francisco skyline, Albany Hill, East Bay Hills, and Mt. Tamalpais.

- The project is not expected to obstruct views of scenic vistas (Albany Hill) from public rights-of-way; views of Albany Hill in the project area are largely obstructed by existing development west and south of the site.

- The project would be consistent with the San Pablo Avenue complete streets design requirements set forth by Chapter 3 of the Specific Plan.

- Streets that run east and west with the potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Jefferson Avenue and Alameda Avenue. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site looking west to Jefferson Avenue and Alameda Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Jefferson Avenue may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the Jefferson Avenue public right-of-way.

---

FIGURE B-1
Existing Project Viewshed

Source: Michael Baker International, 2018
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The SPASP FEIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but it concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of nonreflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less than significant level. The project would implement Mitigation Measure 4-2 and would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. No new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, are required.

Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR; it is within the allowable height limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on visual and aesthetic resources.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 nonagricultural use?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site area is on a developed parcel, and there are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the project site. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation.\(^4\) El Cerrito and the SPASP area do not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract.\(^5\) The project site is a combination of primarily commercial and light industrial purposes, is not currently used for any type of agricultural or forestry use, and is not zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The project site does not meet the definition of forestland provided in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) due to its location in an intensely developed area, which would preclude the management of any forestry resources. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact on agriculture or forestry resources.


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

| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with federal and state standards for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Air quality setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 5 – Air Quality of the SPASP FEIR.

Discussion

Clean Air Plan Consistency

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a nonattainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards. The SPASP FEIR stated the SFBAAB was nonattainment for ozone, fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$), and coarse particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), and there have no changes in attainment status for the air basin since certification of the SPASP FEIR.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines were used for the analysis in the SPASP FEIR to determine whether the Specific Plan would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. When the SPASP FEIR was prepared, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan was the applicable plan. The plan laid out a comprehensive strategy to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, particulate matter (PM), greenhouse gases, and toxic air contaminants. The plan included 18 Stationary Source Measures (SSMs), 10 Mobile Source Measures (MSMs), 17 Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), 6 Land Use and Local Impact Measures (LUMs), and 4 Energy and Climate Measures (ECMs). The SPASP FEIR (page 5-16) concluded that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would increase at a lower rate under the SPASP than population or service population growth, resulting in a less than significant impact related to consistency with the then-applicable clean air plan.
The BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. As described in the 2017 plan, all of the 2010 TCMs were carried forward into the 2017 Clean Air Plan, although the measure descriptions and numbering were updated. In addition, 8 of the 10 MSMs, all 6 LUMs, and all 4 ECMS were carried forward into the 2017 plan. The MSMs primarily address vehicles and their components as they relate to emissions and are not directly applicable to the project. The SSMs are not applicable to the project.

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned. In addition, the project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR.

Consistency with the Climate Action Plan is determined by whether the project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., excessive parking or preclude the extension of a transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, project implementation would not substantially increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the 2017 Climate Action Plan and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the plan or designed to bring the region into attainment. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions**

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-21) identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the SPASP would result in short-term emissions from construction activities, including site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction, fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 5-1 requires that BAAQMD-recommended basic mitigation measures be implemented to control PM emissions during construction and BAAQMD-recommended additional measures to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) and PM$_{2.5}$ and other construction emissions to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced.

Development of the project would result in similar construction-related, potentially significant short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR, and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 would be required. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts due to fugitive dust (PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$) and diesel exhaust (DPM and nitrogen oxide [NOX]) than were evaluated in the SPASP FEIR. Architectural coating activities during construction would result in emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG). Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provides project screening sizes for different land uses. A mid-rise apartment project

---


7 Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.
of fewer than 240 dwelling units would have construction-related emissions of ROG that would be less than significant. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

The SPASP FEIR evaluated operational emissions and concluded the SPASP would not cause significant increases in VMT compared to service population growth and would not interfere with Clean Air Plan control measures (page 5-23). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in accordance with the BAAQMD significance criteria for plan-level analysis of criteria pollutants and precursors. The project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NOx). Project-generated increases in emissions would be predominantly associated with motor vehicle use, energy required for commercial and residential building operations, energy used due to water consumption, energy used in solid waste collection and disposal, and area sources such as hearths and use of landscaping equipment. Mobile emissions from vehicle use are the primary source of NOx. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers. The analysis concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR. Per Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 494 dwelling units would have operational-related emissions of ROG that would be less than significant. The project would contribute to, but would not exceed, operational emissions impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Other Air Pollutants
Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others because of the types of population groups or activities involved. Sensitive population groups include children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, especially those with cardiorespiratory diseases. Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution.

As a mixed-use residential/commercial development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residential buildings adjacent to the project to the west and south. The closest schools are Balboa School approximately 600 feet to the west and St. John the Baptist School approximately 800 feet to the north.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots
Recognizing the relatively low carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less than significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP FEIR (page 16-31), peak-hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the SPASP would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes lower than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

---

Toxic Air Contaminants and PM$_{2.5}$

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-24) concluded that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of DPM, which is a toxic air contaminant (TAC). DPM emissions would be generated with the use of off-road diesel equipment required for demolition, excavation, paving, and other construction activities. Although the use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic, the SPASP FEIR concluded this would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-2 to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling. Based on a qualitative screening assessment, the project’s DPM emissions would be limited because the project site is small (0.43 acre) and would not require grading or excavation beyond building footings, which reduces the need for large diesel-powered, off-road equipment. In addition, implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 would substantially further reduce fugitive dust, diesel PM, and diesel exhaust NOx emissions. Therefore, construction-related emissions of TACs would be less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that could include sensitive receptors, as well as new nonresidential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. For long-term operations, the SPASP FEIR (page 5-25) concluded that if projects under the SPASP are located within the overlay distances in Table 5-7 in the EIR, this would represent a potentially significant impact. SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires a TAC analysis to determine the location of new sensitive receptors within the overlay distances. The project’s residential uses would be within the overlay distances. A health risk screening analysis was completed following the recommended BAAQMD methodology and using the appropriate BAAQMD tools. Four permitted stationary sources were identified within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site: one gasoline dispensing facility, one dry cleaning facility, and two diesel powered emergency generators. The only high-volume roadway identified within the 1,000-foot radius is State Route (SR) 123 (San Pablo Avenue). The project would site new sensitive receptors on the second floor of the building, 22 horizontal feet from the nearest travel lane of SR 123. Using the data from the BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool – Contra Costa County, 20 feet, and the Stationary Source Screening Analysis Tool – Contra Costa County, the increased community screening risk and cumulative risk is shown in Table B-1, accounting for distance using the BAAQMD distance adjustment tools. These risks do not represent the actual health risk to the community; they are conservative screening estimates of maximum risk to determine whether further analysis is required. Community health screening risks are below the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, new sensitive receptor exposure risk due to stationary or mobile source TAC emissions would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

---


Table B-1
Community Health Risk Screening for Existing Stationary Sources,
Highways, and High-Traffic Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (in feet)</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (in one million)</th>
<th>Chronic Hazard Index (HI)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Concentration ($\mu$g/m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito Public Works (Gas Station)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito Fire Dept. (Generator)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Cleaners (Dry Cleaning)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito (Generator)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 123 (San Pablo Avenue)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Individual Significance Threshold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sources</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Cumulative Significance Threshold</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = not applicable. Distances are from the source to the closest project property line.

Asbestos-Containing Materials

The project proposes to demolish existing structures on the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed for the project did not identify any asbestos-containing materials (ACMs).\textsuperscript{11} However, because the existing structure was constructed prior to 1978, ACMs may be present.

Demolition of the existing structures would be subject to the BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 – Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing, which regulates the safe handling and disposal of ACM.\textsuperscript{12} California Health and Safety Code Section 19827.5 requires that local agencies not issue demolition permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants. In accordance with the state regulation, the BAAQMD must be notified prior to demolition or abatement activities. Compliance with state and BAAQMD regulations would

\textsuperscript{11} Basic Environmental. 2015. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

ensure the impacts due to airborne asbestos would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

**Odors**

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-30) identified that the SPASP area would include potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. Most of these major existing sources are, however, already buffered by existing uses. Mitigation Measure 5-4 was adopted to ensure potential land use compatibility impacts due to odors would be appropriately identified and mitigated. Consistent with SPASP policies and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-4, the project would be in an area surrounded by commercial uses and would not be in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated. This would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be required.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 and 5-2, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 5-1 and 5-2. A TAC analysis was prepared in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-3, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential air quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with air quality than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.
### IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

The project is in a highly urbanized area between the El Cerrito and Richmond city limits. The project site is located on 100 percent disturbed land.

Project implementation would largely result in minimal impacts on biological resources because the area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. There are no plant or animal 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 or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands.\(^{13,14}\) No creeks, wetlands, or

---


riparian habitats are near or adjacent to the property; therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts on these habitats.

The SPASP FEIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the SPASP. Removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season could be considered an “unlawful take” under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFWS provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The project would result in the removal of existing grass and shrubs on the project site. However, tree removal would comply with all City requirements to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal. The FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less than significant levels.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1, would be required.

Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and the El Cerrito General Plan. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 6-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on biological resources.
V CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the plan area on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites within the SPASP area, and there is a reasonable possibility that archaeological and paleontological resources could be uncovered during these activities (Impacts 7-2 and 7-3). The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less than significant levels.

The SPASP FEIR identified properties or features within the SPASP area that may be eligible for listing in a local, state, or federal register of historic resources (Impact 7-1). While the building on the project site, at 10963 San Pablo Avenue, was not identified in the SPASP FEIR as potentially eligible for listing as a historical resource, it was evaluated for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) because it was identified as being over 50 years of age.

In compliance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2, a field survey and evaluation for architectural resources was completed, and a records search (#17-1157) was undertaken at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park for the project site and vicinity. However, a field survey for archaeology was not completed because the entire project site is covered with a commercial building and a paved surface parking lot. Based on the records search, there are no known historical or archaeological resources located within the project site. One prehistoric archaeological resource (P-07-004477) was identified approximately 0.25 mile from the project site. P-07-004477 consists of midden soils and shell fragments. Further, this area of El Cerrito has been identified as sensitive for buried prehistoric cultural resources. 

The commercial building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue was evaluated for inclusion in the California Register to determine if it is a historical resource as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5[a]. The evaluation identified 10963 San Pablo Avenue to have significance as one of El Cerrito's oldest buildings; however, it lacks integrity because it is no longer recognizable as a 1902 Italianate-style commercial building. Owners and occupying businesses do not appear to have been influential, and the current architecture is not noteworthy nor associated with a master architect/builder/developer. The building therefore does not appear eligible for listing in the California Register and does not qualify as a historical resource under CEQA. (See Appendix CUL.)

The records search of the project site and the California Register evaluation of 10963 San Pablo Avenue identified no historical or archaeological resources on the project site; however, there is elevated prehistoric archaeological sensitivity and the potential exists for previously unknown cultural resources to be encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site. Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains during construction activities, would be required to be implemented. As such, with implementation of previously identified mitigation measures, the project would have no new impact on cultural resources.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, would be required.

Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. Ground-disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resource impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on cultural resources.
VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Discussion of potential geology and soils impacts associated with the project are based on the geotechnical investigation, which is presented as Appendix GEO in this report.¹⁶

Subsurface Conditions

Boring test results from the project site show alluvial deposits, mostly consisting of hard clays with varying sand content with moderate liquefaction potential. Most recent groundwater testing results for the project site indicate groundwater measurements ranging from 4.8 to 5.7 feet below ground surface (bgs).¹⁷


Seismic Conditions

The closest active earthquake faults in the project vicinity are the Hayward, San Andreas, and Calaveras faults. The Hayward fault is approximately 1 mile from the project site and of the three is the closest. Based on U.S. Geological Survey research, the San Francisco Bay Area will likely experience an earthquake magnitude of 6.7 or greater by 2045.\textsuperscript{18}

According to the geotechnical investigation (Appendix GEO), it is likely the project site would experience damage from seismic ground shaking. Risk of damage to the project site from fault rupturing, landsliding, compaction, liquefaction, and lateral spreading is relatively low.

Summary

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the geologic and soil impacts in the plan area are primarily related to potential ground shaking and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the SPASP area is not located in an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that slope instability hazards are also minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is served by a comprehensive, integrated wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. Neither septic tank systems nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the SPASP, including the project.

The SPASP area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements. In compliance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report for the project site (Appendix GEO). The project would also implement project design features and actions discussed in Appendix GEO to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that grading and construction activities within the SPASP area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques outlined in the geotechnical report would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code and City-required erosion control techniques. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.

VII GREENHOUSE GASES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with state greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change goals and policies for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the BAAQMD. GHG science, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 9 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change of the SPASP FEIR.

GHG emissions in this discussion are presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO$_2$e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO$_2$e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO$_2$ were being emitted.

Discussion

GHG Emissions

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain a methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. BAAQMD thresholds were developed based on substantial evidence that such thresholds represent quantitative levels of GHG emissions, compliance with which means that the environmental impact of the GHG emissions would normally not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA.\(^{19}\,\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\)

The BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they should include in the administrative record for the project. The BAAQMD provides the CEQA Thresholds Options and Justification Report developed by staff in 2009 as a reference for lead agencies when determining appropriate thresholds.

The BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. The lead agency is encouraged to incorporate best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction, as applicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to, using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet, using local building materials of at least

\(^{19}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2009. Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance.

10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.21

For operational emissions, the BAAQMD suggests applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 6.6 metric tons (MT) CO$_2$e per year per service population. The SPASP FEIR compared plan-level GHG emissions to the more conservative BAAQMD project-level efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT CO$_2$e per year per service population.

In the SPASP FEIR (page 9-7), operational GHG emissions in 2040 were estimated for both traffic scenarios—Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift—using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2. Inputs of land use types, sizes, and trip generation rates from the SPASP were used in the modeling. The SPASP FEIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the SPASP would have emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MTCO$_2$e per year per service population under the Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, which would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MTCO$_2$e per year per service population. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR concluded this impact would be less than significant.

The project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth than was analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers, which concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR.22 Therefore, the project would contribute to, but would not exceed, GHG emissions impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Consistency with Adopted Plans to Reduce GHG Emissions

The SPASP FEIR analyzed this impact (page 9-9) and concluded that the SPASP would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the state and local levels regarding GHG emissions. The plan would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce emissions of GHGs. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill 375), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) developed a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) plan as a component of Plan Bay Area 2040.23 This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT. The SPASP furthers these goals locally by supporting higher-density, transit-oriented development that results in a mix of housing types, greater employment density, and community-support services to create a vibrant, walkable Priority Development Area (PDA) supportive of transportation mode shift and economic development.

---

The El Cerrito Climate Action Plan outlines the most effective actions to reduce locally produced GHG emissions and to create a safer and more sustainable El Cerrito. The plan outlines a series of sustainable community strategies, which include encouraging more compact, higher-density infill development to reduce VMT. The SPASP supports the goal to create a walkable, bicycle-friendly San Pablo Avenue supported by strong public transportation use, vital commercial activity, a mix of housing types, pedestrian design elements, green infrastructure, and urban green open spaces.

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned and in support of land use planning strategies identified in Plan Bay Area 2040 and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted plans to reduce GHG emissions. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.

---

# ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Discussion

Hazardous materials impact analysis is based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), which is included as Appendix HAZ of this report. The Phase I ESA identifies recognized environmental conditions (REC) indicating the presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons in structures, soils, groundwater, or surface water on the project site. The Phase I ESA includes a visual evaluation of the presence of asbestos, lead paint, radon, or mold.

---

Basics Environmental. 2015. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. 10963–10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, California.
Project Site

As described in the project description of this report, the property is on a 0.43-acre parcel with a one-story, 9,360-square-foot commercial building and associated pavement and landscaped areas. The parcel is bordered by San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The commercial space is currently occupied by three businesses: a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade and museum. There are currently no hazardous materials or other conditions associated with the three businesses. General observations of the rest of the associated paved and landscaped areas did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains, or spills. No obvious evidence of underground storage tanks, collection drains, sumps, underground hydraulic hoists, distressed vegetation, or surface impoundments were observed on the project site. No wells or groundwater monitoring wells were observed on or near the project site.

Asbestos

The current building on the project site was built prior to 1979, and it is likely that asbestos was used in building construction. No evidence of asbestos was evident on the property; however, an asbestos survey was not conducted for the Phase I ESA. To confirm if any asbestos materials are contained within the structure on the subject site, an asbestos survey should be performed by a trained asbestos professional. Since the existing structure would be demolished, an asbestos inspection would be required, pursuant to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP).

Lead-Based Paint

Lead-based paint is any paint, varnish, stain, or other applied coating that has 1 milligram (mg) per square centimeter (cm) (or 5,000 µg/g by dry weight) or more of lead. A lead-based paint survey was not conducted as part of the Phase I ESA. However, the existing structure was confirmed to have been constructed before the ban on lead-based paints in 1978; thus, lead-based paints may have been used in its construction. As stated in the Phase I ESA, visual observations showed that the painted surfaces of the structure appeared to be in fair condition with no obvious signs of chipping, cracking, and/or significant health risk concerns (Appendix HAZ).

Radon

Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive gas that is odorless, invisible, and without taste. It is released during the natural decay of uranium, which is present in most rock, soil, and water. Radon testing was not conducted at the property as part of the Phase I ESA. However, based on the Map of Radon Zones provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), there is a low potential that radon concentrations at or above 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l) are present at the site. Concentrations at or above 4 pCi/l are considered to be concentrations of concern per the EPA and the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA).

Mold

Molds have been found to cause a variety of health problems in humans, including allergic, toxicological, and infectious conditions. A mold survey was not conducted as a part of the Phase I ESA. However, no obvious evidence of mold or water-damaged materials was observed within easily accessible areas of the structure (Appendix HAZ).

Recognized Environmental Conditions

Recognized environmental conditions (RECs) are defined as “the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under
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conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment."26 The Phase I ESA concluded that there were no apparent obvious RECs on site that warrant further investigation or documentation at the time of the evaluation.

Adjacent Properties
A visual assessment of four adjacent properties was conducted for hazards and hazardous materials as part of the Phase I ESA. The properties included three residential apartment buildings and one mixed-use residential/retail complex. No obvious evidence of significant environmental concerns was observed on any of the sites.

Environmental Database Review
Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) compiled data from available government agency databases on locations of actual and potentially impacted sites within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Copies of the environmental database lists and the location map for the subject site are included in Appendix HAZ. Data includes site assessment for soil vapor screening from contaminated soil or groundwater on or near the project site, soil, water, and leaking underground storage tank (LUST) contamination. Databases include the State Water Resources Control Board’s GeoTracker database and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s EnviroStor website. No properties included in EDR’s investigation would pose a significant environmental risk to the project. A complete list of mapped sites is in Appendix HAZ.

Schools
There are several private and public schools within 1 mile of the project site, including St. John the Baptist, Balboa School, Cameron School, Caliber: Beta Academy, Summit Public School, and Windrush School. The closest schools near the project site are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, a private K–8 school, approximately 800 feet to the north.

Airports and Airstrips
The project site is approximately 20 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the plan area; however, a helipad at Doctors Medical Center is approximately 1.5 miles from the SPASP area.

Emergency Response
The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) is responsible for the City’s Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond share reciprocal duties for emergency response services. The Richmond Fire Department (RFD) Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond’s comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and the RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster.

Wildfire Hazards

Areas of Very High Fire Hazard Severity are designated in the El Cerrito General Plan, and a Special Study Map is prepared and maintained by the City’s Building Official. These areas are located near East Bay Regional Park District open space and certain City parks, but the project is not located in the vicinity of a wildfire hazard area.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the SPASP area. The SPASP did identify the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during project construction due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the SPASP area. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with all applicable, existing, jurisdictional city, regional, and state mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure that potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City of El Cerrito, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Toxic Substances Control requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR determined that the proposed residential, commercial, and open space uses as part of the SPASP would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the SPASP area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substance such as fuel, paint, and solvents but would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The SPASP determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

According to these requirements, the project would be required to investigate any potential soil or groundwater contamination at the site and comply with existing regulations. As the discussion above states, the Phase I ESA prepared for the project concluded that no existing environmental hazards would impact the project.

The closest schools are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, approximately 800 feet to the north. The project, as a residential mixed-use site, would not result in impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school. Because the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated. The SPASP FEIR states that all roadways must be engineered and maintained to support emergency response vehicles and equipment. In addition, the SPASP area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to a wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the

---
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SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground-disturbing activities. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials at or affecting the proposed project site, and there would be no new impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.
**IX HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The existing site consists of an approximately 9,135-square-foot one-story commercial building and an asphalt parking lot which takes up approximately 7,000 square feet of the site. Landscaping surrounds the parking lot and covers approximately 1,700 square feet of the site, with small areas of concrete walkways making up the rest of the site.

The site slopes from west to east and south to north. Runoff from the bordering existing paved roads is collected in five storm drain inlets (three to the north and two to the south) at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and S. 56th Street in the Richmond city limits; the runoff then discharges to an existing 30-inch storm drain line located in S. 56th Street.
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Soil classification for this site is Group D. A geotechnical report describing site soil conditions is presented as Appendix GEO of this report.

Summary
The SPASP FEIR determined that long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP could result in contamination of plan area stormwater runoff with petroleum and other contaminants from motor vehicles. However, compliance with State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and jurisdictional City-required post-construction, non-point-source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with applicable SWRCB and City of El Cerrito water quality protection requirements and conditions would ensure any potential construction period and post-construction water quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Construction projects are also required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of best management practices to control stormwater peak flows and pollutant levels. This requirement is stipulated in Provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). All projects within the SPASP area must comply with NPDES requirements, including the project. The project includes a Stormwater Control Plan presented as Appendix HYDRO of this report. The City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and state requirements as part of the development review process.

The proposed increase in population and traffic associated with the project could increase discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff beyond current levels after partial or full buildout of the SPASP. The project would decrease the amount of pervious surface on the site by replacing the existing 16,477 square feet of impervious surfaces on the site with 13,550 square feet of impervious surfaces. The project would also comply with design specifications and Integrated Management Practices described in Appendix HYDRO. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR identified that portions of the plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the project site is not located in this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. The project is not located near a dam or levee. There are no rivers or streams near the project area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the project is not located near this area.

Applicable Mitigation
No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.
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Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to stormwater discharge. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the hydrology and water quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

The project site is located on two parcels in the cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. It is expected that the two lots will be merged into one lot within the City of El Cerrito’s jurisdiction prior to the issuance of building permits.

### Summary

The SPASP FEIR concluded that project implementation would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use (commercial/housing) development in the plan area at densities and heights within currently permitted limits. Project implementation would not result in the division of an established community because the area was primarily developed prior to completion of the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor; facilitating development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, and public transportation centers; and promoting compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development patterns and land uses.

The project site is designated TOMIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP and zoned as TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher-density area within 1 mile of BART that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the downtown and uptown areas. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot height limit (a height of 65 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The project is generally consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

The project is in full compliance with the development and design standards of the SPASP and would go to the City’s Design Review Board. The project would not deviate from SPASP development standards related to building height, length of building façades, new shadows, and transparency of ground-floor uses (see Section I, Aesthetics, for additional discussion). The project would generally comply with the standards of the TOMIMU designation and would develop the site with a mix of high-density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the SPASP FEIR.
No existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would apply to the project vicinity, and there would be no impact.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial land use changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR, and required by the City of El Cerrito General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in new impacts related to land use and planning.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI</th>
<th>MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project does not involve the loss of an available known resource that would be of value to the region. The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.
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II. NOISE. Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An environmental noise study was prepared for the project and is presented as Appendix NOI of this report. Noise setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 13 – Noise of the SPASP FEIR. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels (dBA) but may be expressed as dB, unless otherwise noted.

Discussion

This section compares noise impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. The project would include residential and commercial uses in a developed area in El Cerrito. Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would result from the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by residential and commercial land uses.

An environmental noise study was prepared for the project and is referenced in this section. The noise study is intended to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1. The study examines the impacts of noise on the proposed noise-sensitive uses of the project site together with the project design features and the applicable city and state noise standards. Future noise level impacts are based on ambient noise measurements conducted at the project site as a component of the noise study.
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Traffic on San Pablo Avenue, adjacent to the project, is the primary contributor to the existing ambient background noise. Other components of the existing noise environment include traffic on Jefferson Avenue, adjacent to the project; traffic on Interstate 80 approximately 0.25 mile to the west; noise from the BART train tracks approximately 550 feet to the east; and operational noise from the adjacent commercial and residential uses (e.g., parking lot activities, building mechanical equipment, people talking).

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. As a mixed-use residential/commercial development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residential buildings adjacent to the project to the west and south. The closest schools are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, approximately 800 feet to the north.

Noise and Land Use Compatibility

The SPASP FEIR found that residential land uses facilitated by the SPASP would be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 60 dB Ldn from traffic noise and 70 dB Ldn from BART noise. Future noise levels would exceed El Cerrito’s land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-1, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less than significant level.

The noise study identified traffic noise on San Pablo Avenue as the dominant source of noise in the project vicinity. The eastern portion of the project site would have a higher noise level than other areas of the site because it is adjacent to San Pablo Avenue. The noise levels on the San Pablo Avenue side of the site measured 73 dB Ldn, and the noise levels on the Jefferson Avenue side of the site measured 64 dB Ldn.

The City sets forth normally acceptable noise level standards for land use compatibility and interior noise exposure of new development. Per City Municipal Code Section 19.21-50, the normally acceptable exterior noise level for residential units near is 60 dB Ldn. However, the outdoor standard will not normally be applied to the small decks associated with apartments and condominiums; these will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The normally acceptable interior noise level for residential units is 45 dB Ldn.

The environmental noise study concluded that some of the project’s residential units would require windows and exterior doors with sound ratings above typical construction-grade materials and that exterior walls might require an additional layer of gypsum board. Figure B-2 shows sound transmission class (STC) rating recommendations for the proposed apartments.

Implementation of the recommendations in the noise study would reduce noise levels in residential areas to below the maximum levels defined by the City’s General Plan policies and Municipal Code. Therefore, the impact of noise on sensitive receptors sited by the project would be less than significant with implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 13-1 and the
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recommendations of the noise study. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Consistent with SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-1, the project design shall implement the following measures for all San Pablo Avenue facing units to reduce interior noise impacts in compliance with City noise standards:

- Interior Noise Control Measures:
  - Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 32.
  - Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot.
  - Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8" Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC).
  - Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8" type X or Type C.
  - Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

Stationary Source Noise Impacts
The SPASP FEIR identified that implementation of the SPASP would introduce commercial uses adjacent to residential land uses. Specific tenants for the proposed commercial uses have not been identified, but uses could include retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, or cafes. New commercial development proposed along with or next to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards. The SPASP FEIR identified this as a potentially significant impact and identified Mitigation Measure 13-2, which requires site-specific analysis for proposed commercial uses to reduce long-term noise impacts to a less than significant level. A site-specific analysis of the noise levels associated with these uses is provided below.

Implementation of the project would generate various on-site stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, parking lot activities, and solid waste collection and recycling operations. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors in the project vicinity are the residences approximately 60 feet north of the project site boundary.

HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or located within mechanical rooms. The noise sources could take the form of fans, pumps, air compressors, chillers, or cooling towers. HVAC operations would be required to meet all City noise standards.
This concludes our environmental noise study for 10963 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA. Please contact us with questions.

FIGURE B-2
Window STC Ratings for Apartments, Floors 2 through 5

Source: CSDA Design Group, 2017

Not To Scale
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Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location, sizing, and any sound enclosures, are unknown at the time of this analysis. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, a conservative level of 80 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related noise with a location on the building roof approximately centered above the proposed commercial space.\footnote{L_{\text{max}}: The maximum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.} These off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 54 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ during the day and 60 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ during the night. Therefore, the HVAC equipment noise would be in compliance with the City’s exterior daytime and nighttime noise standards for residential uses.

The primary parking for the project would be in an enclosed first-floor parking garage. Typical parking noise includes engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, tire noise, and people conversing. These noises would be substantially reduced by the exterior walls of the parking garage and noise levels at nearby residential buildings and would not be expected to exceed the City’s daytime or nighttime noise standards.

Additional on-site stationary noise sources would include delivery trucks and loading noise. Because the proposed retail space is less than 3,000 square feet, deliveries from large trucks would be rare. Deliveries from small trucks and vans would not be of a sufficient number to create a perceptible increase in ambient noise above the existing traffic noise. Therefore, stationary noise impacts due to long-term operation of the project would be less than significant.

Mobile Source Noise Impacts

Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. The SPASP DEIR (page 13-21) found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the SPASP, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area, and the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases would be less than 1 dB $L_{\text{dn}}$. Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial, and the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project vicinity. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers; the analysis concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR.\footnote{Fehr & Peers. 2017. 10963 San Pablo Avenue – Transportation Impact Analysis.} This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Construction Noise

The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction. Large pieces of earthmoving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 80 to 85 dB measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods.
The SPASP concluded that although construction noise would be localized to the individual site, businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout the plan horizon. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dB or higher. Such a large increase in noise levels, although short term in duration, would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, but concluded that construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The project would be on a small site, which would limit the size and number of construction equipment in use. In addition, since the project site is flat and already developed, no grading activities would be required. The project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The project would require the implementation of the Municipal Code, City of El Cerrito General Plan policies, and Mitigation Measure 13-3, as included in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Construction-Related Vibration**

The SPASP FEIR identified that construction projects within the SPASP area may, in some cases, be located directly adjacent to existing structures, including weakened structures. Construction activities may include demolition of existing structures, site preparation work, foundation work, pile driving, and new building erection. Demolition for an individual site may last several weeks and at times may produce substantial vibration. Vibratory driven piles or driving drilled caissons could be used to stabilize building foundations.

Depending on the proximity of existing structures to each construction site, the structural soundness of the existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, vibration levels may be high enough to damage existing structures. Given the scope of the SPASP and the close proximity of many existing structures, groundborne vibration impacts would be potentially significant.

As with any type of construction, vibration levels may at times be perceptible. However, construction phases that have the highest potential for producing vibration (pile driving and vibratory compacting) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. With the use of administrative controls, such as notifying neighbors of scheduled construction activities and scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with the least potential to affect nearby businesses, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and would not result in a physical or perceived significant impact.

The SPASP FEIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4 to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, jackhammers, and related construction equipment entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the proximity of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce groundborne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Ground Vibration from BART Operations**

The SPASP FEIR identified that future development under the SPASP would not expose persons to excessive vibration from BART operations. This impact would be less than significant.
Along the entire SPASP area, BART operates on an elevated platform. According to data in the Federal Transportation Agency (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, vibration levels resulting from BART would be well below the 72 VdB guidelines for Category 2 land uses near the footprint of the elevated structure.\textsuperscript{38} Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The project is more than 500 feet from the BART tracks. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to any new or more significant groundborne vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Aircraft Noise**

The SPASP FEIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the project. The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site. However, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dB CNEL noise contours of any public airport, nor does any portion of the project site lie within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport.\textsuperscript{39} Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources, and there would be no impact.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4. A noise study was prepared in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1 and a significant impact was identified. The noise study identified measures to reduce the impact to less than significant. An analysis of stationary source noise impacts was completed in this discussion in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 13-2, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential noise and vibration impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with noise than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.

\textsuperscript{38} Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is approximately 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Under conditions where there are a frequent number of events per day, the FTA has established thresholds of 65 VdB for Category 1 buildings, 72 VdB for Category 2 buildings, and 75 VdB for Category 3 buildings.

\textsuperscript{39} CNEL: a weighted average of community noise level over time.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Project consistency for population and housing is evaluated based on SPASP FEIR potential environmental impacts that could occur with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. The project would include 2,989 square feet of retail space (a reduction of 6,146 square feet over existing conditions) and 60,560 square feet of residential space. The 2017 population in El Cerrito was 23,549. There are approximately 10,720 housing units in El Cerrito. ABAG expects the number of housing units to increase by about 11.9 percent between 2010 and 2040, to projected total of 12,000 housing units.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the population growth associated with the SPASP would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the SPASP boundaries. SPASP implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth in a transit-rich, mixed-use plan area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts.

Table B-2 shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated in the SPASP FEIR and shows existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. Because the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.

---

Table B-2  
Existing and Proposed Housing Units and Population within the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluated in the SPASP FEIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>968&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Estimated population associated with approved units, under construction units, and the project was determined by allowable persons per unit for studio, 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom apartments.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project in and of itself would not substantially contribute to significant population growth in El Cerrito. The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in the SPASP. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the population and housing impacts of the project, and no new impacts would result.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV  PUBLIC SERVICES. 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 following public services:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The closest fire station is located at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, approximately 530 feet from the project site.

The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) has automatic aid response agreements with the Richmond Fire Department (RFD), the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and the Albany Fire Department. For the 2013–2014 fiscal year, the ECFD had 37 personnel; two paramedic assignments were authorized for each responding engine to provide advanced life support services during emergency medical responses. The El Cerrito General Plan states a goal to maintain an average emergency response time for the first fire engine of less than 6 minutes for 95 percent of all emergency calls for service, provided adequate financial resources are available. The RFD has a total of 97 positions: 93 sworn personnel plus 3 administrative staff and an emergency services manager. The RFD has seven fire stations, seven engine companies, one truck company, two rescue units, one HazMat unit, and one breathing support unit. All RFD personnel are trained to the level of EMT-D and HazMat First Responder Operational.

The ECFD is responsible for the City's Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The RFD Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond's comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster.

Project implementation would not require the El Cerrito and Richmond fire departments to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand associated with implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, the SPASP FEIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel would be funded by currently adopted public facility fees levied on the new development (in Richmond) and by the annual budget review and allocation (in El Cerrito). Given these factors, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Because the population and housing units would fall within the total development...
anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

**Police Protection**

The El Cerrito Police Department (ECPD) provides community police services through three divisions: Field Operations, Administrative and Support, and Special Operations. The ECPD operates out of the Public Safety Building at 10900 San Pablo Avenue. The City contracts with state and other local agencies to provide and support police services. Police dispatching is contracted with the Richmond Police Department (RPD); criminalist services and animal control services are contracted with Contra Costa County.

ECPD staffing for 2012 included 46 sworn officers and 10.55 equivalent professional staff. Four teams patrol the city 24 hours a day year-round.

Increased demand associated with project implementation would be negligible and would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The SPASP identified police department–required approvals that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. In addition, the project falls within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR and would not result in new impacts associated with police services.

**Public Schools**

The project is located in the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). The following public schools would serve students in the SPASP area: Fairmont Elementary School (K–5), Harding Elementary School (K–5), Madera Elementary School (K–5), Fred T. Korematsu Middle School (6–8), and El Cerrito Senior High School (9–12). None of the schools are in the SPASP area. Table B-3 shows school district student yield factors for 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Unit Type</th>
<th>Grades K–6 Students</th>
<th>Grades 7–8 Students</th>
<th>Grades 9–12 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached Units</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached Units</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Attached Units</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Davis Demographics & Planning, Inc., April 23, 2013; San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR, June 2, 2014

Note: Yield factors represent students generated per household across the school district.

The SPASP FEIR evaluated the impact that the SPASP’s anticipated 1,706 new residences and the associated increase in expected student population would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in district schools over the 25-year horizon of SPASP implementation. The SPASP FEIR concluded that new students would be accommodated in existing schools, and plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. The project would add 50 new housing units and increase the population by 142 residents. These numbers would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR (refer to Section XIII, above); the project would also generate students within the assumptions of the SPASP FEIR. As such, existing school facilities can accommodate the project.
**Parks and Recreational Facilities**

The City of El Cerrito Recreation Department offers a variety of family activities and programs, including visual arts, sports, tutoring, performing arts, swimming, child care, martial arts, and special events. The department also schedules activities and rentals of buildings, picnic areas, sports fields, and tennis courts. Public parks in the project vicinity include Baxter Creek Park, Central Park, and Cerrito Vista Park.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and recreation facilities meets the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP. As discussed in further detail in Section XV, Recreation, of this document, the SPASP FEIR concludes that the impacts on parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. The project includes private open space as well as new public open space adjacent to Jefferson Avenue. Additionally, the SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluates public service impacts and the project’s impacts are included in and analyzed by the SPASP FEIR. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the project has no new impacts on public services.
**ENVIROMENTAL CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV</th>
<th>RECREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The project would increase the local population by 142 residents, which would be negligible compared to the total population. Open space level of service levels per 1,000 residents are 5 acres for El Cerrito and 3 acres for Richmond. Project implementation would not increase demand for parks and recreational facilities, and SPASP service levels of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents would be maintained.

The project would include a total of 5,588 square feet of private open space in the form of balconies and outdoor courtyard space for residents. In addition, the project would provide commercial and public open space for residents and patrons consistent with SPASP FEIR requirements. Because the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would conform to SPASP and General Plan open space standards for El Cerrito and Richmond. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including parks and recreations impacts. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR and General Plan policies. Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on parks and recreation.

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

This section compares traffic impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. A traffic study and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan have been prepared for the project and are presented as Appendix TRA of this report.

**Trip Generation**

Table B-4 presents the project’s trip generation and compares the trips generated to the assumptions in the SPASP FEIR. Using the same trip generation methodology used in the SPASP FEIR, it is estimated that the project would generate about 17 AM peak-hour and 32 PM peak-hour trips.
### Table B-4
#### Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size (^a)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (#223)</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center (#820)</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Trip Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donut Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Trip Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Fehr & Peers. 2017. 10963 San Pablo Avenue – Transportation Impact Analysis.

\(a\). KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit

\(b\). ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP FEIR trip generation methodology. AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.26 trips per DU (31 percent in, 69 percent out) PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.34 trips per DU (58 percent in, 42 percent out)

\(c\). ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 820 (shopping center), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP FEIR trip generation methodology. AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.84 trips per KSF (62 percent in, 38 percent out) PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 3.26 trips per KSF (48 percent in, 52 percent out)

The SPASP FEIR assumed developments at planned/entitled and high priority opportunity sites as part of the traffic analysis for the EIR. Although the project is within the SPASP area, it was not included as a planned/entitled project or priority opportunity site as part of the EIR traffic analysis. However, this analysis compares the project to the high priority opportunity sites analyzed in the EIR to ensure the project does not exceed the total assumptions made for the SPASP area. Since the certification of the SPASP FEIR, four developments, including this project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the City’s approval process. The four developments combined would generate about 26 morning and 47 evening net new peak-hour trips. The combined trip generation is less than the total trip generation estimated for all the opportunity sites in the SPASP FEIR.

As uses proposed by the project are consistent with the assumptions in the SPASP FEIR and the project would generate fewer automobile trips than assumed in the SPASP FEIR, the project would not result in additional impacts on traffic operations at the intersections analyzed in the SPASP FEIR.

**Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation**

Residents would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Avenue, about 130 feet west of San Pablo Avenue. The driveway would provide access to a secured parking garage. Section 2.04.02.02 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires two-way driveways for

---
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buildings on corner lots of community streets to be no wider than 20 feet and located along the adjacent side street. San Pablo Avenue in the project vicinity is classified as a community street. The proposed driveway has a width of 20 feet, which meets the Form-Based Code requirements.

Project Driveway Site Distance

The driveway on Jefferson Avenue would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Vehicles parked on Jefferson Avenue on both sides of the driveway may block sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on Jefferson Avenue. Trees planted on both sides of the driveway may also affect visibility of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than 6 feet from the ground. The project would paint 10 feet of red curb on both sides of the driveway to ensure adequate sight distance.

Bicycle Parking, Access, and On-Site Circulation

Per the requirements of the Form-Based Code, the project would require 76 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 6 short-term spaces. As proposed, the project meets those requirements.

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses. As described on page A-19, access to long-term bicycle parking would be located along the exterior of the building through side gates located on Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. Bike storage in the garage would be accessible through the lobby or the garage entrance. Short-term parking would be located along the building frontage on both Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. One bicycle stall would be located along Jefferson Avenue, and two bicycle stalls would be located along San Pablo Avenue to accommodate a total of six short-term parking spaces.

Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation

Pedestrian access to the residences would be provided through a staircase and elevator in the building lobby and a staircase in the garage. The building lobby would be accessible through the main entrance on Jefferson Avenue, through the project garage, and through the walkway on the south side of the site. The commercial component of the project would be accessible through an entrance along San Pablo Avenue.

The SPASP Form-Based Code (Section 2.04.02) requires a minimum of 14 feet of sidewalk space along community streets: 8 feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and 6 feet of amenity space, which includes landscaping. For neighborhood streets, the Form-Based Code requires a minimum of 10 feet of sidewalk space: 5 feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and 5 feet of amenity space. The project would include 14-foot sidewalk widths along San Pablo Avenue, a community street, and 10-foot sidewalk widths along Jefferson Avenue, a neighborhood street, which would meet code requirements for total sidewalk width. The project would also provide 8 feet and 5 feet of pedestrian right-of-way along San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue, respectively, which would meet code requirements.

Transit Access

AC Transit provides nearby transit service to the project site with a bus stop on southbound San Pablo Avenue, at the near side of the San Pablo Avenue/Jefferson Avenue intersection (just north of Jefferson).

Vehicle Parking and TDM Requirements
The project would provide a secured parking garage with a two-way drive aisle and a total of 34 spaces, including 31 double-lift parking spaces, 1 surface space, and 2 ADA spaces. The surface parking space dimensions are approximately 9 feet in width and 18 feet in length, meeting Form-Based Code requirements for perpendicular parking spaces.

TOMIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) requires a maximum of 1.5 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit. There is no required parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square feet. For projects proposing a residential parking ratio between zero and one space per unit, additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures and a parking study are required.

Table B-5 summarizes the required and proposed parking for the project. The Form-Based Code would limit parking to a maximum of 75 off-street residential parking spaces for the project. The project would provide 34 spaces (corresponding to 1.4 spaces per unit) and is therefore within the allowable number of parking spaces for TOMIMU residential developments.

Section 2.05.07.07 of the Form-Based Code requires that at least 10 percent of the total number of parking spaces provided for a multifamily residential project be pre-wired to allow for electric vehicle (EV) charging, with at least one space being an accessible parking space. The site plan designates three parking spaces as pre-wired to accommodate EV charging, one of which is an accessible space, which would meet code requirements. An additional parking space is designated as a run conduit for a future EV station.

Table B-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Required Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Supply Ratio (spaces/unit) 0.68


Notes:
-- DU = dwelling units; KSF = 1,000 square feet
-- The project is not required to provide commercial parking spaces, as the proposed commercial space is less than 3,000 square feet.
-- Source: SPASP Form-Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 – TOMIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential; Max 1.5 spaces per DU

The project would be required to implement a basic TDM plan. The project proposes the following TDM strategies that would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project:

The Plan requires additional TDM measures consisting of: 1) subsidizing the purchase of Clipper Cards for each residential unit of the proposed building for one year. The subsidy is to be $3.00 per day per residential unit; and 2) designating the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) creating TDM marketing materials and providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling.
Applicable Mitigation

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in new impacts related to transportation. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the transportation impacts of the project, and no new impacts related to transportation would result.

Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, no new impacts related to transportation would result.
**Environmental Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, features, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) A listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(k). or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this document, Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project. This mitigation measure would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

In addition, subsequent to certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 states that prior to the release of an EIR or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because (a) this checklist supports the findings that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162; (b) no new or substantially more severe significant effects could occur under the project; (c) no new mitigation measures would be required; (d) the project is within the scope of the environmental review of the SPASP FEIR; and (e) no further review under CEQA is required, the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for this project. However, as stated above, SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project and would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts on tribal cultural resources) of the project, and no new impacts would result.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand, in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Existing water utility infrastructure is present along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. There is an existing lateral service near the southwest corner of the property. Existing sewer mains are present along San Pablo Avenue. Estimated domestic water consumption on the project site is 6,000 gallons per day (gpd). Wastewater generation based on project conditions would be 5,300 gpd.

The SPASP FEIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of buildout of the SPASP; average daily demand would be 882,720 gallons gpd, which represents less than 1 percent of the planning level water demand forecast in the Urban Water Management Plan. The SPASP FEIR concluded that this represents a small increase and would be a less than significant impact on water supply. The SPASP FEIR also noted that development within the SPASP area would incorporate the City’s requirements for adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards; application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process; coordination of development review with EBMUD (including consistency with the Urban Water Management Plan); and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigation required as conditions of approval. The SPASP FEIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the SPASP, including the project, would require less than 1 percent of EBMUD’s forecast planning-level water demand for its service area.
by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that development associated with the SPASP would result in less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that the wastewater and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, to accommodate new development facilitated by the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR included recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements.

The project would rely on potable and nonpotable water for both domestic use and fire protection from existing major facilities, including reservoirs and pumping plants which are serviced by EBMUD. Service would be granted subject to EBMUD regulations governing water services, which may include water main extensions and/or off-site pipeline improvements.

Construction of the project-related utility infrastructure would be temporary and would occur within existing public rights-of-way, City property, a project development site, or private property subject to a municipal easement.

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via an 18-inch collector main along Potrero Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Potrero Avenue and Schmidt Lane. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, a district-wide per fixture sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge is required to be paid by new development to the district. The connection/capacity charge funds sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP.

Currently the SSD imposes a sewer connection charge on all development projects within its service territory. The purpose of the charge is to have new development buy into a fair share of the district’s existing sanitary sewer system. The SSD uses these funds to acquire, construct, install, and replace existing capital facilities and other assets.

In September 2017, a special study was completed to help plan for future developments in the SPASP. Without pipe upsizing, the anticipated development in the SPASP would surcharge existing facilities. An additional capacity charge will fund sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP. For new connections and increased discharges in the SPASP, both residential and nonresidential developments will pay $217.89 per fixture unit over and above district-wide sewer connection and capacity fees for existing structures.

The SSD may also may require that larger projects within its service territory analyze capacity impacts on the existing sanitary sewer system. Larger development projects include:

44 Based on the SSD’s estimate that a dwelling unit generates on average 143 gallons per day (Urban Economics 2017).
- 10 housing units
- a minimum of 10,000 square feet of commercial space
- 1,000 square feet of restaurant space

Based on these criteria, the project would be categorized as a large development project because it would build more than 10 residential units. The developer would also submit a sewer capacity plan to the City for approval.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the SPASP area. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulations. Moreover, the projected solid waste would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient capacities to accommodate development included as part of the SPASP, including the project. As such, solid waste impacts would remain less than significant.

Applicable Mitigation

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in new impacts related to utilities and service systems. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the project, and no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.

Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.
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APPENDIX CUL: CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES
10963 San Pablo Avenue
Historical Resource Evaluation
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This Historic Resource Evaluation memorandum examines the historic significance and integrity of the property addressed 10963 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito (APN: 509-110-015), which was built in 1902. The study provides a record of research findings, evaluation according to the California Register of Historical Resources significance criteria and aspects of integrity, and culminates in a preliminary determination of the property's eligibility for designation as a Historic Resource.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Current Historic Status

- National Register of Historic Places – Not Listed
- California Register of Historical Resource – Not Listed
- Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory – Not listed
- City of El Cerrito - No local inventory of historic resources; not listed.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps

- 1926 – The only Sanborn map edition available for the City of El Cerrito was published in 1926. The map shows that the current parcel consisted of a number of smaller lots, some of which were developed and others vacant. A two-story rooming house with a projecting canopy along its street-facing facades, stood at the southwest corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Street intersection. Scattered outbuildings and a small dwelling sat to its south. The rooming house had a much smaller footprint than the current building (less than one-quarter the current footprint) and the outbuildings and dwelling all stood within the footprint of the current building on the parcel (pg. 8)
Aerial Photographs

The earliest aerial photograph available via the Historic Aerials website\(^1\) dates to 1946 and shows the subject building to nearly the full extent of its current footprint, minus an addition along the south side that is known to have been added in 1953. A projecting canopy along portions of the street-facing facade appears to be that which was present in the 1926 Sanborn map image and definition within the roof surface and visible shadows suggest that the original 1902 building remained present, possibly in its two-story form, with the larger building formed from additions to the south and west sides of the original structure.

Later aerial photographs from 1958 and 1959 appear to show that the canopy was removed by that time and there is less definition in the roof surface, suggesting that the second story of the original building had been removed. Additionally, by 1958 the 20' wide concrete block addition (see building permit #3177, below) had been added to the south side of the building and is visible in aerial photographs.

Later, between 1968 and 1980, the rear southwest corner of the building appears to have been expanded with a small addition that infilled the corner and created the current projecting bay at the rear of the building.

Building Permit Records

The following building permit records are on file at the City of El Cerrito Building Division:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Permit #</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>Store addition, remodeling, install sign for Van's Donuts. One-story masonry block addition to store – one-story masonry block wall on south side, 20' x 80', attached to present building, tar and gravel roof, plaster interior, unfinished storage area and concrete floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Historic Aerials by NETRONline; Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC, 1999-2017; www.historicaerials.com. Actual image not included due to copyright restrictions.

1955 4252 Install and connect sign for Van's Donuts. 2’ x 6’ sign, projecting 8’ over public right of way. Mounted to parapet and supported by guy wires attached to roof and facade. Owner [of business]: Fred L. Van Amburg

1989 7575 Alteration – 2x4 studs, 16” centers between studs, 8' high spanning across 19' space, 4'-4” doorway, 1/2” sheet rock.

1997 None Lot line adjustment between APNs 509-110-001 and 509-110-002, and 509-110-003 and 509-110-013. The proposed easement will be appurtenant to adjust APN 509-110-001 and will encumber adjusted APN 509-110-002. The easement will provide for access, awnings, and other appurtenances and will prohibit building of any structures in the easement area. The easement will terminate if and when the existing building on adjusted APN 510-110-001 is removed.

1997 ? (possibly related to 97-1045) Exterior alterations to storefront.

1997 97-1045 Exterior alteration – extend height of parapet from 10” to 20” on south wall. Owner: Ruby Violet Pozzan

1998 98-0536 Install ventilation hood system. Owner: Ruby Violet Pozzan

1999 98-1044 Cooking hood installation. Owner: Lander International

2006 05-1308 Minor kitchen remodel at Goody Donuts. Owner: Cheeryble Properties

Chain of Title & Occupancy

Gathered from city/county directories, Federal census records, building permit records, and historical essays found on the El Cerrito Historical Society website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant/Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902 – ca. 1910</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.1910 – ca. 1916</td>
<td>Joe Villalobos (?)</td>
<td>Joe Villalobos Saloon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.1916 – ca. 1926</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1926</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>rooming house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca.1932 – ca. 1975</td>
<td>Angelo Fara</td>
<td>Angelo's Market (groceries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1975 - 1998</td>
<td>Ruby Violet (Fara) Pozzan</td>
<td>various donut shops (Van's, Momsy's, Goody), Angelo's Market?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 - current</td>
<td>Lander International</td>
<td>Goody Donut, Hair Extraordinaire, Playland-Not-at-the-Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architect & Builder

No original building permit or other archival information available identifying architect and/or builder.
Miscellaneous Notes

- “At the southwest corner of Jefferson and San Pablo in 1916, stood the Joe Villalobos Saloon, a two story building with rooms upstairs and very tall eucalyptus trees along side the building. This building still stands and is now occupied by the present day Angelo's Market.”
- “[Byron P. Pozzan] married Ruby Fara 48 years ago and together they owned and operated Angelo's market in El Cerrito.” (When and for how long they Pozzans continued to operate Angelo's Market is unclear.)

Historic Photographs

![View south down San Pablo Avenue, subject property is the two-story building on the right containing Joe Villalobos' saloon; photograph undated.](image)


---


EVALUATION

Historical Significance

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

In order for a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found significant under one or more of the following criteria.

- **Criterion 1 (Events):** Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

- **Criterion 2 (Persons):** Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

- **Criterion 3 (Architecture):** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.
- **Criterion 4 (Information Potential)**: Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Resources eligible for the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.  

The building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue appears to be eligible for individual listing in the California Register under one of the above criteria. A full evaluation follows:

**Criterion 1 (Event)**

The building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue may be associated with historical events and patterns of development significant to the history of El Cerrito or the State of California that would raise it to a level of individual significance and eligibility. Although no specific events of historical importance are known to have occurred at the property, the building falls into the pattern of early initial development that established the nascent town of El Cerrito. The city was not incorporated until 15 years later, in 1917. The original building was constructed in 1902 and is one of the oldest buildings in the city. The El Cerrito Historical Society identifies the ten oldest buildings in the city, with the oldest built in 1895, and 10963 San Pablo shown to be among three built in 1902. It is one of the youngest three in the grouping of oldest buildings, but still represents a vestige of El Cerrito's founding and pre-incorporation era. The building was built along San Pablo Avenue, a main thoroughfare through El Cerrito, then and now, which fits with general trends locally, regionally, and nationwide, of commercial buildings being established along routes of easy access and, thus, forming the hub or spine of a growing town. The El Cerrito Historical Society disclaims that their information on the ten oldest buildings “is based on the build dates in the Contra Costa County Records. Some of the buildings have been modified such that character-defining features may no longer be evident.” This disclaimer regarding modification and loss of character-defining features certainly applies to the building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue, which has been altered to to the point of being unrecognizable. If the building continued to retain integrity it might be eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events); however, its lack of integrity negates the significant associations described above (see Integrity section, below).

**Criterion 2 (Persons)**

The commercial building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue was originally small enough that it housed a single business, first a saloon, then a grocery store. It has since grown to accommodate three storefronts and associated commercial units. Names that were found to be most strongly associated with the businesses housed at the property over the years include Joe Villalobos, Angelo Fara, and Ruby V. (Fara) Pozzan. These three also appear to have owned the property during the periods when they operated businesses in the building. It is unclear whether Villalobos was the person responsible for the construction of the subject building, or if his saloon was the first business to be housed in it, as his presence at the property can only be traced back as far as 1916. Basic biographical information for both he and Fara indicates that they were both immigrant business owners. Ruby Pozzan continued her father's grocery businesses for some time after his presumed death and was landlord to other businesses that came to be located in the expanded building. All three appear to have been well-known local business proprietors, although none have been confirmed as city founders, early business leaders, or otherwise stand out as having significant contributions or accomplishments that would make them significant to local or state history. Based on this analysis, the property is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 2 (Persons).

---

Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design)

The building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue does not exhibit high architectural merit and has detrimentally diminished integrity. It was originally a two-story building that appears to have been designed in a modest iteration of the Italianate style. It was likely clad with horizontal wood siding. It had tall narrow window openings with what appear to be double-hung sashes, typical of the Victorian era. It had a front-facing gable roof and the majority of its ornament was found on its false-front parapet, which appears to have featured a projecting cornice, block modillions, and a shaped and tabbed parapet profile. Even as such, the building does not appear to have been superlative among other Italianate style commercial buildings of the day, which are found throughout the East Bay and beyond. Today, it has been so drastically modified that no vestige of the building’s original appearance remains. It currently bears a common and unremarkable utilitarian commercial aesthetic characterized by a one-story form, flat roof, stucco siding, and large extruded aluminum multi-lite storefront windows. No architect or builder were found to have designed or constructed the building, so it cannot claim association with a master of either trade. Because the building lacks architectural merit and physical integrity, and is not the work of any known architect or builder, it does not rise to a level of individual significance that would make it eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design).

Criterion 4 (Information Potential)

The analysis of 10963 San Pablo Avenue for eligibility under Criterion 4 (Information Potential) is primarily concerned with the discipline of archaeology and is beyond the scope of this report.

Integrity

In order to qualify for listing in the California Register, a property must possess significance under one of the aforementioned criteria and have historic integrity. The process of determining integrity is similar for both the California Register and the National Register. The same seven variables or aspects that define integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association—are used to evaluate a resource’s eligibility for listing in the California Register and the National Register. According to the National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, these seven characteristics are defined as follows:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.

Setting addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building/s.

Materials refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.

Feeling is the property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

The building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue retains integrity of location, having never been moved from its original site on the west side of San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito. The integrity of setting is weak, however; as the surrounding neighborhood has changed greatly since the building's construction in 1902 and is now a dense urban corridor characterized by commercial and high-density residential properties of non-historic/recent construction. The subject building has lost all integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, having been drastically enlarged and remodeled to the extent that the original building is greatly changed and no longer recognizable. It has been reduced in height from two to one stories; subsumed by extensive additions and accretions that have more than quadrupled it in size; and re-clad, re-fenestrated, and remodeled with modern materials such as stucco and extruded aluminum sash windows that bear no reference to historic materials or the original appearance of the building. Subsequently, integrity of feeling and association are also lost, because the building no longer expresses the historic Italianate aesthetics of its time period and its current appearance obscures perception and understanding of its age, original use, and architectural character. Overall, the building lacks integrity, which compounds its ineligibility for historic designation.

CONCLUSION

The building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue could be historically significant and eligible for California Register designation as one of the City of El Cerrito's oldest buildings; however it has lost integrity so drastically that it is no longer recognizable nor identifiable as the 1902 Italianate style commercial building it once was. Owners and occupying businesses during the historic period and later do not appear to have been influential and the current architecture is not noteworthy nor associated with a master architect/builder/developer. The building, therefore, does not appear to be eligible for listing on the California Register and subsequently does not qualify as a historic resource under CEQA.

CURRENT TENANT

The building is currently occupied by three businesses; Goody Donut shop, Hair Extraordinaire salon (possibly out of business), and the most prominent tenant, Playland-Not-at-the-Beach. The latter is a non-profit, volunteer operated “museum of fun” that houses pinball machines, arcade and carnival games, antique amusement devices, and other amusements, as well as historic exhibits with artifacts from the Sutro Baths and Whitney's Playland in San Francisco.

Playland-at-the-Beach was a seaside amusement park that was founded at San Francisco's Ocean Beach in 1884. The first ride was a “gravity railroad” roller coaster. A steam railroad and, later, trolley lines served Ocean Beach from downtown San Francisco and the amusement park grew to include numerous concessionaire-operated games and rides, as well as the nearby attractions of Cliff House and Sutro Baths. In the early 1920s, the various independent attractions began to be bought up by the partnership of Arthur Looff and John Friedle, then George and Leo Whitney, for whom it was named Whitney's Playland in 1928. By 1934, the amusement park occupied three city blocks and included 14 rides, 25 concessions, and five restaurants. The Whitneys purchased Cliff House and Sutro Baths, bringing everything under single ownership, which lasted until George Whitney's death in 1958. Post-World War II saw the slow deterioration and downsizing of Playland, exacerbated by Whitney's death. In 1972, the park was torn down. A condominium development now stands on the site.

---

5 Wikipedia, “Playland (San Francisco)”, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Playland_(San_Francisco)
Playland-not-at-the-Beach was devised by El Cerrito businessman Richard Tuck in 2000. He purchased the former grocery store building to house his collection of Playland artifacts. Community volunteers stepped in to curate Tuck's collection and the “museum of fun” opened to the public in 2008 with the goal to “educate newer generations about bygone days and allow those who remember Whitney's Playland and the Sutro Baths the opportunity to recapture the glorious sights and sounds of that marvelous era.” The museum has 25 exhibits with specific emphasis on the attractions that once existed at Playland-at-the-Beach and the Sutro Baths. Included are the giant clown's blue hat from the top of the Playland Funhouse; Walking Charley, one of the original hand carved life-size wooden characters from the Fun House; books of Playland tickets and original park signage; parts of rides and games; rare photographs; employee uniforms; and prizes from the Playland arcade games.\footnote{Playland-Not-at-the-Beach (website); http://www.playland-not-at-the-beach.org/. Wikipedia, “Playland-Not-At-The-Beach,” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Playland-Not-At-The-Beach.}

Although no longer in their original Ocean Beach location or seaside amusement park setting, the collection of Playland artifacts that the Playland-not-at-the-Beach organization maintains represents a significant concentration of curated and cared-for artifacts from a well-loved and historically significant (but no longer extant) site, which are made available to the public through the generosity of a private collector. It seems unlikely that any other more appropriate repository would be found that would satisfy the issue of location and setting in conjunction with the collection owner's own location preference and the organization's non-profit status. Making it possible for the museum to remain a tenant at its current location after the site has been redeveloped would likely be the most feasible way to protect and continue to make accessible the historic Playland artifact collection.
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Corrosivity Test Results
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the geotechnical investigation performed by Rockridge Geotechnical, Inc. for the proposed mixed-use building to be constructed at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, California. The site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue, as shown on the Site Location Map, Figure 1.

The site consists of two adjacent parcels bounded by San Pablo Avenue to the east, Jefferson Avenue to the north, and neighboring two-story buildings to the west and south. The overall site has plan dimensions of roughly 90 feet by 200 feet and is currently occupied by an asphalt-paved parking lot on the western half and a commercial building on the eastern half. The site is relatively level.

Based on schematic design drawings prepared by Studio KDA for the project, dated March 1, 2017, we understand plans are to demolish the existing building and to construct a 50-unit, multi-family residential building. The building will occupy the majority of the site and will consist of four wood-framed levels over an at-grade concrete podium level that will house parking as well as retail space, a gym, lounge conference room and leasing office.

2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

Our geotechnical investigation was performed in accordance with our proposal dated March 21, 2017. Our scope of services consisted of exploring subsurface conditions at the site by drilling three test borings, performing laboratory testing on select soil samples collected from the borings, and performing engineering analyses to develop conclusions and recommendations regarding:
• design groundwater level
• site seismicity and seismic hazards, including the potential for liquefaction and lateral spreading, and total and differential settlement resulting from liquefaction and/or cyclic densification
• the most appropriate foundation type(s) for the proposed building
• design criteria for the recommended foundation type(s), including vertical and lateral capacities for each of the foundation type(s)
• estimates of foundation settlement
• site grading and excavation, including criteria for fill quality and compaction and suitability for reuse of the on-site soil as engineered fill
• subgrade preparation for interior and exterior concrete slabs-on-grade
• 2016 California Building Code site class and design spectral response acceleration parameters
• corrosivity of the near-surface soil and the potential effects on buried concrete and metal structures and foundations
• construction considerations.

3.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

Subsurface conditions at the site were explored by drilling three test borings and performing laboratory testing on select soil samples. Prior to our investigation, we obtained a drilling permit from Contra Costa County Environmental Health Division (CCCEHD) and contacted Underground Service Alert (USA) to notify them of our work, as required by law. We also retained Precision Locating, LLC, a private utility locator, to check that the boring locations were clear of buried utilities. Details of the field investigation and laboratory testing are described in the remainder of this section.

3.1 Test Borings

Three test borings, designated as Borings B-1 through B-3, were drilled on April 10, 2017 by Pitcher Drilling Company of East Palo Alto, California at the approximate locations shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2. The borings were drilled using a truck-mounted drill rig equipped with
mud rotary capabilities. All three borings were terminated in bedrock at depths ranging between approximately 30 and 35 feet below the existing ground surface (bgs).

During drilling, our field engineer logged the soil and bedrock encountered and obtained representative samples for visual classification and laboratory testing. Groundwater was encountered during drilling and before switching to mud rotary drilling methods. The level and time at which groundwater was observed are noted on the boring logs. The final boring logs were developed based on laboratory test data, review of soil and rock samples in the office, and the conditions recorded on the field logs. Boring logs are presented on Figures A-1 through A-3 in Appendix A. The soil and rock encountered in the borings were classified in accordance with the classification charts shown on Figures A-4 and A-5, respectively.

Soil samples were obtained using the following samplers:

- Sprague and Henwood (S&H) split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch outside diameter and 2.5-inch inside diameter, lined with 2.43-inch inside diameter stainless steel tubes.
- Standard Penetration Test (SPT) split-barrel sampler with a 2.0-inch outside and 1.5-inch inside diameter, without liners.

The S&H and SPT samplers were driven with a 140-pound, automatic hammer falling about 30 inches per drop. The samplers were driven up to 18 inches and the hammer blows required to drive the sampler were recorded every six inches and are presented on the boring logs. A “blow count” is defined as the number of hammer blows per six inches of penetration or 50 blows for six inches or less of penetration. The blow counts used for this conversion were: (1) the last two blow counts if the sampler was driven more than 12 inches, (2) the last one blow count if the sampler was driven more than six inches but less than 12 inches, and (3) the only blow count if the sampler was driven six inches or less. The blow counts required to drive the S&H and SPT samplers were converted to approximate SPT N-values using factors of 0.84 and 1.44, respectively, to account for sampler type, approximate hammer energy, and the fact that the SPT sampler was designed to accommodate liners, but liners were not used. The converted SPT N-values are presented on the boring logs.
Upon completion of drilling, the boreholes were backfilled with cement grout under the observation of the CCCEHD inspector and patched with asphalt. The soil cuttings generated by the borings were collected in drums and disposed of off-site by the drilling subcontractor.

3.2 Laboratory Testing

We re-examined each soil sample obtained from our borings to confirm the field classifications and selected representative samples for laboratory testing. Geotechnical laboratory tests were performed on select soil samples to assess their engineering properties and physical characteristics. Soil samples were tested by B. Hillebrandt Soils Testing, Inc. of Alamo, California to measure moisture content, dry density, particle size distribution (gradation), and plasticity (Atterberg limits). Corrosivity testing of a sample of near-surface soil was performed by Project X Corrosion Engineering of Murrieta, California. The results of the geotechnical laboratory tests are presented on the boring logs and in Appendix B.

4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

As presented on the Regional Geologic Map (Figure 3), the site is mapped as being underlain by Holocene-age alluvium (Qha) (Graymer, 2006). Alluvial deposits are sediments deposited by flowing water (rivers, streams, flood plains, etc.). These types of deposits can be composed of interbedded layers of mixed gravelly, sandy, clayey, and silty soils.

Based on the results of our borings, we conclude that the site is underlain by alluvial deposits predominantly consisting of stiff to hard clays with varying sand content interbedded with layers of loose dense to dense clayey sand. In the southwest corner of the site in Boring B-3 a layer of medium stiff clay and sandy clay was encountered to a depth of about 5-1/2 feet bgs. Loose clayey sand was encountered in Boring B-2 between a depth of about 6 and 8 feet bgs. Where explored, the top of sandstone is at depths of 26-1/2 to 31 feet bgs and the sandstone has low to moderate hardness, friable to moderately strong, and deeply to moderately weathered.
Two Atterberg limits tests were performed on select samples of the near-surface clay (i.e., upper 2-1/2 to 3 feet). The Atterberg limits tests performed on near-surface clay samples from Borings B-1 and B-3 resulted have a plasticity indices (PIs) of 17 and 14, respectively. These PI values indicate the surficial clay has moderate expansion potential\(^1\). An additional Atterberg limits test was performed on a sample of clayey sand from Boring B-2 at a depth of about 7 feet bgs to further evaluate liquefaction potential.

4.1 Groundwater

Groundwater was measured in test borings when first encountered before switching to mud rotary drilling methods. Initial groundwater was measured at depths ranging from 5.3 to 9 feet bgs in the borings. It should be noted; groundwater may not have had sufficient time to stabilize at the time the measurements were taken in the borings.

To estimate the highest potential groundwater level at the site, we reviewed information on the State of California Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker website (http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/). A nearby site with historic groundwater data on the GeoTracker website is 10940 San Pablo Avenue (to the east of the site; similar ground surface elevation). The data at this site consists of two measurements in three monitoring wells. Groundwater was measured on April 11, 1995 and May 8, 2001. Groundwater measurements range from approximately 4.8 to 5.7 feet bgs (Subsurface Consultants, Inc., 2001).

The groundwater level at the site is expected to fluctuate several feet seasonally with potentially larger fluctuations annually, depending on the amount of rainfall. Based on the results of our investigation and our review of available groundwater data at the site vicinity, we estimate the groundwater table at the site can be as shallow as about 5 feet bgs.

---

\(^1\) Expansive soil undergoes volumetric changes with changes in moisture content (i.e. it shrinks when dried and swells when wetted).
5.0 SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

The results of our evaluation regarding seismic considerations for the project site are presented in the following sections.

5.1 Regional Seismicity

The site is located in the Coast Ranges geomorphic province of California that is characterized by northwest-trending valleys and ridges. These topographic features are controlled by folds and faults that resulted from the collision of the Farallon plate and North American plate and subsequent strike-slip faulting along the San Andreas Fault system. The San Andreas Fault is more than 600 miles long from Point Arena in the north to the Gulf of California in the south. The Coast Ranges province is bounded on the east by the Great Valley and on the west by the Pacific Ocean.

The major active faults in the area are the Hayward, San Andreas, and Calaveras faults. These and other faults in the region are shown on Figure 4. For these and other active faults within a 50-kilometer radius of the site, the distance from the site and estimated mean characteristic Moment magnitude\(^2\) [2007 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP) (USGS, 2008) and Cao et al. (2003)] are summarized in Table 1.

---

\(^2\) Moment magnitude is an energy-based scale and provides a physically meaningful measure of the size of a faulting event. Moment magnitude is directly related to average slip and fault rupture area.
### TABLE 1
Regional Faults and Seismicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault Segment</th>
<th>Approximate Distance from Site (km)</th>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Mean Characteristic Moment Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hayward</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hayward-Rodgers Creek</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodgers Creek</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Thrust</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Connected</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. San Andreas - Peninsula</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. San Andreas (1906 event)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. San Andreas - North Coast</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Napa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Calaveras</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gregorio Connected</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley 5, Pittsburg Kirby Hills</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Connected</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Reyes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1800, four major earthquakes have been recorded on the San Andreas Fault. In 1836, an earthquake with an estimated maximum intensity of VII on the Modified Mercalli (MM) scale occurred east of Monterey Bay on the San Andreas Fault (Toppozada and Borchardt, 1998). The estimated Moment magnitude, $M_w$, for this earthquake is about 6.25. In 1838, an earthquake occurred with an estimated intensity of about VIII-IX (MM), corresponding to an $M_w$ of about 7.5. The San Francisco Earthquake of 1906 caused the most significant damage in the history of
the Bay Area in terms of loss of lives and property damage. This earthquake created a surface rupture along the San Andreas Fault from Shelter Cove to San Juan Bautista approximately 470 kilometers in length. It had a maximum intensity of XI (MM), an $M_w$ of about 7.9, and was felt 560 kilometers away in Oregon, Nevada, and Los Angeles. The most recent earthquake on the San Andreas fault to affect the Bay Area was the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989, with an $M_w$ of 6.9. This earthquake occurred in the Santa Cruz Mountains about 105 kilometers south of the site.

In 1868, an earthquake with an estimated maximum intensity of X on the MM scale occurred on the southern segment (between San Leandro and Fremont) of the Hayward Fault. The estimated $M_w$ for the earthquake is 7.0. In 1861, an earthquake of unknown magnitude (probably an $M_w$ of about 6.5) was reported on the Calaveras Fault. The most recent significant earthquake on this fault was the 1984 Morgan Hill earthquake ($M_w = 6.2$).

On August 24, 2014 an earthquake with an estimated maximum intensity of VIII (severe) on the MM scale occurred on the West Napa fault. This earthquake was the largest earthquake event in the San Francisco Bay Area since the Loma Prieta Earthquake. The $M_w$ of the 2014 South Napa Earthquake was 6.0.

The U.S. Geological Survey's 2014 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities has compiled the earthquake fault research for the San Francisco Bay area in order to estimate the probability of fault segment rupture. They have determined that the overall probability of moment magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake occurring in the San Francisco Region during the next 30 years (starting from 2014) is 72 percent (Field, 2015). The highest probabilities are assigned to the Hayward Fault, Calaveras Fault, and the northern segment of the San Andreas Fault. These probabilities are 14.3, 7.4, and 6.4 percent, respectively.
5.2 Geologic Hazards

Because the project site is in a seismically active region, we evaluated the potential for earthquake-induced geologic hazards including ground shaking, ground surface rupture, liquefaction, lateral spreading, and cyclic densification. We used the results of our field investigation to evaluate the potential of these phenomena occurring at the project site.

5.2.1 Ground Shaking

The seismicity of the site is governed by the activity of the Hayward Fault, although ground shaking from future earthquakes on other faults, will also be felt at the site. The ground shaking intensity felt at the project site will depend on: 1) the size of the earthquake (magnitude), 2) the distance from the site to the fault source, 3) the directivity (focusing of earthquake energy along the fault in the direction of the rupture), and 4) subsurface conditions. The site is less than two kilometers from the Hayward Fault. Therefore, the potential exists for a large earthquake to induce strong to very strong ground shaking at the site during the life of the project.

5.2.2 Ground Surface Rupture

Historically, ground surface displacements closely follow the trace of geologically young faults. The site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no known active or potentially active faults exist on the site. We, therefore, conclude the risk of fault offset at the site from a known active fault is very low. In a seismically active area, the remote possibility exists for future faulting in areas where no faults previously existed; however, we conclude the risk of surface faulting and consequent secondary ground failure from previously unknown faults is also very low.

3 Liquefaction is a phenomenon where loose, saturated, cohesionless soil experiences temporary reduction in strength during cyclic loading such as that produced by earthquakes.

4 Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which surficial soil displaces along a shear zone that has formed within an underlying liquefied layer. Upon reaching mobilization, the surficial blocks are transported downslope or in the direction of a free face by earthquake and gravitational forces.

5 Cyclic densification is a phenomenon in which non-saturated, cohesionless soil is compacted by earthquake vibrations, causing ground-surface settlement.
5.2.3 Liquefaction and Associated Hazards

When a saturated, cohesionless soil liquefies, it experiences a temporary loss of shear strength created by a transient rise in excess pore pressure generated by strong ground motion. Soil susceptible to liquefaction includes loose to medium dense sand and gravel, low-plasticity silt, and some low-plasticity clay deposits. Flow failure, lateral spreading, differential settlement, loss of bearing strength, ground fissures and sand boils are evidence of excess pore pressure generation and liquefaction.

We evaluated the liquefaction potential of soil encountered below groundwater at the site using data collected in our borings. Our liquefaction triggering analyses were performed using the methodology proposed by Youd et al. (2001). Liquefaction-induced ground settlement was estimated using the relationship proposed by Tokimatsu & Seed (1984).

Our analyses were performed using a groundwater depth of 5 feet bgs. In accordance with the 2016 CBC, we used a peak ground acceleration of 0.88 times gravity (g) in our liquefaction evaluation; this peak ground acceleration is consistent with the Maximum Considered Earthquake Geometric Mean (MCEG) peak ground acceleration adjusted for site effects (PGA_M). We also used a moment magnitude 7.33 earthquake, which is consistent with the mean characteristic moment magnitude for the Hayward Fault, as presented in Table 1.

Our liquefaction analysis indicates the majority of the clayey sand layers underlying the site are sufficiently dense to resist liquefaction; however, we encountered an approximately 2-foot-thick layer of loose granular soil between depths of 6 and 8 feet at Boring B-2. With about 30 percent plastic fines and a plasticity index (PI) of about 16, this material is considered too plastic to exhibit “sand-like” liquefaction behavior during a major earthquake. However, we conclude this layer may experience a temporary reduction in shear strength, referred to as cyclic softening, during a major earthquake. Dissipation of the excess pore pressures in the clayey sands following the earthquake could result in settlement of shallow foundations and other at-grade improvements of up to approximately 3/4 inch. Considering the soil layer susceptible to cyclic
softening is not continuous, seismically induced differential settlement of 1/2 inch over a horizontal distance of 30 feet should be assumed in design of foundations.

The layer subject to cyclic softening in Boring B-2 is relatively shallow, such that the potential for a reduction in bearing capacity may occur. The reduction in bearing capacity is accounted for in the footing recommendations presented in Section 7.2.

Considering the relatively flat site grades and the absence of a free face in the site topography, as well as the depth and relative thickness of the potentially liquefiable layers, we conclude the risk of lateral spreading is very low.

5.2.4 Cyclic Densification

Cyclic densification (also referred to as differential compaction) of non-saturated sand (sand above groundwater table) can occur during an earthquake, resulting in settlement of the ground surface and overlying improvements.

The results of our borings indicate the soil above the groundwater at the site generally consists of cohesive soil which is not susceptible to cyclic densification due to its relatively high fines content and cohesion. Therefore, we conclude the potential for ground surface settlement resulting from cyclic densification at the site is nil.
6.0 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

From a geotechnical standpoint, we conclude the site can be developed as planned, provided the recommendations presented in this report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and implemented during construction. The primary geotechnical concern at the site is providing adequate foundation support for the proposed building. This and other geotechnical issues, as they pertain to the proposed building, are discussed in the remainder of this section.

6.1 Foundation Support and Settlement

The proposed building is planned to be constructed at-grade. The site is underlain primarily by medium stiff to very stiff clay which has moderate strength and relatively low compressibility. Therefore, we conclude the proposed building may be supported on conventional spread footings without excessive settlement under static conditions. As discussed in Section 5.2.3, thin layers of medium dense clayey sand may be subject to cyclic softening during a major earthquake beneath portion of the site. As a result of the potential for cyclic softening, we conclude that reduced allowable bearing pressures should be used in the design of the footings. Based on our experience with similar projects, we anticipate maximum column loads on the order of 450 kips. Our settlement analyses indicate total static settlement of footings bearing on undisturbed native soil or properly engineered fill, designed using the allowable bearing pressures presented in Section 7.2 of this report, will be less than 3/4 inch and differential settlement will be less than about 1/2 inch over a horizontal distance of 30 feet.

6.2 Groundwater

As discussed in Section 4.1, we conclude the design high groundwater depth for the proposed project should be 5 feet bgs. If any portions of the new construction will extend close to this elevation (elevator pits, underslab vaults, etc.), they should include waterproofing and be designed for hydrostatic pressures. Furthermore, any excavations deeper than 5 feet may require temporary dewatering during construction, as discussed in Section 6.5.
6.3 Expansive Soil

Atterberg limits tests performed on samples of the near-surface clay indicate that the surficial soil at the site has moderate expansion potential. Expansive near-surface soil is subject to volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. These volume changes can cause movement and cracking of foundations and sidewalks. Therefore, foundations and concrete slabs should be designed and constructed to resist the effects of the expansive soil.

In general, the effects of expansive soil can be mitigated by moisture-conditioning the expansive soil, providing select, non-expansive fill below interior and exterior slabs, and either supporting foundations below the zone of severe moisture change or by providing a stiff, shallow foundation that can limit deformation of the superstructure as the underlying soil shrinks and swells. Recommendations for building pad preparation, exterior concrete flatwork subgrade preparation, and site drainage and landscaping considerations are included in Section 7.1.

6.4 Soil Corrosivity

Corrosivity testing was performed by Project X Corrosion Engineer of Murrieta, California on a sample of soil obtained during our field investigation from Boring B-2 at a depth of one foot bgs. The results of the test are presented in Appendix B of this report.

Based on the results of the corrosivity test, we conclude the soil is considered “mildly corrosive” with respect to resistivity. Accordingly, all buried iron, steel, cast iron, ductile iron, galvanized steel and dielectric-coated steel or iron should be protected against corrosion depending upon the critical nature of the structure. The results indicate that sulfate ion concentrations are sufficiently low to not pose a threat to buried concrete.

The results indicate the chloride ion concentration is considered “corrosive” and intrusion of chloride ions into the concrete may lead to corrosion of the embedded steel reinforcement (Caltrans, 2015). To help prevent the diffusion of chloride ions into the concrete, supplementary cementitious materials such as fly-ash, silica fume, slag, etc. should be used in the concrete
design to reduce the permeability of the concrete. A low water-cement ratio leads to a denser concrete, which also leads to lower permeability concrete (Caltrans, 2010).

If needed, a corrosion engineer should be retained to provide detailed recommendations for corrosion protection of buried metals and reinforcing in buried concrete structures.

### 6.5 Construction Considerations

The soil to be excavated for the proposed foundations and utilities is expected to consist primarily of clay and sandy clay which can be excavated with conventional earth-moving equipment such as backhoes. If site grading is performed during the rainy season, the near-surface clay will likely be wet and will have to be dried before compaction can be achieved.

All disturbed soil resulting from demolition activities that will be beneath the bottom of foundation should be overexcavated and recompacted in accordance with the recommendations below in Section 7.1.

Any excavations extending more than about 5 feet below existing grades will likely require temporary dewatering during construction. Any footing excavations that extend close to the groundwater (deeper than about 3 feet below existing grades) may be soft and sensitive to disturbance from construction activities, especially if standing water is allowed to pond on the subgrade. Disturbance to footing subgrades can be mitigated to some degree by over-excavating the footings by about 3 inches and placing mudslabs following inspection by our engineer. The purpose of the mudslab is to protect the sensitive soil subgrade and to provide a firm working surface during placement of reinforcing steel. We recommend the contractor budget accordingly for potential dewatering and mudslabs in the bottoms of deep footing excavations.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations for site preparation and grading, foundation design, seismic design, and other geotechnical aspects of the project are presented in this section.

7.1 Site Preparation and Grading

Site clearing should include removal of all existing pavements, former foundation elements, and underground utilities. Any vegetation and organic topsoil should be stripped in areas to receive improvements (i.e., building, pavement, or flatwork). Tree roots with a diameter greater than 1/2 inch within four feet of building subgrade should be removed. Demolished asphalt concrete should be taken to an asphalt recycling facility. Aggregate base beneath existing pavements may be re-used as select fill, if carefully segregated.

In general, abandoned underground utilities should be removed to the property line or service connections and properly capped or plugged with concrete. Where existing utility lines are outside of the proposed building footprint and will not interfere with the proposed construction, they may be abandoned in-place provided the lines are filled with lean concrete or cement grout to the property line. Any excavations created during demolition should be properly backfilled with compacted fill under the direction of our field engineer.

In areas to receive fill or improvements (i.e. building pad subgrade), the soil subgrade should be scarified to a depth of at least eight inches, and moisture-conditioned and compacted to the specified percent relative compaction, as presented below in Table 2. Note that “moisture-conditioning” may require wetting or drying of the soil, depending on the particular conditions encountered during construction.

---

6 Relative compaction refers to the in-place dry density of soil expressed as a percentage of the maximum dry density of the same material, as determined by the ASTM D1557 laboratory compaction procedure.
If grading work is performed during the rainy season, the contractor may find the subgrade material too wet to compact to the recommended relative compaction and will have to be scarified and aerated to lower its moisture content so the specified compaction can be achieved. Material to be dried by aeration should be scarified to a depth of at least eight inches; the scarified soil should be turned at least twice a day to promote uniform drying. Once the moisture content of the aerated soil has been reduced to acceptable levels, the soil should be compacted in accordance with our recommendations. Aeration typically is the least costly method used to stabilize the subgrade soil; however, it generally requires the most time to complete. Other soil stabilization alternatives include overexcavating and replacing with drier material, and lime-treatment.

7.1.1 Fill Materials and Compaction Criteria

All fill should be placed in horizontal lifts not exceeding eight inches in loose thickness, moisture-conditioned, and compacted in accordance with the requirements provided below in Table 2. Each type of material is described in the following text according to its uses and specifications.
### TABLE 2
Summary of Compaction Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Required Relative Compaction (percent)</th>
<th>Moisture Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General subgrade – low-plasticity</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General subgrade – low to moderately expansive clay</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>2+% above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building pad subgrade – low-plasticity</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building pad subgrade – low to moderately expansive clay</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>2+% above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior flatwork subgrade – low-plasticity</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior flatwork subgrade – low to moderately expansive clay</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>2+% above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior flatwork – select fill</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular pavement subgrade (upper 6 inches)</td>
<td>95+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and backfill – low to moderately expansive clay</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>2+% above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and backfill – low plasticity</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Above optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and backfill - clean sand or gravel</td>
<td>95+</td>
<td>Near optimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill and backfill – aggregate base</td>
<td>95+</td>
<td>Near optimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Select fill is considered low-plasticity soil.

**On-site Soil**

On-site soil may be used as general fill, provided it is free of organic matter, contain no rocks or lumps larger than three inches in greatest dimension, and can be compacted to the relative compactions presented in Table 2 (moisture-conditioning will likely be required).
Select Fill
Select fill should consist of on-site or imported soil that is free of organic matter, contain no rocks or lumps larger than three inches in greatest dimension, have a liquid limit less than 40 and plasticity index less than 12, and be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Samples of proposed select fill material should be submitted to the Geotechnical Engineer at least three business days prior to use at the site.

The grading contractor should provide analytical test results or other suitable environmental documentation indicating proposed imported fill is free of hazardous materials at least three days before use at the site. If this data is not provided, a minimum of two weeks will be required to perform any necessary analytical testing.

Aggregate Base Material
Imported aggregate base (AB) may be used as select fill or trench backfill (above bedding materials). AB placed beneath sidewalks and vehicular pavements within public right-of-way should meet the requirements in the 2015 Caltrans Standard Specifications, Section 26, for Class 2 Aggregate Base (3/4 inch maximum).

Controlled Low Strength Material
Controlled low strength material (CLSM) may be considered as an alternative to fill beneath the building, concrete flatwork, or pavement. CLSM should meet the requirements in the 2015 Caltrans Standard Specifications. It is an ideal backfill material when adequate room is limited or not available for conventional compaction equipment, or when settlement of the backfill must be minimized. No compaction is required to place CLSM. CLSM should have a minimum 28-day unconfined strength of 50 pounds per square inch (psi).

7.1.2 Exterior Flatwork Subgrade Preparation
We recommend exterior concrete flatwork be underlain by a minimum of six inches of select, non-expansive fill (such as Class 2 AB). The soil subgrade and select fill should be moisture-conditioned and compacted in accordance with the requirements provided above in Table 2. The
prepared subgrade should be kept moist until it is covered with select fill. We recommend thickening the edges of concrete flatwork where it is immediately adjacent to landscaped areas.

### 7.1.3 Utility Trench Backfill

Excavations for utility trenches can be readily made with a backhoe. All trenches should conform to the current CAL-OSHA requirements. To provide uniform support, pipes or conduits should be bedded on a minimum of four inches of clean sand or fine gravel. After the pipes and conduits are tested, inspected (if required) and approved, they should be covered to a depth of six inches with sand or fine gravel, which should be mechanically tamped. The pipe bedding and cover should be eliminated where an impermeable plug is required as described below. Backfill for utility trenches and other excavations is also considered fill, and should be placed and compacted in accordance with the recommendations previously presented. If imported clean sand or gravel (clean is defined as soil with less than 10 percent fines) is used as backfill, it should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. Jetting of trench backfill should not be permitted. Special care should be taken when backfilling utility trenches in pavement areas. Poor compaction may cause excessive settlements, resulting in damage to the improvements above the fill.

Where utility trenches enter the building pad, an impermeable plug consisting of CLSM, at least three feet in length, should be installed where the trenches enter the building footprint. Furthermore, where sand- or gravel-backfilled trenches cross planter areas and pass below asphalt or concrete pavements, a similar plug should be placed at the edge of the pavement. The purpose of these recommendations is to reduce the potential for water to become trapped in trenches beneath the building or pavements. This trapped water can cause heaving of soils beneath slabs and softening of subgrade soil beneath pavements.

Foundations for the proposed structure should be bottomed below an imaginary line extending up at a 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical) inclination from the base of the utility trenches running parallel to the foundation. Alternatively, the portion of the utility trench that is below the 1.5:1 line can
be backfilled with CLSM (see Section 7.1.1 for material requirements) or Class 2 AB compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. If utility trenches are to be excavated below this zone-of-influence line after construction of the building foundations, the trench walls need to be fully supported with shoring until CLSM is placed—compacted AB shall not be used in this scenario.

### 7.1.4 Drainage and Landscaping

Positive surface drainage should be provided around the building to direct surface water away from foundations and below-grade walls. To reduce the potential for water ponding adjacent to the building, we recommend the ground surface within a horizontal distance of five feet from the building slope down away from the building with a surface gradient of at least two percent in unpaved areas and one percent in paved areas. In addition, roof downspouts should be discharged into controlled drainage facilities to keep the water away from the foundation and below-grade walls. The use of water-intensive landscaping or unlined bio-swales around the perimeter of the building should be avoided.

### 7.2 Spread Footing Foundations

Provided the estimated total and differential settlements presented in Sections 5.2 and 6.1 are acceptable, the proposed podium may be supported on deepened spread footings founded on undisturbed native soils.

Continuous footings should be at least 18 inches wide, and isolated spread footings should be at least 24 inches wide. Perimeter footings should be bottomed at least 30 inches below the outside grade. The perimeter footing embedment depth may be decreased by six inches where pavement or concrete flatwork is immediately adjacent to the building. Interior footings should extend at least 24 inches below the bottom of the capillary moisture break. Footings to be constructed near underground utilities should be bottomed below an imaginary line extending up at an inclination of 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical) from the bottom of the utility trench.
Footings may be designed using allowable bearing pressures of 2,500 pounds per square foot (psf) for dead-plus-live loads and 3,300 psf for total design loads, which include wind or seismic forces.

As discussed in Section 6.5, footings that extend near the groundwater level (deeper than about 3 feet bgs) should incorporate a mud slab to protect the footing subgrade from disturbance during construction. This will involve over-excavating the footing by about 3 inches and placing lean concrete or sand-cement slurry in the bottom (following inspection by our engineer). A mud slab will help protect the footing subgrade during placement of reinforcing steel. Water can then be pumped from the excavations prior to placement of structural concrete, if present.

Lateral loads may be resisted by a combination of passive pressure on the vertical faces of the footings and friction between the bottoms of the footings and the supporting soil. To compute lateral resistance of new footings, we recommend using an allowable equivalent fluid weight (triangular distribution) of 275 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) for sustained loads and an allowable uniform pressure of 1,500 psf (rectangular distribution) for transient loads. Passive pressure in the upper one foot of soil should be neglected unless confined by a slab or pavement. Frictional resistance should be computed using a base friction coefficient of 0.3. The passive pressure and frictional resistance values include a factor of safety of at least 1.5 and may be used in combination without reduction.

Footing excavations should be free of standing water, debris, and disturbed materials prior to placing concrete. The bottoms and sides of the excavations should be moistened following excavation and maintained in a moist condition until concrete is placed. If the foundation soil dries during construction, the footing will eventually heave, which may result in cracking and distress. We should check footing excavations prior to placement of a mudslab (if used) and/or reinforcing steel to check for proper bearing and cleanout.
7.3 Building Slab

The building slab in the parking and retail areas may be designed as slabs-on-grade. The garage slab-on-grade should be at least five inches thick and underlain by a minimum of six inches of Class 2 aggregate base (AB) compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. The slab-on-grade floor in other parts of the building should be underlain by at least six inches of select fill compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction, as well as the capillary break described below.

Where water vapor transmission through the slab-on-grade floor is undesirable, we recommend installing a capillary moisture break and a water vapor retarder beneath the floor. A vapor retarder and capillary moisture break are generally not required beneath parking garage floor slabs because there is sufficient air circulation to allow evaporation of moisture that is transmitted through the slab; however, we recommend the vapor retarder and capillary break be installed in the retail space, residential lobby and amenity areas, and below the slab-on-grade in utility rooms and any areas in or adjacent to the parking garage that will be used for storage and/or will receive a floor covering or coating.

A capillary moisture break consists of at least four inches of clean, free-draining gravel or crushed rock. The vapor retarder should meet the requirements for Class B vapor retarders stated in ASTM E1745. The vapor retarder should be placed in accordance with the requirements of ASTM E1643. These requirements include overlapping seams by six inches, taping seams, and sealing penetrations in the vapor retarder. If required by the structural engineer, the vapor retarder may be covered with two inches of sand to aid in curing the concrete and to protect the vapor retarder during slab construction—however, this is not a requirement from a geotechnical standpoint. The sand overlying the vapor retarder should be moist at the time concrete is placed. However, excess water trapped in the sand could eventually be transmitted as vapor through the slab. Therefore, if rain is forecast prior to pouring the slab, the sand should be covered with plastic sheeting to avoid wetting. If the sand becomes wet, concrete should not be placed until the sand has been dried or replaced.
The particle size of the capillary break material and sand (if used) should meet the gradation requirements presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**  
**Gradation Requirements for Capillary Moisture Break**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>Percentage Passing Sieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravel or Crushed Rock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 inch</td>
<td>90 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 inch</td>
<td>30 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 inch</td>
<td>5 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8 inch</td>
<td>0 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concrete mixes with high water/cement (w/c) ratios result in excess water in the concrete, which increases the cure time and results in excessive vapor transmission through the slab. Therefore, concrete for the floor slab should have a low w/c ratio - less than 0.50. If the concrete is poured directly over the vapor retarder, we recommend the w/c ratio of the concrete not exceed 0.45. In either case, water should not be added to the concrete mix in the field. If necessary, workability should be increased by adding plasticizers. In addition, the slab should be properly cured. Before the floor covering is placed, the contractor should check that the concrete surface and the moisture emission levels (if emission testing is required) meet the manufacturer’s requirements.

### 7.4 Seismic Design

We understand the proposed building will be designed using the seismic provisions in the 2016 CBC. The site latitude and longitude are 37.9169° and -122.3126°, respectively. In accordance with the 2016 CBC, we recommend the following:
- Site Class C
- \( S_S = 2.290 \, g, \, S_1 = 0.950 \, g \)
- \( S_{MS} = 2.290 \, g, \, S_{M1} = 1.236 \, g \)
- \( S_{DS} = 1.527 \, g, \, S_{D1} = 0.824 \, g \)
- Seismic Design Category E for Risk Categories I, II, and III.

8.0 ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

Prior to construction, Rockridge Geotechnical should review the project plans and specifications to verify that they conform to the intent of our recommendations. During construction, our field engineer should provide on-site observation and testing during site preparation, placement and compaction of fill, and installation of building foundations. These observations will allow us to compare actual with anticipated subsurface conditions and to verify that the contractor's work conforms to the geotechnical aspects of the plans and specifications.

9.0 LIMITATIONS

This geotechnical investigation has been conducted in accordance with the standard of care commonly used as state-of-practice in the profession. No other warranties are either expressed or implied. The recommendations made in this report are based on the assumption that the subsurface conditions do not deviate appreciably from those disclosed in the exploratory borings. If any variations or undesirable conditions are encountered during construction, we should be notified so that additional recommendations can be made. The foundation recommendations presented in this report are developed exclusively for the proposed development described in this report and are not valid for other locations and construction in the project vicinity.
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EXPLANATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>af</td>
<td>Artificial Fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qha</td>
<td>Alluvium (Holocene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qpa</td>
<td>Alluvium (Pleistocene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fsr</td>
<td>Franciscan Complex melange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geologic contact: dashed where approximate and dotted where concealed, queried where uncertain
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- Red: Strike slip
- Black: Thrust (Reverse)
- Blue: Normal
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Date 04/12/17 | Project No. 17-1299 | Figure 4
## MATERIAL DESCRIPTION

### 1. Material Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>Sampler/Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Blow/6&quot;</th>
<th>SPT</th>
<th>N-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Laboratory Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Strength Test</th>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Shear Strength</th>
<th>Fines %</th>
<th>Natural Moisture Content %</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>140 lbs./30 inches</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72/</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **3 inches of asphalt**
- **9 inches of aggregate base**
- **CLAY (CL)**
  - brown, very stiff, moist, trace fine sand
  - Sandy Clay with Gravel (CL)
  - yellow-brown with yellow mottling, very stiff, moist, fine to medium sand, fine subangular gravel
  - LL = 33, PI = 17; see Appendix B
- **grades sandy**
- **CLAYEY SAND (SC)**
  - yellow-brown, medium dense, moist, medium to fine sand
  - Particle Size Distribution; see Appendix B (4/10/17; 8:40 AM)
  - medium dense to dense, wet, trace fine to coarse subangular gravel
- **CLAY (CL)**
  - yellow-brown with olive mottling, very stiff; wet, trace fine sand, trace black fine gravel
- **CLAYEY SAND (SC)**
  - yellow-brown to yellow-brown, medium dense, wet, fine to medium sand, trace fine gravel
  - Particle Size Distribution; see Appendix B
- **CLAY (CL)**
  - yellow-brown, very stiff, wet
- **CLAYEY SAND (SC)**
  - yellow-brown, dense, wet, fine to coarse sand, subangular to subrounded fine gravel
- **CLAY (CL)**
  - yellow-brown, very stiff, wet, fine sand
- **CLAYEY SAND (SC)**
  - yellow-brown, very dense, wet, fine sand
- **SANDSTONE**
  - yellow-brown, low hardness, friable, deeply weathered, poorly consolidated
SANDSTONE (continued)

olive-brown, moderately hard, weak to moderately strong, moderately weathered

Boring terminated at a depth of 35.1 feet below ground surface.
Boring backfilled with cement grout and surface asphalt patched.
Groundwater encountered at a depth of 8 feet before switching to mud rotary.

*S&H and SPT blow counts for the last two increments were converted to SPT N-Values using factors of 0.84 and 1.44, respectively, to account for sampler type and hammer energy. SPT sampler used without liners.
### MATERIAL DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (feet)</th>
<th>SAMPLES</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SPT, N-Value</th>
<th>MATERIAL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRAB</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CLAY (CL) dark brown, moist, trace fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrosion Test; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CLAY with SAND (CL) yellow-brown, stiff, moist, fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CLAY (CL) olive-brown with yellow-brown motting, very stiff, moist, trace fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4/10/17; 1:17 PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC) yellow-brown, loose, wet, fine to medium sand, trace subangular fine gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>LL = 33, PI = 16; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle Size Distribution; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CLAY (CL) olive-brown with motting yellow-brown, very stiff, wet, trace fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>with fine subangular gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC) yellow-brown, medium dense, wet, fine to medium sand, fine to coarse subangular gravel, plastic fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle Size Distribution; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>interbedded with sandy clay layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SANDY CLAY (CL) olive-brown with yellow-brown, very stiff to hard, wet, fine sand, trace fine subrounded gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>interbedded with clayey sand layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC) yellow-brown, dense, wet, fine to medium sand, trace fine subangular gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
<td>SANDSTONE yellow-brown, low hardness, friable to weak, deeply weathered, poorly consolidated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. S&H and SPT blow counts for the last two increments were converted to SPT N-Values using factors of 0.84 and 1.44, respectively, to account for sampler type and hammer energy. SPT sampler used without liners.

---

Boring terminated at a depth of 30.3 feet below ground surface.
Boring backfilled with cement grout and surface asphalt patched.
Groundwater encountered at a depth of 5.3 feet before switching to mud rotary.
## Log of Boring B-3

**PROJECT:** 10963 SAN PABLO AVENUE  
El Cerrito, California

**Boring location:** See Site Plan, Figure 2  
**Date started:** 4/10/17  
**Date finished:** 4/10/17  
**Logged by:** S. Magallon

**Drilling method:** Mud Rotary  
**Hammer weight/drop:** 140 lbs./30 inches  
**Hammer type:** Automatic Hammer  
**Sampler:** Sprague & Henwood (S&H), Standard Penetration Test (SPT)

### MATERIAL DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH (feet)</th>
<th>S&amp;S</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Blows/6&quot;</th>
<th>SPT N-Value</th>
<th>MATERIAL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 inches of asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9 inches of aggregate base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAY (CL) dark brown, medium stiff, moist, trace fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>LL = 30, PI = 14; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SANDY CLAY (CL) yellow-brown, medium stiff, moist, fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC) yellow-brown with olive, dense, moist to medium sand, fine to coarse subangular gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium dense, wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S&amp;H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle Size Distribution; see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC) yellow-brown with red-brown motting, hard, wet, fine to medium sand, fine subangular gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SANDY CLAY (CL) yellow-brown with red-brown motting, hard, wet, fine to medium sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>78/9&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fine sand, trace angular fine gravel, interbedded with clayey sand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LABORATORY TEST DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Strength Test</th>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Shear Strength</th>
<th>Fines %</th>
<th>Natural Moisture Content %</th>
<th>Dry Density Lbs/Cu Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: This document is a draft version.*
**MATERIAL DESCRIPTION**

- **SANDSTONE**
  - Olive-brown to yellow-brown, low to medium hard, friable to weak, deeply to moderately weathering, moderately consolidated

---

**LABORATORY TEST DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Shear Strength</th>
<th>Moisture Content</th>
<th>Natural Moisture Content</th>
<th>Dry Density</th>
<th>Lbs/Cu Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

*Boring terminated at a depth of 31.3 feet below ground surface.*

*Boring backfilled with cement grout and surface asphalt patched. Groundwater encountered at a depth of 9 feet before switching to mud rotary.*

*S&H and SPT blow counts for the last two increments were converted to SPT N-Values using factors of 0.84 and 1.44, respectively, to account for sampler type and hammer energy. SPT sampler used without liners.*
### Unified Soil Classification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Divisions</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Typical Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravels (More than half of coarse fraction &gt; no. 4 sieve size)</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Well-graded gravels or gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Poorly-graded gravels or gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Well-graded sands or gravelly sands, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Poorly-graded sands or gravelly sands, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Silty sands, sand-silt mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands (More than half of coarse fraction &lt; no. 4 sieve size)</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Inorganic silts and clayey silts of low plasticity, sandy silts, gravelly silts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, lean clays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OL</td>
<td>Organic silts and organic silt-clays of low plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Inorganic silts of high plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silts and Clays LL = &lt; 50</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silts and Clays LL = &gt; 50</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Organic silts and clays of high plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Organic Soils</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Peat and other highly organic soils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grain Size Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range of Grain Sizes</th>
<th>U.S. Standard Sieve Size</th>
<th>Grain Size in Millimeters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulders</td>
<td>Above 12&quot;</td>
<td>Above 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbles</td>
<td>12&quot; to 3&quot;</td>
<td>305 to 76.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel coarse</td>
<td>3&quot; to No. 4</td>
<td>76.2 to 4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel fine</td>
<td>3&quot; to 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>76.2 to 19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4&quot; to No. 4</td>
<td>19.1 to 4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand coarse</td>
<td>No. 4 to No. 200</td>
<td>4.76 to 0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand medium</td>
<td>No. 4 to No. 10</td>
<td>4.76 to 2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand fine</td>
<td>No. 10 to No. 40</td>
<td>2.00 to 0.420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 40 to No. 200</td>
<td>0.420 to 0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt and Clay</td>
<td>Below No. 200</td>
<td>Below 0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Designations/Symbols

- Sample taken with Sprague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch outside diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter. Darkened area indicates soil recovered
- Classification sample taken with Standard Penetration Test sampler
- Undisturbed sample taken with thin-walled tube
- Disturbed sample
- Sampling attempted with no recovery
- Core sample
- Analytical laboratory sample
- Sample taken with Direct Push sampler
- Sonic

### Sampler Type

- C Core barrel
- CA California split-barrel sampler with 2.5-inch outside diameter and a 1.93-inch inside diameter
- D&M Dames & Moore piston sampler using 2.5-inch outside diameter, thin-walled tube
- O Osterberg piston sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube
- PT Pitcher tube sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube
- S&H Sprague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch outside diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter
- SPT Standard Penetration Test (SPT) split-barrel sampler with a 2.0-inch outside diameter and a 1.5-inch inside diameter
- ST Shelby Tube (3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled tube) advanced with hydraulic pressure
I FRACTURING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Size of Pieces in Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little fractured</td>
<td>Greater than 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally fractured</td>
<td>1.0 to 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately fractured</td>
<td>0.5 to 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely fractured</td>
<td>0.1 to 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensely fractured</td>
<td>0.05 to 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed</td>
<td>Less than 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II HARDNESS

1. Soft - reserved for plastic material alone.
2. Low hardness - can be gouged deeply or carved easily with a knife blade.
3. Moderately hard - can be readily scratched by a knife blade; scratch leaves a heavy trace of dust and is readily visible after the powder has been blown away.
4. Hard - can be scratched with difficulty; scratch produced a little powder and is often faintly visible.
5. Very hard - cannot be scratched with knife blade; leaves a metallic streak.

III STRENGTH

1. Plastic or very low strength.
2. Friable - crumbles easily by rubbing with fingers.
3. Weak - an unfractured specimen of such material will crumble under light hammer blows.
4. Moderately strong - specimen will withstand a few heavy hammer blows before breaking.
5. Strong - specimen will withstand a few heavy ringing hammer blows and will yield with difficulty only dust and small flying fragments.
6. Very strong - specimen will resist heavy ringing hammer blows and will yield with difficulty only dust and small flying fragments.

IV WEATHERING - The physical and chemical disintegration and decomposition of rocks and minerals by natural processes such as oxidation, reduction, hydration, solution, carbonation, and freezing and thawing.

D. Deep - moderate to complete mineral decomposition; extensive disintegration; deep and thorough discoloration; many fractures, all extensively coated or filled with oxides, carbonates and/or clay or silt.
M. Moderate - slight change or partial decomposition of minerals; little disintegration; cementation little to unaffected. Moderate to occasionally intense discoloration. Moderately coated fractures.
L. Little - no megascopic decomposition of minerals; little of no effect on normal cementation. Slight and intermittent, or localized discoloration. Few stains on fracture surfaces.
F. Fresh - unaffected by weathering agents. No disintegration of discoloration. Fractures usually less numerous than joints.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

V CONSOLIDATION OF SEDIMENTARY ROCKS: usually determined from unweathered samples. Largely dependent on cementation.

U = unconsolidated
P = poorly consolidated
M = moderately consolidated
W = well consolidated

VI BEDDING OF SEDIMENTARY ROCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Splitting Property</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Stratification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Greater than 4.0 ft.</td>
<td>very thick-bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocky</td>
<td>2.0 to 4.0 ft.</td>
<td>thick bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slabby</td>
<td>0.2 to 2.0 ft.</td>
<td>thin bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaggy</td>
<td>0.05 to 0.2 ft.</td>
<td>very thin-bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaly or platy</td>
<td>0.01 to 0.05 ft.</td>
<td>laminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papery</td>
<td>less than 0.01</td>
<td>thinly laminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Laboratory Test Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description and Classification</th>
<th>Natural M.C. (%)</th>
<th>Liquid Limit (%)</th>
<th>Plasticity Index (%)</th>
<th>% Passing #200 Sieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-1 at 3.0 feet</td>
<td>SANDY CLAY with GRAVEL (CL), yellow-brown with yellow mottling</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-2 at 7.0 feet</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND (SC), yellow-brown</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-3 at 3.0 feet</td>
<td>CLAY (CL), dark brown</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOL</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>DEPTH (ft.)</td>
<td>Material Description</td>
<td>USCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◯</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>7.0'</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND, yellow-brown</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>16.0'</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND, olive-brown to yellow-brown</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>7.0'</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND, yellow-brown</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>16.0'</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND, yellow-brown</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▽</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>10.0'</td>
<td>CLAYEY SAND, yellow-brown with olive</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION REPORT**

10963 SAN PABLO AVENUE  
El Cerrito, California  

DRAFT
**SOIL ANALYSIS LAB RESULTS**

Client: Rockridge Geotechnical  
Job Name: 10963 San Pablo Ave  
Client Job Number: 17-1299  
Project X Job Number: S170413A  
April 20, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bore# / Description</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Min-Resistivity</th>
<th>Sulfates</th>
<th>Chlorides</th>
<th>Nitrate</th>
<th>Ammonia</th>
<th>Sulfide</th>
<th>Redox</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.0600</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.1020</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unk = Unknown  
NT = Not Tested  
ND = 0 = Not Detected  
mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram (parts per million) of dry soil weight  
mg/L = milligrams per liter of liquid volume  
Chemical Analysis performed on 1:3 Soil-To-Water extract

Please call if you have any questions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Eddie Hernandez, M.Sc., P.E.  
Sr. Corrosion Consultant  
NACE Corrosion Technologist #16592  
Professional Engineer  
California No. M37102  
ehernandez@projectxcorrosion.com
APPENDIX HAZ: PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT
PHASE I
ENVIRONMENTAL
SITE ASSESSMENT

10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito
California

FOR

Lander International, LLC
10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

basics
ENVIRONMENTAL

September 25, 2015
15-ENV4321
September 25, 2015
15-ENV4321

Lander International, LLC
10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Attention: Mr. Timothy Sauer

Subject: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report
10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, California 94530

Dear Mr. Sauer:

We have performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-13/AAI of 10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, California, the property. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 1 of this report. This assessment has revealed no obvious evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property that warrants further investigation and/or documentation at this time.

Should you have any questions regarding this report, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Basics Environmental, Inc.

Donavan G. Tom, M.B.A., E.P., R.E.P.A.
Principal Consultant
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PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT
10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, California
For
Lander International, LLC
15-ENV4321
September 25, 2015

I declare that, to the best of my professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of “Environmental Professional” as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency's Final Rule (40 CFR 312.21). I have the specific qualifications based on education, training and experience to assess a property of the nature, history and setting. In performing Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, I develop and perform the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

The findings, interpretations of data, recommendations, specifications or professional opinions are presented within the limits prescribed by available information at the time the report was prepared, in accordance with generally accepted professional environmental practice and within the requirements by the Client. There is no other warranty, either expressed or implied. The data and findings of this report are based on the readily available data and information obtained from numerous public and private agencies regarding the subject site and its immediate vicinity. Additional search (at greater cost) may or may not disclose information which may significantly modify the findings of this report. We accept no liability on completeness or accuracy of the information presented and or provided to us, or any conclusions and decisions which may be made by the Client or others regarding the subject site.

This report was prepared solely for the benefit of Basic's Client. Basics consents to the release of this report to third parties involved in the transaction for which the report was prepared, including without limitation, lenders, title companies, public institutions, attorneys, and other consultants. However, any use of or reliance upon this report shall be solely at the risk of such party and without legal recourse against Basics, or its subcontractors, affiliates, or their respective employees, officers, or directors, regardless of whether the action in which recovery of damage is sought is based upon contract, tort (including the sole, concurrent or other negligence and strict liability of Basics), statute or otherwise. This report shall not be used or relied upon by a party that does not agree to be bound by the above statements.

Donavan G. Tom, M.B.A., E.P., R.E.P.A.
Principal Consultant
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Investigation

Basics Environmental, Inc. (Basics) has performed this Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for Lander International, LLC pursuant to our signed agreements on September 14, 2015. The "subject site" is at 10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, California (APNs 509-110-015 & 509-110-017). The purpose of this ESA is to:

• Observe site conditions at the property in accordance with the protocols set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E1527-13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s All Appropriate Inquiry (AAI) Final Rule 40 CFR Part 312, except where modified by the proposal;

• Identify to the extent feasible recognized environmental conditions in connection with the subject site. The ESA is intended to evaluate the potential for the presence of hazardous or toxic chemicals in the soil and/or groundwater resulting from past and present land use activities. To the extent possible, potential sources of hazardous or toxic chemicals from adjacent off-site operations will also be evaluated; and

• Render findings and professional opinion regarding the potential for adverse environmental impacts on or adjacent to the site.

1.2 Scope of Work

The scope of work performed for this ESA consisted of the following tasks:

• Field reconnaissance and personal interviews to evaluate environmental land-use conditions on the subject site and view adjacent properties;

• Aerial photograph, City Directory and/or Fire Insurance/Topographic Map review (typically back to 1940 or first developed use of the property) to evaluate former environmental land-use conditions on the subject site and adjacent properties;

• Review of federal, state and county files and environmental database search report obtained from a commercial service providing up to date and current information;
• Evaluation of the physical setting (geomorphic, geologic and hydrogeologic) of the subject site property; and

• Preparation of this ESA report to present the findings and professional opinions regarding potential recognized environmental conditions on the site.

The work for this ESA was performed within the client approved scope of work and budget for the investigation.

1.3 Special Terms and Conditions

The goal of this ESA is to identify recognized environmental conditions indicating the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons in structures, ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property. Recognized environmental conditions are not intended to include de minimus conditions that do not present risks to public health or environment and that would not be subject to enforcement actions by government agencies.

1.4 Limitations and Exceptions

This ESA only includes a visual evaluation of the presence of asbestos, lead paint, radon, or mold, if applicable. In addition, this ESA does not include the results of any sampling, monitoring, or other types of field and/or laboratory testing or investigation.

1.5 User Responsibilities

The user of this ESA will be responsible for: (1) determining the relationship of the purchase price to the value of the property; (2) disclosure of specialized knowledge, experience or information which may effect the environmental condition of the subject site; and (3) disclosure of any environmental cleanup liens against the property within recorded land title records, if applicable. None of the above was provided by the client for our review.
2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND RECONNAISSANCE

2.1 Site Description and Uses

2.1.1 Interviews

A Basics representative visited the subject site on September 18, 2015. Basics observed the various facilities and operations conducted at the site and also noted the land-use in the vicinity of the site. Mr. Timothy Sauer, CFO and Founder of Lander International, LLC, provided access to available areas. Mr. Sauer was also briefly interviewed prior to and during the site visit. A standard environmental questionnaire was utilized to obtain disclosure of specialized knowledge, experience or information which may effect the environmental condition of the subject site.

Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated he purchased the building around 1997. During that time, the building was occupied by a grocery store/meat market, donut shop and hair salon. He converted the grocery store/meat market into offices and then converted the offices into the current arcade/museum in 2003. Mr. Sauer indicated that, for purposes of this assessment, he has no specialized knowledge or experience pertaining to the site or the adjacent properties that is material to RECs in connection with the subject property. Additional information obtained from interviews of onsite representatives is incorporated within the appropriate sections of this report.

2.1.2 Site Description and Uses

The subject site is located within the City of El Cerrito at the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue and approximately one mile north east of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay (See Drawings 1 and 2). The subject site consists of two adjacent parcels of land (APNs 509-110-015 & 509-110-017).

APN 509-110-015 is an approximately 0.348-acre “parallelogram” shaped parcel of land improved with an approximately 9,360-square foot one-story commercial building (10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue) and associated paved and landscaped areas (See Photos 1 and 2). This parcel is on the east portion of the subject site.
The one-story commercial building appears to have been built in stages and is constructed of wood framing on concrete slab and perimeter foundations, with concrete masonry exterior walls. Interior building materials include sheet rock interior walls and partitions, carpet and tile covered floors and “drop-style” and high ceilings. An HVAC system is located on the roof.

APN 509-110-017 is an approximately 0.070-acre (Jefferson Avenue) ‘triangular” shaped parcel of land improved with associated paved and landscaped areas (See Photos 3 & 4). This parcel is on the west portion of the subject site.

Utilities including water, electric, natural gas and sewage service are publicly available. No obvious evidence of electrical transformers was observed at the subject site. Information obtained from the site inspection indicated no evidence that PCB-containing equipment is now used or has been used in connection with the property.

The general area surrounding the property is developed commercial and residential. A site plan illustrating the site and adjacent properties is shown in Drawing 3.

The one-story commercial building (10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue) is currently segregated into three business units (10963, 10969 and 10979 San Pablo Avenue). 10963 San Pablo Avenue is currently occupied by Goody Donuts and utilized as a donut shop. 10969 San Pablo Avenue is currently occupied by Hair Extraordinaire and utilized as a hair salon. 10979 San Pablo Avenue is currently occupied by Lander International, LLC dba Playland Not at the Beach and utilized as an arcade and museum.

2.1.3 Environmental Land-Use Conditions

The subject site was evaluated for the use and storage of hazardous substances and petroleum products; use of aboveground and underground storage tanks, storage and disposal of hazardous wastes; evidence of releases from hazardous materials, and identification of conduits to the subsurface.
One-Story Commercial Building (10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue) (circa 1902) - The one-story commercial building occupies the majority of APN 509-110-015 (See Photos 1 – 4). The one-story commercial building appears to have been built in stages. Discussions with Mr. Sauer indicated to his knowledge the building was originally two structures and later connected into one.

**Goody Donuts (10963 San Pablo Avenue)** – 10963 San Pablo Avenue is located on the southeast corner of the building and is currently segregated into a retail area, kitchen area and restroom facility. The main entrance to the business unit is located along the east side of the building providing access to the retail area from San Pablo Avenue. Discussions with a representative of Good Donuts stated to his knowledge no hazardous materials, underground tanks, sumps or hazardous materials are utilized or located within the unit.

The retail area occupies the east half of the business unit. Located in this area are a glass donut display case and typical furnishings and supplies (See Photo 5). Visual observations of the retail area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the tile covered floor did not reveal any obvious evidence of drains, sumps or other conduits to the subsurface.

The kitchen area occupies the west half of the business unit. A restroom facility is located on the far northwest corner of the building. Located in this area is a commercial grade oven, miscellaneous processing equipment, tables and racks (See Photo 6). A maintenance sink is located along the north side of the kitchen area. Visual observations of the kitchen area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the tile covered floor did not reveal any obvious evidence of drains, sumps or other conduits to the subsurface.

**Hair Extraordinaire (10969 San Pablo Avenue)** – 10969 San Pablo Avenue is located on the center east side of the building and is currently segregated into a salon area, office and restroom facility. The main entrance to the business unit is located along the east side of the building providing access to the salon area from San Pablo Avenue. Discussions with a representative of Hair Extraordinaire stated to her knowledge no hazardous materials, underground tanks, sumps or hazardous materials are utilized or located within the unit.
The salon area occupies the majority of the business unit. Located in this area are typical hair styling stations, furnishings and supplies (See Photo 7). Visual observations of the retail area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the tile covered floor did not reveal any obvious evidence of drains, sumps or other conduits to the subsurface.

The office and restroom facility are located on the far west end of the business unit. Due to limited access, visual observations of these areas could not be conducted. Limited visual observations of the exterior entrances to the office and restroom facility did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills.

Playland Not at the Beach (10979 San Pablo Avenue) – 10979 San Pablo Avenue occupies the majority of the building and is currently segregated into a reception/lobby area, individual offices, exhibit rooms, museum area, carnival arcade area, break room, pinball arcade area and small separate office. The main entrance to the business unit is located at the northeast corner of the building providing access to the reception/lobby area from San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. Additional personnel doors are located on the south and west sides of the building providing additional access from the associated paved areas. Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated to his knowledge no hazardous materials, underground tanks, sumps or hazardous materials are utilized or located within the unit. Mr. Sauer also stated an outside service maintains the pinball machines and arcade games.

According to the Playland-Not-at-the-Beach web site, the business unit consists of 30+ pinball machines, arcade games, videogames, carnival games of skills, penny arcades full of antique amusement devices, an amazing hand-carved miniature circus, side show acts, miniature dioramas, Fascination games, and historic exhibits with artifacts from the Sutro Baths and Whitney's Playland in San Francisco. Playland-Not-at-the-Beach is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit Museum of Fun. Designed and built entirely by volunteers, the 20+ interactive exhibits celebrate the magic and history of America's bygone amusements. The goal is to educate newer generations about the bygone days and allow those who remember Whitney's Playland and the Sutro Baths the opportunity to recapture the glorious sights and sounds of that marvelous era.
Reception/Lobby Area and Office Areas - The reception/lobby area and office areas are located on the east portion of the business unit. The reception/lobby area and office areas consists of a common lobby area and individual offices. Located within the reception/lobby area and office areas are typical office furnishings and supplies (See Photos 9 & 10). Visual observations of the reception/lobby area and office areas did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the carpet covered floors within the reception/lobby area and office areas did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

Museum Area and Exhibit Rooms - The museum area and exhibit rooms are located on the center and northwest portions of the business unit. The museum area and exhibit rooms consists of individual rooms. Located within the museum area and exhibit rooms are historic exhibits with artifacts from the Sutro Baths and Whitney's Playland in San Francisco. Playland-Not-at-the-Beach including a hand-carved miniature circus, and miniature dioramas (See Photos 11 & 12). Visual observations of the museum area and exhibit rooms did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the carpet covered floors within the museum area and exhibit rooms did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

Carnival Arcade Area - The carnival arcade area is located on the center west portions of the business unit. The carnival arcade area consists of individual rooms. Located within the carnival arcade area are carnival games of skills, penny arcades full of antique amusement devices, arcade games and videogames (See Photos 13 & 14). Visual observations of the carnival arcade area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the carpet covered floors within the carnival arcade area did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

Break Room - The break room is located on the center portion of the business unit. The break room consists of a kitchen/break room and restroom facilities. Located within the kitchen/break room and restroom facilities are typical furnishings and supplies (See Photo 15). Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated to his knowledge this area was originally an outside patio area between the two original buildings which was enclosed when they combined the two buildings into one a long time ago. Mr. Sauer also indicated no indications of hazardous materials or
collections sumps were noted when he renovated this area when he purchased the building in 1997. Visual observations of the break room did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the tile covered floors within the break room did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

*Pinball Arcade Area* - The pinball arcade area is located on the south portion of the business unit. The pinball arcade area consists of a individual rooms. Located within the pinball arcade area are pinball machines (See Photos 16 & 17). Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated to his knowledge the far west end of this area was originally a walk in cooler for the previous grocery store/meat market. Mr. Sauer also indicated no indications of hazardous materials or collections sumps were noted when he renovated this area when he purchased the building in 1997. Visual observations of the pinball arcade area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the linoleum, carpet and bare concrete floors within the pinball arcade area did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

*Small Separate Office* – A small separate office is located on the south portion of the business unit, however it has a separate entrance along the south side of the building. Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated the office is utilized by his company as primarily storage of office files. Visual observations of the small office area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the carpet covered floors within the small office did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

*Associated Paved and Landscaped Areas* - The associated paved area is located on the west portion of APN 509-110-015 and entire portion of APN 509-110-017 and is accessible via a paved driveway along Jefferson Avenue to the north (See Photos 3 and 4). The associated paved area is paved with asphalt and concrete and utilized as a parking lot. A concrete walkway is also located along the south side of the building. In addition, a wooden access ramp is located along the west side of the building providing access to 10979 San Pablo Avenue business unit from the associated paved parking area. The associated landscaped area is primarily located on the west perimeter of the subject site and interspersed between the subject site perimeter and associated paved areas.
Located at the northwest corner of the subject site building is a former flue vent. Discussions with Mr. Sauer stated to his knowledge the flue may have been associated with the former grocery store/meat market. Mr. Sauer also indicated no indications of hazardous materials or collections sumps were noted when he renovated this area when he purchased the building in 1997. Visual observations of the former flue vent did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills.

A designated garbage bin area is located near the southwest corner of the subject site building within the associated paved area (See Photo 8). Visual observations of the designated garbage bin area did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. Visual observations of the bare asphalt within this area did not reveal any obvious evidence of sumps, cracks, drains or other conduits to the subsurface.

General observations of the rest of the associated paved and landscaped areas did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains or spills. No obvious evidence of underground storage tanks, distressed vegetation, or surface impoundments were observed throughout the site during the inspection.
2.2 **Adjacent Properties**

Sites in the vicinity of the subject site were observed during the site reconnaissance to evaluate conditions or businesses indicative of hazardous or potentially toxic materials use.

The following are the uses of the adjoining properties.

- **North** - Jefferson Avenue and beyond Eskaton Hazel Shirley Manor Residential Apartments (11025 San Pablo Avenue)
- **South** - El Cerrito Village Mixed Residential/Retail Complex (5929 Alameda Avenue & 10945-10955 San Pablo Avenue)
- **East** - San Pablo Avenue and beyond Civic Plaza Apartments (10944 San Pablo Avenue)
- **West** - Residential Apartment Building (5842-5900 Jefferson Avenue)

Visual observations of the immediate adjacent properties did not reveal any obvious business activities indicative to the use, storage and/or treatment of hazardous materials. In addition, no obvious evidence was noted at the immediate adjacent properties that would represent a significant environmental concern to the subject site.

2.2.2 **Wells**

No obvious evidence of wells, such as water supply wells and/or groundwater monitoring wells, were noted on or nearby the subject site.
2.3 Non-ASTM E1527 Considerations

2.3.1 Asbestos Containing Construction Materials

An asbestos survey was not conducted at the property as part of this assessment. However, the subject site structure was confirmed to have been constructed before 1979, the year asbestos containing construction materials was banned, thus, asbestos may have been utilized in its construction. No obvious evidence of friable or non-friable suspect asbestos containing materials was observed within easily accessible areas of the structure. However, original building materials not easily accessible including, but not limited to, flooring and masting materials, sheet rock muds and taping compounds, ceiling and roofing materials, and ducting and surfacing materials may contain ACCMs. To confirm if any asbestos materials are contained within the structure on the subject site, an asbestos survey should be performed by an AHERA trained asbestos professional. If the property building is slated for renovation or demolition, an asbestos inspection will be required, pursuant to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant (NESHAPs).

2.3.2 Lead-Based Paint

A lead-based paint survey was not conducted at the property as a part of this assessment. However, the subject site structure was confirmed to have been constructed before the ban on lead-based paints in 1978, thus, lead-based paints may have been utilized in its construction. Visual observations of the painted surfaces of the subject site structure appeared to be in fair condition with no obvious signs of chipping, cracking, and/or significant health risk concerns.

Lead-based paint is any paint, varnish, stain, or other applied coating that has 1 mg per square cm (or 5,000 μg/g by dry weight) or more of lead. In Section 1017 of the Housing and Urban Development Guidelines, Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, otherwise known as "Title X", states that a lead-based paint hazard is "any condition that causes exposure to lead that would result in adverse human health effects" resulting from lead-contaminated dust, bare, lead-contaminated soil, and/or lead-contaminated paint that is deteriorated or present on accessible, friction, or impact surfaces. Therefore, under Title X, intact lead-based paint on most walls and ceilings would not be considered a "hazard,” although the
paint should be maintained and its condition monitored to ensure that it does not deteriorate and become a hazard.

2.3.3 Radon

Radon testing was not conducted at the property as a part of this assessment. However, based on the Map of Radon Zones provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), there is a low potential that radon concentrations at, or above, 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l) are present at the site. Concentrations at, or above, 4 pCi/l are considered to be concentrations of concern per Cal-EPA and EPA. Based on the map, radon has been detected in Contra Costa County at average levels less than 2 pCi/l. Additional information can also be obtained from the California Department of Public Health’s Radon Program which provides a list of radon test results from throughout the state which are sorted by zip code.

Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive gas that is odorless, invisible, and without taste. It is released during the natural decay of uranium, which is present in most rock, soil and water. Its occurrence in the state is influenced primarily by geology. Radon can be found throughout California because uranium exists in all rock and soil. Although certain areas of the state are more likely to contain higher radon levels than others, radon is a house-to-house issue. You may live in an area of low radon potential yet your house can have elevated radon but your neighbor's house has a low radon level. Radon, in its natural state cannot be detected with the human senses. To confirm if any radon is contained within the structure on the subject site, testing should be performed by an EPA-authorized state certified radon testing professional.

2.3.4 Mold

A mold survey was not conducted at the property as a part of this assessment. However, no obvious evidence of mold or water damaged materials were observed within easily accessible areas of the structures.

In general, mold is a subset of the fungi family. Fungi are common and found in most ecosystems. Fungi are needed to help recycle organic material to sustain plant and animal life. In order to reproduce, mold release tiny spores into the air, which eventually attach onto surfaces favorable for growth. A class of fungi, molds have been found to cause a variety of health
problems in humans, including allergic, toxicological, and infectious responses. Molds are decomposers of organic materials, and thrive in humid environments, and produce spores to reproduce as plants produce seeds. When mold spores land on a damp spot indoors, they may begin growing and digesting whatever they are growing on in order to survive. When excessive moisture or water accumulates indoors, mold growth will often occur, particularly if the moisture problems remain undiscovered or not addressed.

Currently, there are no established “sound, science-based Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs) for indoor molds at this time”. As mold becomes a more prevalent issue, building owners will need to stay informed on the subject. There are dozens of Internet web sites geared to the topic, and increased litigation in this area is also fueling increased interest. With any new trend there often is misinformation, incorrect conclusions, and conflicting information. Those involved in the building industry should consider the source and weight of information carefully before drawing conclusions and making decisions.

To confirm if any mold is present within the structures on the subject site, laboratory test and sampling can be performed by a qualified industrial hygienist for various species of fungi such as Aspergillus, Cladosporium, Stachybotris and other mycotoxins, and bacteria families such as Legionella, etc. However, the only types of evidence that have been related consistently to adverse health effects are the presence of current or past water damage, damp materials, visible mold, and mold odor, not the number or type of mold spores nor the presence of other markers of mold in indoor air or dust.
3.0 PHYSICAL SITE SETTING

3.1 Geomorphic Description

The subject site is within the Coast Ranges geomorphic province of California within the northern end of the East Bay Plain, on the eastern flank of the San Francisco Bay structural trough. The subject site is situated approximately one-mile north of the eastern shoreline of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay on a relatively flat topography at an approximate elevation of approximately 15 feet above mean sea level. The structural depression that underlies the San Francisco Bay has accumulated up to 1100 feet of poorly consolidated sediment (Alameda County, 1988). The trough is filled with approximately 950 feet of alluvial fan deposits, characterized by lenticular beds of poorly sorted gravel, sand, silt, and clay that exhibit wide variations in bed thickness and grain size over short distances.

3.2 Geologic Setting

The subject site is located in the San Francisco Bay Region, which lies near the margin of the Pacific and North American crustal plates. Because these crustal plates are moving relative to each other, the region is tectonically active and experiences numerous and frequent earthquakes. Movement in the area occurs along two principal fault systems: the San Andreas fault (which parallels the California coast west of the Bay), and the Hayward fault (which is sub parallel to the San Andreas fault on the east side of the Bay) (Norris and Webb 1976). The subject site has been, and could in the future, be affected by seismic activity. The alluvial and marine sediments filling the structural basin underlying the San Francisco Bay have been sub-divided based on their dominant modes of deposition and geologic age. In general, these sediments include Bay Mud, the Merritt Sand, and Younger and Older Alluvium. However, fluvially deposited sediments predominate at on the upper portions of the East Bay Plain, and are generally characterized by thin sheets of younger, Holocene fluvial and interfluvial basin deposits underlain by older alluvium of Pleistocene age.
Information regarding soil lithology was researched at the California Water Resources Control Board’s website at [https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/](https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/). Based on subsurface investigations performed for the Civic Center Plaza Apartments at 10940 San Pablo Avenue, located approximately across San Pablo Avenue to the east, the subsurface soils in the area have been described as consisting of clays with high to medium plasticity from the surface to 4 feet bgs, low to medium-plasticity, sandy clays with occasional gravel from 4 feet to 12 feet bgs, and clayey sands from 8 feet to 20 feet bgs, the deepest explored level (Allied Environmental Services 1995).

### 3.3 Hydrogeologic Setting

Information regarding first depth to groundwater and flow direction were researched at the California Water Resources Control Board’s website at [https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov](https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov). According to the San Francisco Bay region’s Basin Plan, groundwater at the site falls within the East Bay Plain (RWQCB, 1995). Within this basin, the site lies approximately at the dividing line between two groundwater sub-areas: the Central sub-area, and the Berkeley sub-area. In 1999, the Water Board completed the “East Bay Plain Groundwater Basin Beneficial Use Evaluation Report” (RWQCB, 1999). After examining the current uses and potential likely future uses of groundwater in this basin, the Water Board recommended that shallow and deep groundwater in the area of the site (i.e., a portion of the Central sub-area and the Berkeley sub-area) be designated as Zone B Groundwater Management Zone. Zone B groundwater is described as “Groundwater unlikely to be used as a drinking water resource”. Groundwater in this category is described as likely to have been used historically as a domestic water supply (e.g., private wells), but unlikely to be used as public water supply. The Water Board also recommended that sub-area boundaries be reorganized, including the elimination of the Central sub-area and expanding the Berkeley sub-area to extend all the way to the shoreline. These proposed amendments (along with others) to the Basin Plan were approved by the San Francisco Bay Regional Board members in 2000.

Regionally, the shallow ground water is within the alluvial fans of the San Francisco Sub-Basin of the East Bay Plain Groundwater Basin (SFRWQCB, 1999) and flow direction is to the southwest in the direction of the San Francisco Bay. Locally, topography slopes southwesterly
towards the San Francisco Bay roughly illustrating the direction of the ground water flow
direction.

Based on subsurface investigations performed for the Civic Center Plaza Apartments at
10940 San Pablo Avenue, located approximately across San Pablo Avenue to the east,
groundwater has been encountered at approximately 6 to 8 feet bgs and occurred at depths
between 4.74 and 5.72 feet bgs in site wells. Groundwater flow is consistently in the west to
southwest direction at a relatively low groundwater gradient (Subsurface Consultants, Inc. 2001).
Hillside runoff, aquifer pumping, tidal fluctuations or other factors may influence ground water
levels. Seasonal variations should also be anticipated.
4.0 HISTORICAL REVIEW

Site historical information was obtained from a review of Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) Topographic Maps, aerial photographs, Polk and Haines City Directories. In addition, local building department records were also reviewed. The following Sanborn maps, topographic maps, and city directories were reviewed on September 21, 2014, within the libraries maintained by the University of California in Berkeley, California and City of Oakland, in Oakland, California. The aerial photographs were reviewed online within the sites maintained by National Environmental Title Research, LLC, TerraServer, and Google Earth.

Note: Copies of supporting aerials, city directories and topographic are not included in the report. The historical references are reviewed within local public libraries and are copyright protected and cannot be reproduced without the consent of the owner. As such, our reports properly cite and reference the historical reference in accordance with ASTM E1527-13/AAI protocols. Any incorporation of these documents without the permission of the owner would be against the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.G.S. Topographic Map</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.G.S. Topographic Map</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.G.S. Topographic Map</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Photograph</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk City Directory</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Fire Insurance Map</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the topographic maps of 1895 and 1915, the subject site and adjacent properties are shown as undeveloped. During that time, a paved road (current San Pablo Avenue) is shown adjacent to the east.

According to local building department records, the north portion of the subject site was developed with a two-story residential room building and the south portion of the subject site was developed with a small one-story residential dwelling in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the ECBD files.
In the Richmond/El Cerrito Sanborn Maps of 1903, 1905, 1909 and 1916, the subject site and adjacent properties fall beyond the area of coverage and no site-specific maps or details are available. However, the index map of 1916 shows the subject site bordered by Jefferson Avenue to the north and San Pablo Avenue to the east.

In the city directories of 1925 and 1930, the subject site nor San Pablo Avenue are listed.

In the Sanborn Map of 1926, the subject site is shown as four adjacent parcels of land. The city limit line was shown to cut through the west portion of the subject site (as currently noted). The north parcel is shown developed with a two-story residential room building with two associated out buildings. The south parcel is shown developed with a small one-story residential dwelling. The two west parcels are shown undeveloped. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond undeveloped parcels to the north; an auto wrecking yard consisting of a small one-story second hand auto parts shop, small residential dwelling, garage and yard to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond residential dwelling and undeveloped parcels to the east; and undeveloped parcels to the west.

In the Sanborn Map of 1930, the subject site is shown as three adjacent parcels of land. The city limit line was shown to cut through the west portion of the subject site (as currently noted). The north parcel is shown developed with a two-story non descript retail storefront building (original address of 1051 San Pablo Avenue), one-story non descript retail storefront building (original address of 1057 San Pablo Avenue) and two associated out buildings. The south parcel is shown vacant. The combined two west parcels are shown undeveloped. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond undeveloped parcels to the north; a yard consisting of a small one-story non descript retail storefront, small residential dwelling, garage and yard to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond residential dwelling and undeveloped parcels to the east; and undeveloped parcels to the west.

In the city directories of 1937 and 1942, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Angelo Fara grocers (1345 San Pablo Avenue).

In the topographic maps of 1942, 1959, 1968, 1973 and 1980, the subject sites and adjacent properties are shown within a shaded region designated as “urban developed” with no site-specific details available.
In the city directory of 1948, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Angelo Fara Market & Delicatessen, Johnson & Perelli grocers, De Maria Fruits and G F McDermott Meats (1345 San Pablo Avenue).

In the aerial photograph of 1946 and Sanborn Map of 1950, the subject site is shown as two adjacent parcels of land. The city limit line was shown to cut through the west portion of the subject site (as currently noted). The combined north and south parcels are shown developed with a two-story non-descript retail storefront building with attached one-story rear warehouse (new address of 1345 San Pablo Avenue) and one-story non-descript retail storefront building with new south addition (new addresses of 1335 & 1349 San Pablo Avenue). The combined two west parcels are shown undeveloped. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond undeveloped parcels to the north; a yard consisting of two commercial building utilized for auto repair and spray paint, a small gas and oil station and yard (1325 San Pablo Avenue) to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond one-story union hall building (1336-1340 San Pablo Avenue) and two-story residential dwelling apartment building (1330-1332 San Pablo Avenue) to the east; and undeveloped parcels to the west.

According to local building department records, permits for a store addition and remodeling of the two existing buildings (apparently into one combined building) were issued in 1954 and 1955 to Angelo Fara (owner).

In the city directories of 1955, 1957, 1961, 1965 and 1975, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Fred Vanamburg “Vans” Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue) and Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan & Rosenstrauch Meats (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the aerial photograph of 1958, the subject site appears as two adjacent parcels of land. The east parcel is shown developed with a one-story non-descript retail storefront building (new address of 10979 San Pablo Avenue) (as noted during the site reconnaissance). The west parcel is shown as a parking lot. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond trailer sales lot to the north; a yard consisting of two commercial building utilized for auto repair and spray paint, a small gas and oil station and yard to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond one-story commercial building (1336-1340 San Pablo Avenue) and two-story residential dwelling apartment building (1330-1332 San Pablo Avenue) to the east; and undeveloped parcels to the west.
In the Sanborn Maps of 1966 and 1970 and aerial photograph of 1968, the subject site is shown as two adjacent parcels of land. The city limit line was shown to cut through the west portion of the subject site (as currently noted). The east parcel is shown developed with a one-story non descript retail storefront building (new address of 10979 San Pablo Avenue) (as noted during the site reconnaissance). The west parcel is shown as a parking lot. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond trailer sales lot to the north; a one-story restaurant building and associated parking lot (10945 San Pablo Avenue) to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond one-story union hall building (10972 San Pablo Avenue) and two-story building utilized as kennels (10960-10962 San Pablo Avenue) to the east; and undeveloped parcels to the west.

In the aerial photograph of 1980, the subject site appears as two adjacent parcels of land. The east parcel is shown developed with a one-story non descript retail storefront building (as noted during the site reconnaissance). The west parcel is shown as a parking lot. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond trailer sales lot to the north; a one-story commercial building and associated parking lot to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond one-story commercial building and two-story building to the east; and residential apartment building to the west.

In the city directory of 1980, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Bob Garcia’s Quality Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), E&W Cyclery (10965 San Pablo Avenue), McClendon Electric Service (10967 San Pablo Avenue) and Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan Meats (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the city directory of 1985, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Bob Garcia’s Quality Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Headliners (10967 San Pablo Avenue), Soup ER Yogurt (10969 San Pablo Avenue) and Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan Meats (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the aerial photograph of 1987, the subject site appears as two adjacent parcels of land. The east parcel is shown developed with a one-story non descript retail storefront building (as noted during the site reconnaissance). The west parcel is shown as a parking lot. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond residential apartment building to the north; residential apartment complex to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond one-story
commercial building and two-story building to the east; and residential apartment building to the west.

In the aerial photographs of 1988, 1993, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2009 and 2012, the subject site appears as two adjacent parcels of land. The east parcel is shown developed with a one-story non-descript retail storefront building (as noted during the site reconnaissance). The west parcel is shown as a parking lot. During this time, bordering the site is Jefferson Avenue and beyond residential apartment building to the north; residential apartment complex to the south; San Pablo Avenue and beyond residential apartment complex to the east; and residential apartment building to the west.

In the city directory of 1990, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Country Style Bakery (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Container Craft (10965 San Pablo Avenue), and Angelo’s Market & Deli (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the city directory of 1995, the subject site is listed as being occupied by El Cerrito Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Hair Extraordinaire (10969 San Pablo Avenue) and Blue & Gold Market (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the city directories of 2000 and 2005, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Goody Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Hair Extraordinaire (10969 San Pablo Avenue) and Lander Consulting (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the city directory of 2010, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Goody Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Hair Extraordinaire (10969 San Pablo Avenue) and Lander International (10979 San Pablo Avenue).

In the city directory of 2015, the subject site is listed as being occupied by Goody Donut Shop (10963 San Pablo Avenue), Hair Extraordinaire (10969 San Pablo Avenue) and Lander International and Playland Not at the Beach (10979 San Pablo Avenue).
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REVIEW

5.1 Agency Record Review

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) was contracted to compile data from available government agency databases on locations of actual and potentially impacted sites within a one-mile radius of the subject property. Copies of the environmental database lists and the location map for the subject site are included in Appendix A.

The results of the database search by EDR revealed 54 mapped sites and 25 unmapped sites within a one-mile radius, of which 24 mapped sites are within a one-eighth mile radius of the subject site. Based on distance from the subject property and regional hydrogeology the following selected site(s) identified by EDR were deemed to have the highest potential to impact the subject site. In addition, a Tier 1 Vapor Encroachment Screen (VES) pursuant to ASTM E2600-10 was performed on the following selected site(s) to assess whether a potential vapor encroachment condition (VEC) exists at the subject property caused by the release of vapors from contaminated soil or groundwater either on or near the subject site. These sites identified by EDR were located either at, adjacent or possibly up gradient of the subject site. No listings were reported for the subject site address or auto repair and spray paint, a small gas and oil station and auto wrecking yard formerly at 1325/10945 San Pablo Avenue (1930s-1950s) by EDR.

• Civic Center Plaza Apartments & City of El Cerrito Public Safety Building – 10940 & 10900 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito. Located across San Pablo Avenue to the east and perceived up/cross gradient to the subject site. Listed on the Cortese, ENF and LUST Lists.

According to the information provided by EDR, this site is listed as impacting the soil and ground water with gasoline during the closure of an underground storage tank in 1994.

According to the RWQCB’s GeoTracker and Cal-EPA EnviroStor websites, this site was previously a vacant lot, occasionally used for parking motor vehicles, The site was part of a former Dolan Lumber Yard Property.
On June 1, 1987, two gasoline USTs (one 10,000-gallon and one 2,000-gallon USTs) were removed from Dolan Lumber Yard. The tanks had holes, however, soil and groundwater samples collected from the tank pits during tank removal activities did not contain hydrocarbons. Two wells were installed immediately down gradient (within 10 feet of the former USTs) in July 1987. Soil samples collected from well borings at 10 feet bgs and groundwater samples collected from the wells did not contain hydrocarbons.

In 1987, the former Dolan Lumber Yard site was divided into two parcels. The parcel comprising of the western and northern parts of the former Dolan Lumber Yard that contained the former USTs was assigned a new address (10944 San Pablo Avenue), and was redeveloped into Civic Center Plaza Apartments. The eastern parcel acquired by the City of El Cerrito maintained the original address (10940 San Pablo Avenue). Initially, the City considered building a new city hall at this parcel, and performed a geotechnical investigation at the site in 1994. Hydrocarbon contaminated soil and groundwater were encountered during this investigation, however no apparent on-site source was identified. Additional environmental investigations indicated that this contamination originated from an off-site source (a leaking underground storage tank (LUST) located at the adjacent (upgradient) site also belonging to the City of El Cerrito (El Cerrito Public Safety Building site at 10900 San Pablo Avenue).

Additional investigations of the release of petroleum hydrocarbons were conducted at this site. Nine additional soil borings were advanced to assess the extent of petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil and groundwater. The results indicated a significant plume of dissolved gasoline down gradient of the former 10,000-gallon gasoline UST at the Public Safety Building. However, the petroleum hydrocarbon plume is limited to the UST area, the Church, and the vacant lot. Groundwater data indicates the flow is to the west toward San Pablo Avenue and that the plume of petroleum hydrocarbons has not migrated in significant concentrations across San Pablo Avenue.

The latest groundwater sampling performed in 2003 indicated that the highest hydrocarbon concentrations (1,800 ppb of TPHg, 2,200 ppb of MtBE, and less than 10 ppb of benzene) remain at the southwestern portion of the subject site, However, the levels were reported to not pose a significant environmental risk. Benzene was not detected.

Subsequently, this issue was case closed by the local regulatory agency on November 11, 2003. Based on this information, the probability of a subsurface environmental impact and/or potential vapor encroachment from this site to the subject site is low.
5.2 Local Agency File Review

On September 15, 2015, a Basics representative contacted the California EPA - Department of Toxic Substance Control (CAL EPA DTSC) in Berkeley, California, in regards to any information concerning the subject site.

- **10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito (APNs 509-110-015 & -017)**
  The subject site

  No information regarding the subject site was available within the CAL EPA DTSC files or EnviroStor online database. No information regarding hazardous materials, underground storage tanks or unauthorized releases was available for the subject site.

On September 15, 2015, a Basics representative contacted the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in Oakland, California, in regards to any information concerning the subject site.

- **10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito (APNs 509-110-015 & -017)**
  The subject site

  No information regarding the subject site was available within the RWQCB files or GeoTracker online database. No information regarding hazardous materials, underground storage tanks or unauthorized releases was available for the subject site.

On September 15, 2015, a Basics representative reviewed the files maintained by the Contra Costa County Health Services Agency – Hazardous Materials Division (CCCHSA) in Martinez, California, in regards to any information concerning the subject site.

- **10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito (APNs 509-110-015 & -017)**
  The subject site

  No information regarding the subject site was available within the CCCHSA files. No information regarding hazardous materials, underground storage tanks or unauthorized releases was available for the subject site.
On September 18, 2015, a Basics representative reviewed the files maintained by the City of El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) in El Cerrito, California, in regards to any information concerning the subject site.

- **10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito (APNs 509-110-015 & -017)**
  The subject site.

  Information from the ECFD files revealed the earliest record for subject site included the following records:

  **10963 San Pablo Avenue**

  On August 21, 1997, a permit was issued to install a new hood at donut shop.

  On March 6, 1998, an existing donut shop changed ownership to El Cerrito Donuts.

  Inspections conducted by the ECFD from 2005 to 2014, indicated this unit was occupied by Goody Donut Shop. No reports of major violations were reported for this unit.

  **10969 San Pablo Avenue**

  Inspections conducted by the ECFD from 2010 to the 2014, indicated this unit was occupied by Hair Extraordinaire. No reports of major violations were reported for this unit.

  **10979 San Pablo Avenue**

  On November 21, 1997, a permit to change the use from a retail market to offices was issued for this unit.

  On February 17, 1998, a permit for interior modifications (offices) was issued for this unit.

  Inspections conducted by the ECFD from 2001 to the 2014, indicated this unit was occupied by Lander International/Playland Not at the Beach. No reports of major violations were reported for this unit.

  No information regarding hazardous materials, underground storage tanks or unauthorized releases was available for the subject site.
On September 18, 2015, a Basics representative reviewed the files maintained by the City of El Cerrito Building Department (ECBD) in El Cerrito, California, in regards to any information concerning the subject site.

- **10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito (APNs 509-110-015 & -017)**

  The subject site.

  Information from the ECBD files revealed the earliest record for subject site included the following records:

  **10963 San Pablo Avenue**

  According to the ECBD this structure was originally built in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the ECBD files.

  In 1954, permits for a store addition and remodeling was issued to Angelo Fara.

  On June 22, 1955, a permit to install a sign (Van’s Donuts) was issued for this address.

  On March 8, 1965, a permit for electrical rewire (Van’s Donuts) was issued for this address.

  On October 16, 1973, a permit for drainage repairs (Van’s Donuts) was issued for this address.

  On January 15, 1975, a permit to remove a non conforming sign (Van’s Donuts) was issued for this address.

  On May 1, 1987, a permit to change a sign (Momsy’s Donuts) was issued for this address.

  On November 4, 2005, a permit for interior modifications (Goody Donuts) was issued for this address.

  **10969 San Pablo Avenue**

  According to the ECBD this structure was an addition to an existing structure originally built in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the ECBD files.

  On July 16, 1980, a use permit for a children’s retail boutique was issued for this address.

  **10979 San Pablo Avenue**

  According to the ECBD this structure was originally built in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the ECBD files.
On May 14, 1936, a permit to construct a double garage was issued to Angelo Fara.

On April 6, 1942, a permit to perform additions and repairs to existing structure was issued to Angelo Fara.

On October 24, 1944, a permit to construct a storeroom was issued to Angelo Fara.

On March 26, 1947, a permit to construct a neon sign (Angelo’s Market) was issued to Angelo Fara.

In 1955, permits for remodeling was issued to Angelo Fara.

On August 17, 1966, a permit to install 660 feet of sidewalk on Jefferson Avenue was issued for this address.

On March 7, 1973, a permit to re roof (Angelo’s Market) was issued for this address.

On January 31, 1974, a permit to remove a non conforming sign (Angelo’s Market) was issued for this address.

On March 10, 1978, a permit to remodel storefront (Angelo’s Market) was issued for this address.

On April 24, 1978, a permit to remove second floor apartment and canopy was issued for this address.

On May 2, 1978, a permit to install canvas canopy and frame (Angelo’s Market) was issued for this address.

On May 2, 1978, a permit to install canvas canopy and frame (Angelo’s Market) was issued for this address.

On February 12, 1997, a line lot adjustment was issued for this address.

On March 31, 1998, a permit to perform interior modifications (offices) was issued to Lander International.

On February 27, 2003, a permit to perform interior modifications (arcade and museum) was issued to Cheerybee Properties.

On May 9, 2007, a permit to construct a ramp was issued to Cheerybee Properties.

On November 8, 2007, a permit to construct a ramp was issued to Cheerybee Properties.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

These conclusions are based on the data collected during performance of this ESA and are therefore subject to the time limitations associated with accessing governmental and site data. The purpose of this assessment was to evaluate the likelihood of soil and ground water degradation as a result of the use, storage, treatment, and/or disposal of hazardous materials/waste on the subject site and sites located within a one-mile radius. Findings are based on a geological and hydrogeological information study, and an evaluation of historical and present property use (historical resource review, regulatory agency database and file review, personal interviews and site reconnaissance study).

6.1.1 Data Gaps

A data gap is the failure to obtain information required by the standard despite good faith efforts by the environmental professional to gather the information. Based on the findings of our investigation, it is our opinion that there are no apparent significant data gaps within the scope of work performed.

6.1.2 Environmental Issues/De Minimus Conditions

De Minimus Condition are defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. On the basis of the information compiled and reviewed by Basics, our findings indicate the following de minimus conditions:
According to local building department records, the south portion of the subject site was reported to have been developed with a small one-story residential dwelling in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the local regulatory agency files reviewed.

By 1930, the small one-story residential dwelling was razed.

The use as residential does not have an obvious high potential business activity indicative to the storage, treatment or disposal of hazardous or potentially toxic materials. In addition, no information regarding the use of hazardous materials was uncovered during this time frame within the scope of work performed.

According to local building department records, the north portion of the subject site was reported to have been developed with a two-story building with two associated out buildings (original address of 1051 San Pablo Avenue) in 1902. No other documentation regarding the original construction was available within the local regulatory agency files reviewed.

Sometime between 1926 and 1930, a one-story addition was developed along the south side of the two-story building (original address of 1057 San Pablo Avenue).

In 1944, a one-story rear warehouse addition was developed along the west side of the two-story building (new address of 1345 San Pablo Avenue) and another one-story addition was developed along the south side of the building (new addresses of 1335 & 1349 San Pablo Avenue).

In 1954 and 1955, additional alterations and remodeling of the building was conducted converting the structures into the one combined building footprint (new addresses of 10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue as noted during the site reconnaissance).

In 1978, the second floor apartment was reported to have been removed.

Based on the historical references reviewed, the subject site building was listed as being occupied by residential rooms (1920s); Angelo Fara grocers (1930s-1940s); Angelo Fara Market & Delicatessen, Johnson & Perelli grocers, De Maria Fruits and G F McDermott Meats (1950s); Fred Vanamburg “Vans” Donut Shop, Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan & Rosenstrauch Meats (1950s-1970s); Bob Garcia’s Quality Donut Shop, E&W Cyclery, McClendon Electric Service and Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan Meats (Late 1970s); Bob Garcia’s Quality Donut Shop, Headliners, Soup ER Yogurt, and Angelo’s Market grocers and Moynahan Meats (mid 1980s); Country Style Bakery, Container Craft and Angelo’s Market & Deli (early 1990s); El Cerrito Donut Shop, Hair Extraordinaire and Blue & Gold Market (mid 1990s); Goody Donut Shop, Hair Extraordinaire, and Lander International and Playland Not at the Beach (2000s-Present).
The occupation by the tenants listed within the historical references reviewed during this time frame do not appear to have a high potential for business activities indicative to the use, storage and/or treatment of hazardous materials. In addition, no information regarding the use of hazardous materials was uncovered during this time frame within the scope of work performed.

From at least the 1940s to 1950s, the adjacent property to the south was occupied by a yard consisting of two commercial building utilized for auto repair and spray paint, a small gas and oil station and yard (1325 San Pablo Avenue).

During the 1960s, the two commercial building utilized for auto repair and spray paint, a small gas and oil station and yard was redeveloped into a commercial restaurant and later redeveloped into the current El Cerrito Mixed Used Village Complex in the 1980s.

No information regarding environmental investigations as part of the redevelopment was readily accessible for our review. In addition, no listings were reported for this adjacent site by EDR. Based on local hydrogeologic data, this adjacent site appears to be cross/down gradient of the subject site. Based on this information, the probability of a subsurface environmental impact and/or potential vapor encroachment from this site to the subject site is low.

Currently, there is no record of ground water impact from the adjacent site. However, if future environmental investigations indicate an impact to ground water has spread from the adjacent site onto the subject site, it appears unlikely that there will be any financial liability to the owner of the subject site even if it has been impacted by the release. This conclusion is based on established State policy, which has been promulgated in Resolution 92-49 of the CWRCB which is entitled Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Water Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304. The Resolution reads in part, “The Regional Water Board shall... Require the discharger (adjacent site) to extend the investigation, and cleanup and abatement, to any location affected by the discharge or threatened discharge; This language and the general practice of the governing regulatory agency are such that it is unlikely that any financial responsibility would be passed to the current or future owner(s) of the subject site in the unlikely event that the remedial investigation were to extend to the subject site.

However, any change in land use and/or redevelopment (including grading activities, excavation, and/or installation of water wells) may lead to exposure pathways that can result in contact with contaminated materials or exposure to unacceptable levels of VOCs vapor. As such, the client should be prepared to deal with the possible discovery and mitigation of potential impacted ground water in accordance with local and state regulations.
During Basics’ site reconnaissance, the subject site facilities were noted as relatively clean with no obvious indications of the present use or storage of appreciable amounts of hazardous materials. In addition, no obvious evidence of collection drains, sumps, underground tanks, underground hydraulic hoists or other conduits to the subsurface within subject site facilities were noted during the site visit, which would suggest a high potential discharge of hazardous materials to the subsurface. In addition, no compelling evidence was discovered that a hazardous substance has been released from its operation onto (or into) the surface.

Because ultimately it remains the user who accepts the liability for having entered into a chain of title, it remains important that the user recognize that the “risk tolerance” of a regulatory agency could change, as could be the case if information is later uncovered to suggest that the de minimus conditions (i.e., those that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies) are of greater significance than once thought.

Based on the de minimus conditions stated above, additional scope of services (i.e. baseline environmental sampling), but not limited to, may or may not disclose information which may significantly reduce the “risk tolerance” in connection with the acquisition of a parcel of commercial real estate.
6.1.3 Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs)

Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) are defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. Based on the findings of our investigation, it is our opinion that there are no apparent obvious RECs on site that warrant further investigation or documentation at this time.

6.1.4 Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions (CRECs)

Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions (CRECs) are defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls. Based on the findings of our investigation, no apparent CRECs were identified onsite.

6.1.5 Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions (HRECs)

Historical Recognized Environmental Condition (HREC) is defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls. Based on the findings of our investigation, it is our opinion that there are no apparent obvious HRECs on site that warrant further investigation or documentation at this time.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General Information</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APN:</strong> 509-110-015-5</td>
<td><strong>Use Type:</strong> RETAIL SALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situs Address:</strong> 10963 SAN PABLO AVE RICHMOND CA 94530-2338</td>
<td><strong>Tax Rate Area:</strong> 003-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address:</strong> PO BOX 1370 EL CERRITO CA 94530-1370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description:</strong> BAY VIEW PARK LTS 1-3 &amp; POR LTS 4,56-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Assessment</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Assd:</strong> 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land:</strong> $301,583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure(s):</strong> $501,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land and Improv:</strong> $803,015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HO Exempt?:</strong> N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemption Amt:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Property Characteristics</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedrooms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baths:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bldg/Liv Area:</strong> 9,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Built:</strong> 1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Acres:</strong> 0.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot SqFt:</strong> 15,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recent Sale History</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Image:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recording Date:</strong> 07/09/1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document #:</strong> 181443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Amount:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The information provided here is based on the data entered by the user.**
General Information

APN: 509-110-017-1
Situs Address: JEFFERSON AVE RICHMOND CA 94804
Mailing Address: PO BOX 1370 EL CERRITO CA 94530-1370
Legal Description: BAYVIEW PARK POR LTS 56,57,58 BLK 4

Use Type: PARKING LOT
Tax Rate Area: 008-001

Assessment

Year Assd: 2015
Land: $49,148
Structure(s): $7,962
Other:
Total Land and Improv: $57,110
HO Exempt?: N
Exemption Amt:

Property Characteristics

Bedrooms:
Baths:
Bldg/Liv Area:
Year Built:
Lot Acres: 0.070
Lot SqFt: 3,092

Recent Sale History

Document Image: Add to Cart
Recording Date: 07/09/1999
Document #: 181443
Transfer Amount:
TRANSACTION SCREEN QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

10929 SAN PABLO AVE.
STREET ADDRESS OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

EL CERRITO, CA 94530
CITY         STATE       ZIP

Tim Sauer
NAME OF PARTY COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE

Cheeryble Properties
COMPANY

10929 SAN PABLO AVE, EL CERRITO, CA 94530
STREET ADDRESS

(510) 232-4264 \* 24
DAYTIME PHONE

Tim@landerint.com
EMAIL ADDRESS / ALTERNATIVE CONTACT INFO

( ) ________
ALTERNATIVE PHONE
SUBJECT PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Total Size: 15,000 square feet  Size of developed Areas: 9,000 sq ft + parking lot
How is property zoned: CC  Is property vacant or improved: improved
Is property currently occupied: YES  How long under current ownership: 2/28/98

Current uses: 1. OFFICE SPACE
2. FAMILY FUN MUSEUM
3. DONUT / SANDWICH SHOP
Past uses: 4. HAIR SALON
1. GROCERY STORE

Structures on the property: 1. ONE SINGLE STORY BUILDING
2. 
3. 

Can a property layout be faxed: YES

Ground cover: Asphalt [ ]  Concrete [ ]
Grass [ ]  Dirt [ ]
Vegetation [ ]  Other ground cover [ ]

Land features: Direction of slope [ ]  Approximate incline [ ]
Sensitive Lands / Wetlands [ ]  Size [ ]
Surface Water [ ]  Size [ ]

How is storm water handled: DRAINS TO CURB / SEWER SYSTEM
Herbicide/Pesticide use (type, quantity, frequency): NONE

Utilities: well or city water: CITY WATER  septic or sewer: SEWER
electricity or gas: BOTH

Are materials ever burned on the property: NO
Storage facilities: NO
Hazardous materials storage: NONE
Waste materials: EB SANITARY
How long since excavation on the property: 2008
By Whom: ____________

Why: ________________

Last time natural features manipulated: 2008
By Whom: ____________

Why: ________________

Previous ESA's: ________________
By Whom: ____________

Why: ________________

Previous remediation work: ________________
By Whom: ____________

Why: ________________

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

General description of area: near shops, city hall

Uses of surrounding properties:
East: sporting goods store
North: senior living facility
West: apartments and houses
South: shops/ auto repairs

Proximity to:
- gas station: 1,000 feet
- waste treatment facility
- manufacturing plants
- water treatment facility

Is there any reason to suspect environmental contamination from adjoining properties? __no__

QUESTIONNAIRE

1a. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that the subject property is currently or has been previously used for an industrial use? __no__ unknown

1b. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that any adjoining properties is currently or has been previously used for an industrial use? __no__ unknown
2a. Did you observe evidence or do you have any knowledge that the subject property is currently or has previously been used for any of the following (circle all that apply):

- gasoline station
- motor repair facility
- dry cleaners
- photo developing laboratory
- junkyard or landfill
- waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing or recycling facility

2b. Did you observe evidence or do you have any knowledge that any adjoining property is currently or has previously been used for any of the following (circle all that apply):

- gasoline station
- motor repair facility
- dry cleaners
- photo developing laboratory
- junkyard or landfill
- waste treatment, storage, disposal, processing or recycling facility

3. Did you observe evidence or do you have any knowledge that there are currently or have been previously any damaged or discarded automotive or industrial batteries, pesticides, paints, or other chemicals in individual containers > 5 gallons (19 L) in volume or 50 gallons (190 L) in the aggregate, stored on or used at the subject property?

4. Did you observe evidence or do you have any knowledge that there are currently or have been previously any industrial drums (typically 55 gal) or sacks of chemicals located on the subject property?

5. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that fill dirt has been brought onto the subject property that originated from a contaminated site or is of unknown origin?

6. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that there is currently or has been previously any pits, ponds, or lagoons located on the subject property in connection with waste treatment or waste disposal?

7. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that there is currently or has been previously any stained soil on the subject property?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that there is currently or has been previously any registered or unregistered storage tanks (above or underground) located on the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you observe evidence or do you have any prior knowledge that there is currently or has been previously any vent pipes, fill pipes, or access ways indicating a fill pipe protruding from the ground on the subject property or adjacent to any structure on the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there currently evidence of leaks, spill, or staining by substances other than water, or foul odors, associated with flooring, drains, walls, ceilings, or exposed grounds on the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If the subject property is served by a private well or non-public water system, is there evidence or do you have any knowledge that contaminants have been identified in the well or system, or that the well has been designated as contaminated by any government environmental/health agency?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you have any knowledge of environmental liens or government notification relating to past or recurrent violations of environmental laws with respect to the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have you been informed of the current or past existence of hazardous substances or petroleum products with respect to the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you have any knowledge of any environmental site assessment of the property or facility that indicated the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products on, or contamination of, the subject property, or recommended further assessment of the subject property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you know of any past, threatened, or pending lawsuits or administrative proceedings concerning a release or threatened release of any hazardous substance or petroleum products involving the subject property by any owner or occupant of the property?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does the subject property discharge waste water (not including sanitary waste or storm water) onto or adjacent to the property and/or into a storm water system?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Do you have any prior knowledge that any hazardous substances or petroleum products, unidentified waste materials, tires, automotive or industrial batteries, or any other waste materials have been dumped above grade, buried and/or burned on the subject property?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Is there a transformer, capacitor, or any hydraulic equipment for which there are any records indicating the presence of PCB’s?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please provide details relating to any questions answered “yes” in the space provided. Attach additional sheets or informative documents if necessary.


The undersigned represents that to the best of their knowledge the above statements and facts are true and correct and the best of his/her knowledge no material facts have been suppressed or misstated.

Signature of party completing questionnaire

Timothy Sauer

Name of party completing questionnaire

Date

9/16/15
Customized for
Basics Environmental
Project: 15-ENV4321
9,360-Sq Commercial Building
10963-10979 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA  94530

Inquiry Number: 4412365.1s
September 16, 2015
Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.
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TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS

10963-10979 SAN PABLO AVENUE
EL CERRITO, CA 94530

COORDINATES

Latitude (North): 37.9169000 - 37° 55' 0.84"
Longitude (West): 122.3129000 - 122° 18' 46.44"
Universal Tranverse Mercator: Zone 10
UTM X (Meters): 560395.4
UTM Y (Meters): 4196612.0
Elevation: 62 ft. above sea level

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP ASSOCIATED WITH TARGET PROPERTY

Target Property Map: 5640624 RICHMOND, CA
Version Date: 2012

TARGET PROPERTY SEARCH RESULTS

The target property was not listed in any of the databases searched by EDR.

DATABASES WITH NO MAPPED SITES

No mapped sites were found in EDR’s search of available ("reasonably ascertainable") government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property for the following databases:

STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal NPL site list
NPL________________________ National Priority List
Proposed NPL________________ Proposed National Priority List Sites
NPL LIENS__________________ Federal Superfund Liens

Federal CERCLIS list
FEDERAL FACILITY__________ Federal Facility Site Information listing
CERCLIS___________________ Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System

Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List
CERC-NFRAP_______________ CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list**
RCRA-TSDF, RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal

**Federal RCRA generators list**
RCRA-LOG, RCRA - Large Quantity Generators
RCRA-SQG, RCRA - Small Quantity Generators
RCRA-CESQG, RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator

**Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries**
LUCIS, Land Use Control Information System
US ENG CONTROLS, Engineering Controls Sites List
US INST CONTROL, Sites with Institutional Controls

**Federal ERNS list**
ERNS, Emergency Response Notification System

**State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists**
SWF/LF, Solid Waste Information System

**State and tribal leaking storage tank lists**
INDIAN LUST, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

**State and tribal registered storage tank lists**
FEMA UST, Underground Storage Tank Listing
AST, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities
INDIAN UST, Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

**State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites**
INDIAN VCP, Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing

**State and tribal Brownfields sites**
BROWNFIELDS, Considered Brownfields Sites Listing

**ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS**

**Local Brownfield lists**
US BROWNFIELDS, A Listing of Brownfields Sites

**Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites**
WMUDS/SWAT, Waste Management Unit Database
SWRCY, Recycler Database
HAULERS, Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INDIAN ODI, ..................... Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
ODI, ............................ Open Dump Inventory
DEBRIS REGION 9, ............... Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations

Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites
US HIST CDL, ..................... National Clandestine Laboratory Register
SCH, ............................. School Property Evaluation Program
CDL, ............................. Clandestine Drug Labs
US CDL, .......................... Clandestine Drug Labs

Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks
CA FID UST, ....................... Facility Inventory Database

Local Land Records
LIENS, ........................... Environmental Liens Listing
LIENS 2, ......................... CERCLA Lien Information
DEED, ............................ Deed Restriction Listing

Records of Emergency Release Reports
HMIRS, ............................ Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
CHMIRS, ........................... California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
LDS, ............................... Land Disposal Sites Listing
MCS, ............................... Military Cleanup Sites Listing
SPILLS 90, .......................... SPILLS 90 data from FirstSearch

Other Ascertainable Records
RCRA NonGen / NLR, .............. RCRA - Non Generators / No Longer Regulated
FUDS, ............................. Formerly Used Defense Sites
DOD, ............................. Department of Defense Sites
SCRD DRYCLEANERS, ......... State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing
US FIN ASSUR, .................... Financial Assurance Information
EPA WATCH LIST, ................. EPA WATCH LIST
2020 COR ACTION, ............... 2020 Corrective Action Program List
TSCA, .............................. Toxic Substances Control Act
TRIS, .............................. Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
SSTS, .............................. Section 7 Tracking Systems
RMP, ............................... Risk Management Plans
RAATS, ............................ RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
PRP, ............................... Potentially Responsible Parties
PADS, ............................. PCB Activity Database System
ICIS, ............................... Integrated Compliance Information System
FTTS, ............................. FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)

MLTS, ............................. Material Licensing Tracking System
COAL ASH DOE, ................. Steam-Electric Plant Operation Data
COAL ASH EPA, .................. Coal Combustion Residues Surface Impoundments List
PCB TRANSFORMER, .......... PCB Transformer Registration Database
RADINFO, ......................... Radiation Information Database
HIST FTTS, ....................... FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
DOT OPS, ........................ Incident and Accident Data
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

CONSENT. Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees  
INDIAN RESERV. Indian Reservations  
UMTRA. Uranium Mill Tailings Sites  
LEAD SMELTERS. Lead Smelter Sites  
US AIRS. Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem  
US MINES. Mines Master Index File  
FINDS. Facility Index System/Facility Registry System  
CA BOND EXP. PLAN. Bond Expenditure Plan  
Cortese. "Cortese" Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List  
CUPA Listings. CUPA Resources List  
DRYCLEANERS. Cleaner Facilities  
EMI. Emissions Inventory Data  
ENF. Enforcement Action Listing  
Financial Assurance. Financial Assurance Information Listing  
HWT. Registered Hazardous Waste Transporter Database  
MINES. Mines Site Location Listing  
MWMP. Medical Waste Management Program Listing  
NPDES. NPDES Permits Listing  
PEST LIC. Pesticide Regulation Licenses Listing  
PROC. Certified Processors Database  
Notify 65. Proposition 65 Records  
UIC. UIC Listing  
WASTEWATER PITS. Oil Wastewater Pits Listing  
WDS. Waste Discharge System  
WIP. Well Investigation Program Case List

**EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS**

**EDR Exclusive Records**

EDR MGP. EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants

**EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES**

**Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives**

RGA LF. Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List  
RGA LUST. Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank

**SURROUNDING SITES: SEARCH RESULTS**

Surrounding sites were identified in the following databases.

Elevations have been determined from the USGS Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified. Sites with an elevation equal to or higher than the target property have been differentiated below from sites with an elevation lower than the target property. Page numbers and map identification numbers refer to the EDR Radius Map report where detailed data on individual sites can be reviewed.

Sites listed in **bold italics** are in multiple databases.

Unmappable (orphan) sites are not considered in the foregoing analysis.
STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal Delisted NPL site list
Delisted NPL: The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425.(e), sites may deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

A review of the Delisted NPL list, as provided by EDR, and dated 03/26/2015 has revealed that there is 1 Delisted NPL site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.734 mi.)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list
CORRACTS: CORRACTS is a list of handlers with RCRA Corrective Action Activity. This report shows which nationally-defined corrective action core events have occurred for every handler that has had corrective action activity.

A review of the CORRACTS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 03/10/2015 has revealed that there is 1 CORRACTS site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.734 mi.)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State- and tribal - equivalent NPL
RESPONSE: Identifies confirmed release sites where DTSC is involved in remediation, either in a lead or oversight capacity. These confirmed release sites are generally high-priority and high potential risk.

A review of the RESPONSE list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/03/2015 has revealed that there are 3 RESPONSE sites within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLAIR SOUTHERN PACIF</td>
<td>AT THE FOOT OF SOUTH</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.794 mi.)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td>Facility Id: 7490012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBORFRONT TRACT</td>
<td>MEADE SOUTH 49TH EAS</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.860 mi.)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td>Facility Id: 70000178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI AMERICAS INC AG</td>
<td>1415 47TH ST S</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.968 mi.)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td>Facility Id: 7280002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS

ENVIROSTOR: The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC’s) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program’s (SMBRP’s) EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.

A review of the ENVIROSTOR list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/03/2015 has revealed that there are 8 ENVIROSTOR sites within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO MILL AND</td>
<td>10812 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>SE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.201 mi.)</td>
<td>E27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 7240025</td>
<td>Status: Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSHINE CLEANERS &amp;</td>
<td>10750 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>SE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.270 mi.)</td>
<td>F33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 60002171</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHLONE GARDENS</td>
<td>6495 PORTOLA DRIVE</td>
<td>SE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.316 mi.)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 60001942</td>
<td>Status: No Further Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elevation</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Direction / Distance</td>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL NORTE CLEANERS</td>
<td>11299 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.260 mi.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 60001445</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAIR SOUTHERN PACIF</td>
<td>AT THE FOOT OF SOUTH</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.794 mi.)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 7490012</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.849 mi.)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 80001815</td>
<td>Facility Id: 7290039</td>
<td>Status: Refer: SMBRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 7490012</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBORFRONT TRACT</td>
<td>MEADE SOUTH 49TH EAS</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.860 mi.)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 70000178</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI AMERICAS INC AG</td>
<td>1415 47TH ST S</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.968 mi.)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 7280002</td>
<td>Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

LUST: The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System.

A review of the LUST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/15/2015 has revealed that there are 17 LUST sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PLAZA A</td>
<td>10940 SAN PABLO</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.048 mi.)</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed Global Id: T0601300634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PLAZA A</td>
<td>10940 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.048 mi.)</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 07-0685</td>
<td>Facility Status: Case Closed date9: 11/11/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO CITY OF P</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY'S RENTAL</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed Global Id: T0601300501 date9: 4/26/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.123 mi.)</td>
<td>D21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed Global Id: T0601300718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.123 mi.)</td>
<td>D23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 07-0772</td>
<td>Facility Status: Case Closed date9: 5/19/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; T SERVICE</td>
<td>10793 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SSE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.245 mi.)</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed Global Id: T0601347816 date9: 5/26/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elevation</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Direction / Distance</td>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVERMAN/SAN PABLO</td>
<td>10734-10766 SAN PABL</td>
<td>SSE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.287 mi.)</td>
<td>F34</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed Facility Id: 07-0840 Facility Status: Case Closed Global Id: T0601352645 date9: 1/23/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALKHI PETROLEUM INC</td>
<td>11319 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.311 mi.)</td>
<td>G35</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Status: Completed - Case Closed
Global Id: T0601300049

**CHEVRON #6967**
Facility Id: 07-0052
Facility Status: Case Closed
date9: 6/20/2001
11319 SAN PABLO AVE NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.311 mi.) G36 79

**EL CERRITO CITY OF**
Facility Id: 07-0092
Facility Status: Leak being confirmed
Global Id: T0601300088
6009 POTRERO AVE NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.343 mi.) 40 86

**TARGET**
Facility Id: 07-0642
Global Id: T0601300593
11402 SAN PABLO AVE NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.351 mi.) G41 89

**EL CERRITO SHELL**
Facility Id: 07-0642
Global Id: T0601391657
EL CERRITO REDEVELOP
Facility Status: Case Closed
date9: 4/25/2003
10602 SAN PABLO AVE SE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.404 mi.) 42 90

**EL CERRITO REDEVELOP**
Facility Id: 07-0123
date9: 4/25/2003
1718 EASTSHORE BLVD NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.424 mi.) H43 96

**PAY N PAK STORE #229**
Facility Id: 07-0232
date9: 4/14/1995
1711 EASTSHORE BLVD NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.440 mi.) H45 109

**UNOCAL**
Facility Id: 07-0522
Global Id: T0601300483
1503 CARLSON BLVD SW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.457 mi.) 46 112

---

SLIC: SLIC Region comes from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

A review of the SLIC list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/15/2015 has revealed that there are 3 SLIC sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P G &amp; E - EL CERRITO</td>
<td>7140 SCHMIDT LN</td>
<td>E 1/4 - 1/2 (0.488 mi.)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORMER UNIQUE CLEANE</td>
<td>6109 POTRERO AVENUE</td>
<td>NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.321 mi.)</td>
<td>G38</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Facility Id: 07S0161

**A&N COMP DRYCLEANERS**

Facility Status: Open - Inactive

Global Id: SL0601385412

**6109 POTRERO AVE**

NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.321 mi.)

G39 84

State and tribal registered storage tank lists

UST: The Underground Storage Tank database contains registered USTs. USTs are regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board’s Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database.

A review of the UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/15/2015 has revealed that there are 2 UST sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO PUBLIC SA</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY'S TRUCK &amp; AU</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites

VCP: Contains low threat level properties with either confirmed or unconfirmed releases and the project proponents have request that DTSC oversee investigation and/or cleanup activities and have agreed to provide coverage for DTSC’s costs.

A review of the VCP list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/03/2015 has revealed that there are 4 VCP sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO MILL AND</td>
<td>10812 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>SE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.201 mi.)</td>
<td>E27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSHINE CLEANERS &amp;</td>
<td>10750 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>SE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.270 mi.)</td>
<td>F33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHLONE GARDENS</td>
<td>6495 PORTOLA DRIVE</td>
<td>SE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.316 mi.)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL NORTE CLEANERS</td>
<td>11299 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.260 mi.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

### Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites

**HIST Cal-Sites:** Formerly known as ASPIS, this database contains both known and potential hazardous substance sites. The source is the California Department of Toxic Substance Control. No longer updated by the state agency. It has been replaced by ENVIROSTOR.

A review of the HIST Cal-Sites list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/08/2005 has revealed that there are 2 HIST Cal-Sites sites within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.849 mi.)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZENECA RICHMOND AG P</td>
<td>1415 SOUTH 47TH STRE</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.968 mi.)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Toxic Pits:** The Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites database identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board.

A review of the Toxic Pits list, as provided by EDR, and dated 07/01/1995 has revealed that there is 1 Toxic Pits site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICI AMERICAS, RICHMO</td>
<td>1415 S 47TH STREET</td>
<td>WSW 1/2 - 1 (0.968 mi.)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

**SWEEPS UST:** Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System. This underground storage tank listing was updated and maintained by a company contacted by the SWRCB in the early 1990’s. The listing is no longer updated or maintained. The local agency is the contact for more information on a site on the SWEEPS list.

A review of the SWEEPS UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 06/01/1994 has revealed that there are 3 SWEEPS UST sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO CITY OF P</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Status: A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Number: 70141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY’S RENTAL</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Number: 70131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lower Elevation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATIC ELECTRIC, INC</td>
<td>1490 KEARNEY ST</td>
<td>1/8 - 1/4 (0.173 mi.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comp Number: 8507

HIST UST: Historical UST Registered Database.

A review of the HIST UST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 10/15/1990 has revealed that there are 2 HIST UST sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO MILL &amp; LU</td>
<td>10812 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.201 mi.)</td>
<td>E28</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 00000067321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elevation</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Direction / Distance</td>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATIC ELECTRIC, INC</td>
<td>1490 KEARNEY ST</td>
<td>N 1/8 - 1/4 (0.173 mi.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 0000008507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Ascertainable Records

ROD: Record of Decision. ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid the cleanup.

A review of the ROD list, as provided by EDR, and dated 11/25/2013 has revealed that there is 1 ROD site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.734 mi.)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAZNET: The data is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year by the DTSC. The annual volume of manifests is typically 700,000-1,000,000 annually, representing approximately 350,000-500,000 shipments. Data from non-California manifests & continuation sheets are not included at the present time. Data are from the manifests submitted without correction, and therefore many contain some invalid values for data elements such as generator ID, TSD ID, waste category, & disposal method. The source is the Department of Toxic Substance Control is the agency. This database begins with calendar year 1993.

A review of the HAZNET list, as provided by EDR, and dated 12/31/2013 has revealed that there are 10 HAZNET sites within approximately 0.125 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID CHEONG</td>
<td>5920 BAYVIEW AVE</td>
<td>SSW 0 - 1/8 (0.075 mi.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID: CAC002750835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY EL CERRITO - FI</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID: CAC001321208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF EL CERRITO P</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID: CAL000351962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGHERTY TRUCK LINE</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVEN</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID: CAL000057048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY’S TRUCK &amp; AU</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC4412365.1s EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 11
HIST CORTESE: The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

A review of the HIST CORTESE list, as provided by EDR, and dated 04/01/2001 has revealed that there are 11 HIST CORTESE sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN LAND CO</td>
<td>10944 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.045 mi.)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PLAZA A</td>
<td>10940 SAN PABLO</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.048 mi.)</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO CITY OF P</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY’S RENTAL</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.123 mi.)</td>
<td>D21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALKHI PETROLEUM INC</td>
<td>11319 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.311 mi.)</td>
<td>G35</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO CITY OF</td>
<td>6009 POTRERO AVE</td>
<td>NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.343 mi.)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>11402 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.351 mi.)</td>
<td>G41</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO REDEVELOP</td>
<td>1718 EASTSHORE</td>
<td>NW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.424 mi.)</td>
<td>H44</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY N PAK STORE #229</td>
<td>1711 EASTSHORE BLVD</td>
<td>NNW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.440 mi.)</td>
<td>H45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCAL</td>
<td>1503 CARLSON BLVD</td>
<td>SW 1/4 - 1/2 (0.457 mi.)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HWP: Detailed information on permitted hazardous waste facilities and corrective action ("cleanups") tracked in EnviroStor.

A review of the HWP list, as provided by EDR, and dated 05/26/2015 has revealed that there is 1 HWP site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP</td>
<td>HOFFMAN BLVD &amp; S 47T</td>
<td>SW 1/2 - 1 (0.849 mi.)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST: Lists includes sites from the Underground Tank Program, Hazardous Waste Generator Program & Business Plan 12185 Program

A review of the CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 05/26/2015 has revealed that there are 14 CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST sites within approximately 0.25 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAR-T COMPLETE AUTO</td>
<td>5934 ALAMEDA AVE</td>
<td>S 0 - 1/8 (0.026 mi.)</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN LAND CO</td>
<td>10944 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.045 mi.)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTY'S MOTORS</td>
<td>10929 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.047 mi.)</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'S AUTO BODY</td>
<td>10919 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.059 mi.)</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDAS AUTO SERVICE C</td>
<td>10903 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.081 mi.)</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITOS CITY OF P</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.084 mi.)</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHERTY'S RENTAL</td>
<td>10895 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.096 mi.)</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO STEEL</td>
<td>1424 KEARNEY ST</td>
<td>N 0 - 1/8 (0.112 mi.)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 0 - 1/8 (0.123 mi.)</td>
<td>D21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITOS MILL &amp; LU</td>
<td>10812 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.201 mi.)</td>
<td>E26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALLS 0496</td>
<td>10794 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.222 mi.)</td>
<td>E29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; T SERVICE</td>
<td>10793 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SSE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.245 mi.)</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECKNICA AUTO</td>
<td>10793 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>SSE 1/8 - 1/4 (0.245 mi.)</td>
<td>E31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATIC ELECTRIC, INC</td>
<td>1490 KEARNEY ST</td>
<td>N 1/8 - 1/4 (0.173 mi.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facility Id: 708507
Due to poor or inadequate address information, the following sites were not mapped. Count: 25 records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEVRON</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME DEPOT</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME DEPOT</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLSON BLVD IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSPO PROPERTY</td>
<td>NPDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD SAN PABLO WALL 45TH PLUME</td>
<td>FTTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER KIEWET &amp; SONS</td>
<td>RESPONSE, ENVIROSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREW SALES</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD-RICHMOND</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAISER ALUM &amp; CHEM CO SHIPYARD #2</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAIR SOUTHERN PACIFIC LDFL</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERS CHEMICAL CO</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVRON USA RICHMOND REF</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP, CORRACTS, RAATS, FINDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE FORBES COMPANY</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA HOUSKA</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE HOME DEPOT #643</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEVRON 96463</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>RCRA-SQG, HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. COREY CUNNINGHAM</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE IMAGING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATELLUS COMMERCIAL CENTER</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID GOLD</td>
<td>CA BOND EXP. PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Search Distance (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal NPL site list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed NPL</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL LIENS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Delisted NPL site list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisted NPL</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal CERCLIS list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FACILITY</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLIS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRACTS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA-TSDF</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal RCRA generators list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA-LQG</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA-SQG</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA-CESQG</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCIS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US ENG CONTROLS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US INST CONTROL</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal ERNS list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State- and tribal - equivalent NPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIROSTOR</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWF/LF</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and tribal leaking storage tank lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN LUST</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIC</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and tribal registered storage tank lists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN VCP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and tribal Brownfields sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNFIELDS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

| Local Brownfield lists          |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| US BROWNFIELDS                  | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |

| Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| WMUDS/SWAT                        | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| SWRCY                            | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| HAULERS                          | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| INDIAN ODI                       | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| ODI                              | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| DEBRIS REGION 9                  | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |

| Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| US HIST CDL                       | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| HIST Cal-Sites                   | 1.000                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | 2       | NR  | 2             |
| SCH                              | 0.250                   |                 | 0     | 0         | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| CDL                              | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| Toxic Pits                       | 1.000                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | 1       | NR  | 1             |
| US CDL                           | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |

| Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| SWEEPS UST                       | 0.250                   |                 | 2     | 1         | NR        | NR      | NR  | 3             |
| HIST UST                         | 0.250                   |                 | 0     | 2         | NR        | NR      | NR  | 2             |
| CA FID UST                       | 0.250                   |                 | 0     | 0         | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |

| Local Land Records               |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| LIENS                            | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| LIENS 2                          | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |
| DEED                             | 0.500                   |                 | 0     | 0         | 0         | NR      | NR  | 0             |

<p>| Records of Emergency Release Reports |                         |                 |       |           |           |         |     |               |
| HMIRS                            | 0.001                   |                 | 0     | NR        | NR        | NR      | NR  | 0             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHMIRS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPILLS 90</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Ascertainable Records</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA NonGen / NLR</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUDS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRD DRYCLEANERS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US FIN ASSUR</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA WATCH LIST</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 COR ACTION</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAATS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLTS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL ASH DOE</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL ASH EPA</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB TRANSFORMER</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADINFO</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST FTTS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT OPS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSENT</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN RESERV</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTRA</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD SMELTERS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US AIRS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MINES</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA BOND EXP. PLAN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortese</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA Listings</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRYCLEANERS</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENF</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assurance</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZNET</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST CORTESE</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWP</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWT</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWMP</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEST LIC</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROC</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify 65</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTEWATER PITS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIP</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

#### EDR Exclusive Records

- **EDR MGP**: 1.000
  - < 1/8: 0
  - 1/8 - 1/4: 0
  - 1/4 - 1/2: 0
  - 1/2 - 1: 0
  - > 1: NR
  - Total Plotted: 0

#### EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

#### Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives

- **RGA LF**: 0.001
  - < 1/8: 0
  - 1/8 - 1/4: NR
  - 1/4 - 1/2: NR
  - 1/2 - 1: NR
  - > 1: 0
  - Total Plotted: 0

- **RGA LUST**: 0.001
  - < 1/8: 0
  - 1/8 - 1/4: NR
  - 1/4 - 1/2: NR
  - 1/2 - 1: NR
  - > 1: 0
  - Total Plotted: 0

- **Totals**: 0 34 11 25 14 0 84

### NOTES:

- **TP** = Target Property
- **NR** = Not Requested at this Search Distance
- Sites may be listed in more than one database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Program/Elements</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>Billing Status</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.026 mi.</td>
<td>Site 1 in cluster A</td>
<td>136 ft.</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td>S102260874</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:</td>
<td>Facility ID: 771534</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
<td>HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
<td>HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.045 mi.</td>
<td>Site 2 in cluster A</td>
<td>235 ft.</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td>S105023619</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:</td>
<td>Facility ID: 770569</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.047 mi.</td>
<td>Site 3 in cluster A</td>
<td>248 ft.</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td>S102260919</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:</td>
<td>Facility ID: 771150</td>
<td>ACTIVE, BILLABLE</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ACTIVE, BILLABLE</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>&lt; 1/8</td>
<td>0.048 mi.</td>
<td>253 ft.</td>
<td>Site 4 of 5 in cluster A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUST:**
- **Region:** STATE
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Latitude:** 37.916759
- **Longitude:** -122.311766
- **Case Type:** Not reported
- **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
- **Status Date:** 11/11/2003
- **Lead Agency:** Not reported
- **Case Worker:** BGS
- **Local Agency:** Not reported
- **RB Case Number:** 07-0685
- **LOC Case Number:** Not reported
- **File Location:** Not reported
- **Potential Media Affect:** Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
- **Potential Contaminants of Concern:** Gasoline
- **Site History:** Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

**Contact:**
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Contact Type:** Regional Board Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- **Organization Name:** SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- **Address:** 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- **City:** OAKLAND
- **Email:** bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Contact Type:** Local Agency Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** SUE LOYD
- **Organization Name:** CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- **Address:** 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
- **City:** MARTINEZ
- **Email:** slloyd@hsd.co.contra-cost.ca.us
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

**Status History:**
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
- **Status Date:** 11/11/2003
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Status:** Open - Case Begin Date
- **Status Date:** 06/24/1987
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 06/23/1995
- **Global Id:** T0601300634
### CIVIC CENTER PLAZA APARTM (Continued)

**Global Id:** T0601300634  
**Status:** Open - Site Assessment  
**Status Date:** 06/28/1995

**Global Id:** T0601300634  
**Status:** Open - Site Assessment  
**Status Date:** 04/10/2001

**Global Id:** T0601300634  
**Status:** Open - Verification Monitoring  
**Status Date:** 09/22/2003

**Regulatory Activities:**

- **Global Id:** T0601300634  
  **Action Type:** Other  
  **Date:** 11/16/1994  
  **Action:** Leak Discovery

- **Global Id:** T0601300634  
  **Action Type:** Other  
  **Date:** 06/24/1987  
  **Action:** Leak Reported

- **Global Id:** T0601300634  
  **Action Type:** ENFORCEMENT  
  **Date:** 04/10/2001  
  **Action:** * Historical Enforcement

- **Global Id:** T0601300634  
  **Action Type:** Other  
  **Date:** 11/16/1994  
  **Action:** Leak Stopped

- **Global Id:** T0601300634  
  **Action Type:** ENFORCEMENT  
  **Date:** 11/11/2003  
  **Action:** Closure/No Further Action Letter

**ENF:**

- **Region:** 2
- **Facility Id:** 217847
- **Agency Name:** El Cerrito Building Services
- **Place Type:** Facility
- **Place Subtype:** Not reported
- **Facility Type:** All other facilities
- **Agency Type:** City Agency
- **# Of Agencies:** 1
- **Place Latitude:** 37.916224
- **Place Longitude:** -122.311921
- **SIC Code 1:** Not reported
- **SIC Desc 1:** Not reported
- **SIC Code 2:** Not reported
- **SIC Desc 2:** Not reported
- **SIC Code 3:** Not reported
- **SIC Desc 3:** Not reported
- **NAICS Code 1:** Not reported
CIVIC CENTER PLAZA APARTM (Continued)

NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 207-0685
Reg Measure Id: 167647
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
301H: Not reported
Application Fee Amt Received: Not reported
Status: Never Active
Status Date: 02/20/2013
Effective Date: Not reported
Expiration/Review Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
WDR Review - Amend: Not reported
WDR Review - Revise/Renew: Not reported
WDR Review - Rescind: Not reported
WDR Review - No Action Required: Not reported
WDR Review - Pending: Not reported
WDR Review - Planned: Not reported
Status Enrollee: N
Individual/General: I
Fee Code: Not reported
Direction/Voice: Passive
Enforcement Id(EID): 237521
Region: 2
Order / Resolution Number: UNKNOWN
Enforcement Action Type: 13287 Letter
Effective Date: 04/10/2001
Adoption/Issuance Date: Not reported
Achieve Date: 6/15/2001
Termination Date: Not reported
ACL Issuance Date: Not reported
EPL Issuance Date: Not reported
Status: Historical
CIVIC CENTER PLAZA APARTM (Continued)

Title: Enforcement - 2 07-0685
Description: Not reported
Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: 6/15/2001
# Of Programs: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 7
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 07-0685

A5
CIVIC CENTER PLAZA APARTMENTS
SE 10940 SAN PABLO AVE
< 1/8 0.048 mi.
0.048 mi.
253 ft.
Site 5 of 5 in cluster A

Relative: Higher
Actual: 68 ft.

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0685
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 07-0685
How Discovered: OM
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 6/28/1995
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: 6/23/1995
Pollution Characterization Began: 4/10/2001
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: 9/22/2003

B6
ABBEY PET HOSPITAL
North 11070 SAN PABLO AVE
< 1/8 0.054 mi.
0.054 mi.
285 ft.
Site 1 of 2 in cluster B

Relative: Lower
Actual: 61 ft.

HAZNET:
envid: S113053675
Year: 2001
GEPaid: CAL000082614
Contact: LEE PRUTTON
Telephone: 5105290777
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 11070 SAN PABLO AVE
ABBOTorney HOSPITAL (Continued) S113053675

Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CA0000084517
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste
Disposal Method: Transfer Station
Tons: 0.06
Facility County: Contra Costa

envid: S113053675
Year: 2000
GEPaid: CAL0000082614
Contact: LEE PRUTTON
Telephone: 5105290777
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 11070 SAN PABLO AVE
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CA0000084517
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste
Disposal Method: Transfer Station
Tons: 0.06
Facility County: Contra Costa

envid: S113053675
Year: 1998
GEPaid: CAL0000082614
Contact: LEE PRUTTON
Telephone: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 11070 SAN PABLO AVE
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CA0000084517
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste
Disposal Method: Transfer Station
Tons: 0.1250
Facility County: 7

envid: S113053675
Year: 1996
GEPaid: CAL0000082614
Contact: LEE PRUTTON
Telephone: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 11070 SAN PABLO AVE
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CA0000084517
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste
Disposal Method: Recycler
Tons: .1251
Facility County: 7
ABBEE PET HOSPITAL  (Continued)  S113053675

envi:  S113053675
Year:  1995
GEPaid:  CAL000082614
Contact:  LEE PRUTTON
Telephone:  0000000000
Mailing Name:  Not reported
Mailing Address:  11070 SAN PABLO AVE
Mailing City,St,Zip:  EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County:  Not reported
TSD County:  Not reported
Waste Category:  Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste
Disposal Method:  Treatment, Incineration
Tons:  .0417
Facility County:  7

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access
1 additional CA_HAZNET: record(s) in the EDR Site Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C7</th>
<th>DON'S AUTO BODY</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</th>
<th>S102260918</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10919 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/8</td>
<td>0.059 mi.</td>
<td>313 ft.</td>
<td>Site 1 of 10 in cluster C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative: Higher
Actual: 68 ft.

| Facility ID: 771837 |
| Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE |
| Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST |
| Program/Elements: HMBP GENERAL |
| Region: CONTRA COSTA |

| Facility ID: 771837 |
| Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE |
| Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST |
| Program/Elements: HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR |
| Region: CONTRA COSTA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>DAVID CHEONG</th>
<th>HAZNET</th>
<th>S117305914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>5920 BAYVIEW AVE</td>
<td>RICHMOND, CA 94804</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/8</td>
<td>0.075 mi.</td>
<td>394 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative: Higher
Actual: 71 ft.

| evid: S117305914 |
| Year: 2013 |
| GEPaid: CAC002750835 |
| Contact: DAVID CHEONG |
| Telephone: 5105997789 |
| Mailing Name: Not reported |
| Mailing Address: 5920 BAYVIEW AVE |
| Mailing City,St,Zip: RICHMOND, CA 948044832 |
| Gen County: Contra Costa |
| TSD EPA ID: AZC950823111 |
| TSD County: 99 |
### DAVID CHEONG (Continued)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method</td>
<td>Landfill Or Surface Impoundment That Will Be Closed As Landfill( To Include On-Site Treatment And/Or Stabilization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C9 MIDAS AUTO SERVICE CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 2 of 10 in cluster C</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative: Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td>68 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>771535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Status</td>
<td>ACTIVE, BILLABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Status</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Elements</td>
<td>HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C10 CITY EL CERRITO - FIRE DEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 3 of 10 in cluster C</th>
<th>HAZNET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative: Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td>69 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>envi</td>
<td>S112882254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID</td>
<td>CAC001321208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>CITY EL CERRITO - FIRE DEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>5102154360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>10890 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City,St,Zip</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD EPA ID</td>
<td>CADO44003556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category</td>
<td>Unspecified oil-containing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method</td>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>.6255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| envi | S112882254 |
| Year | 1999 |
| GEPAID | CAC001321208 |
| Contact | CITY EL CERRITO - FIRE DEPT |
| Telephone | 5102154360 |
| Mailing Name | Not reported |
| Mailing Address | 10890 SAN PABLO AVE |
| Mailing City,St,Zip | EL CERRITO, CA 945300000 |
CITY EL CERRITO - FIRE DEPT (Continued)  

Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAD980887418  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Waste oil and mixed oil  
Disposal Method: Recycler  
Tons: .4795  
Facility County: 7  
envid: S112882254  
Year: 1999  
GEPaid: CAC001321208  
Contact: CITY EL CERRITO - FIRE DEPT  
Telephone: 5102154360  
Mailing Name: Not reported  
Mailing Address: 10890 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000  
Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAD009466392  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Other empty containers 30 gallons or more  
Disposal Method: Recycler  
Tons: 5.0000  
Facility County: 7

C11 EL CERRITO PUBLIC SAFETY BLDG UST U003784313  
SE 10900 SAN PABLO AVE N/A  
< 1/8 EL CERRITO, CA 94530  
446 ft. Site 4 of 10 in cluster C  
Relative: Higher  
Actual: 69 ft.  
USt: Facility ID: 770141  
Permitting Agency: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
Latitude: 37.9174575  
Longitude: -122.310029

C12 EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN LUST S104566437  
SE 10900 SAN PABLO AVE SWEEPS UST  
< 1/8 ENF N/A  
0.084 mi. Site 5 of 10 in cluster C  
Relative: Higher  
Actual: 69 ft.  
LUST: Region: STATE  
Global Id: T0601300737  
Latitude: 37.916233  
Longitude: -122.311359  
Case Type: Not reported  
Status: Completed - Case Closed  
Status Date: 11/1/2003  
Lead Agency: Not reported  
Case Worker: BGS  
Local Agency: Not reported  
RB Case Number: 07-0794  
LOC Case Number: Not reported  
File Location: Regional Board
### EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (Continued)

- **Potential Media Affect:** Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
- **Potential Contaminants of Concern:** Gasoline
- **Site History:** Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

#### Contact:
- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Contact Type:** Regional Board Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- **Organization Name:** SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- **Address:** 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- **City:** OAKLAND
- **Email:** bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Contact Type:** Local Agency Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** SUE LOYD
- **Organization Name:** CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- **Address:** 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
- **City:** MARTINEZ
- **Email:** slloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

#### Status History:
- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
- **Status Date:** 11/11/2003

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Case Begin Date
- **Status Date:** 09/01/1999

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 10/26/1999

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 12/13/2001

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 04/30/2002

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 07/12/2002

- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Status:** Open - Verification Monitoring
- **Status Date:** 09/22/2003

#### Regulatory Activities:
- **Global Id:** T0601300737
- **Action Type:** Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/01/1999</td>
<td>Leak Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/2002</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/2001</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>11/05/2001</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>07/01/2002</td>
<td>Other Workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>01/10/2003</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>10/24/2003</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>01/31/2003</td>
<td>File review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
<td>07/11/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Id</td>
<td>T0601300737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Type</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>01/10/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>T0601300737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>07/12/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>T0601300737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>04/30/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>T0601300737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>11/11/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Closure/No Further Action Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>T0601300737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>07/31/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUST REG 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id</td>
<td>07-0794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Status</td>
<td>Case Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>70141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Discovered</td>
<td>Tank Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Cause</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Source</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Leak Confirmed</td>
<td>10/26/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Program</td>
<td>LUST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY SITE ASSESSMENT:

| Preliminary Site Assessament Began | 4/30/2002 |
| Pollution Characterization Began | 7/12/2002 |
| Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted | Not reported |
| Date Remediation Action Underway | Not reported |
| Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began | 9/22/2003 |

SWEEPS UST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp Number</td>
<td>70141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Of Equalization</td>
<td>44-002328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Date</td>
<td>06-20-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Date</td>
<td>07-22-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Tank Id</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB Tank Id</td>
<td>07-000-070141-000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Status</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Date</td>
<td>06-20-88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued)

Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: 1

Status: Not reported
Comp Number: 70141
Number: Not reported
Board Of Equalization: 44-002328
Referral Date: Not reported
Action Date: Not reported
Created Date: Not reported
Owner Tank Id: Not reported
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-070141-000002
Tank Status: Not reported
Capacity: 2000
Active Date: Not reported
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: PRODUCT
Content: DIESEL
Number Of Tanks: 1

ENF:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 249410
Agency Name: El Cerrito City
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: City Agency
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.915746
Place Longitude: -122.311591
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (Continued)

Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 2 07-0794
Reg Measure Id: 169157
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
301H: Not reported
Application Fee Amt Received: Not reported
Status: Never Active
Status Date: 02/20/2013
Effective Date: Not reported
Expiration/Review Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
WDR Review - Amend: Not reported
WDR Review - Revise/ Renew: Not reported
WDR Review - Rescind: Not reported
WDR Review - No Action Required: Not reported
WDR Review - Pending: Not reported
WDR Review - Planned: Not reported
Status Enrollee: N
Individual/General: I
Fee Code: Not reported
Direction/Voice: Passive
Enforcement Id(EID): 249059
Region: 2
Order / Resolution Number: UNKNOWN
Enforcement Action Type: 13267 Letter
Effective Date: 07/11/2002
Adoption/Issuance Date: Not reported
Achieve Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
ACL Issuance Date: Not reported
EPL Issuance Date: Not reported
Status: Active
Title: Enforcement - 2 07-0794
Description: Not reported
Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: Not reported
# Of Programs1: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00
Region: 2
Facility Id: 249410
Agency Name: El Cerrito City
Place Type: Facility
### EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued) S104566437

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type:</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type:</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude:</td>
<td>37.915746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.311591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility:</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID:</td>
<td>2 07-0794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id:</td>
<td>169157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type:</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/ Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued)  S104566437

Fee Code: Not reported
Direction/Voice: Passive
Enforcement Id(EID): 241646
Region: 2
Order / Resolution Number: UNKNOWN
Effective Date: 04/30/2002
Adoption/Issuance Date: Not reported
Achieve Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
ACL Issuance Date: Not reported
EPL Issuance Date: Not reported
Status: Active
Title: Enforcement - 2 07-0794
Description: Not reported
Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: Not reported
# Of Programs1: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00
Region: 2
Facility Id: 249410
Agency Name: El Cerrito City
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: City Agency
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.915746
Place Longitude: -122.311591
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount</th>
<th>Project $ Completed</th>
<th>Liability $ Paid</th>
<th>Project $ Amount</th>
<th>Liability $ Amount</th>
<th>Initial Assessed Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facility Waste Type 4:** Not reported

**Program:** UST

**Program Category1:** TANKS

**Program Category2:** TANKS

**# Of Programs:** 1

**WDID:** 2 07-0794

**Reg Measure Id:** 169157

**Reg Measure Type:** Unregulated

**Region:** 2

**Order #:** Not reported

**Npdes# CA#:** Not reported

**Major-Minor:** Not reported

**Npdes Type:** Not reported

**Reclamation:** Not reported

**Dredge Fill Fee:** Not reported

**301H:** Not reported

**Application Fee Amt Received:** Not reported

**Status:** Never Active

**Status Date:** 02/20/2013

**Effective Date:** Not reported

**Expiration/Review Date:** Not reported

**Termination Date:** Not reported

**WDR Review - Amend:** Not reported

**WDR Review - Revise/Renew:** Not reported

**WDR Review - Rescind:** Not reported

**WDR Review - No Action Required:** Not reported

**WDR Review - Pending:** Not reported

**WDR Review - Planned:** Not reported

**Status Enrollee:** N

**Individual/General:** I

**Fee Code:** Not reported

**Direction/Voice:** Passive

**Enforcement Id(EID):** 239398

**Region:** 2

**Order / Resolution Number:** UNKNOWN

**Enforcement Action Type:** 13267 Letter

**Effective Date:** 01/10/2002

**Adoption/Issuance Date:** Not reported

**Achieve Date:** Not reported

**Termination Date:** Not reported

**ACL Issuance Date:** Not reported

**EPL Issuance Date:** Not reported

**Status:** Active

**Title:** Enforcement - 2 07-0794

**Description:** Not reported

**Program:** UST

**Latest Milestone Completion Date:** Not reported

**# Of Programs1:** 1

**Total Assessment Amount:** 0.00

**Initial Assessed Amount:** 0.00

**Liability $ Amount:** 0.00

**Project $ Amount:** 0.00

**Liability $ Paid:** 0.00

**Project $ Completed:** 0.00

**Total $ Paid/Completed Amount:** 0.00

**Region:** 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id</td>
<td>249410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>El Cerrito City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude</td>
<td>37.915746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude</td>
<td>-122.311591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID</td>
<td>207-0794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id</td>
<td>169157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID)</td>
<td>238603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>11/05/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Milestone Completion Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Paid</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Completed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id</td>
<td>249410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>El Cerrito City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude</td>
<td>37.915746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude</td>
<td>-122.311591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPA ID Number: S104566437
**EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued)**

| Facility Waste Type | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2 | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3 | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4 | Not reported |
| Program | UST |
| Program Category1 | TANKS |
| Program Category2 | TANKS |
| # Of Programs | 1 |
| WDID | 2.07-0794 |
| Reg Measure Id | 169157 |
| Reg Measure Type | Unregulated |
| Region | 2 |
| Order #: Not reported |
| Npdes# CA#: Not reported |
| Major-Minor | Not reported |
| Npdes Type | Not reported |
| Reclamation | Not reported |
| Dredge Fill Fee | Not reported |
| 301H | Not reported |
| Application Fee Amt Received | Not reported |
| Status | Never Active |
| Status Date | 02/20/2013 |
| Effective Date | Not reported |
| Expiration/Review Date | Not reported |
| Termination Date | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee | N |
| Individual/General | I |
| Fee Code | Not reported |
| Direction/Voice | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID) | 237604 |
| Region | 2 |
| Order / Resolution Number | UNKNOWN |
| Enforcement Action Type | 13267 Letter |
| Effective Date | 08/28/2001 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date | Not reported |
| Achieve Date | 10/22/2001 |
| Termination Date | Not reported |
| ACL Issuance Date | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date | Not reported |
| Status | Historical |
| Title | Enforcement - 2 07-0794 |
| Description | Not reported |
| Program | UST |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date | 10/22/2001 |
| # Of Programs1 | 1 |
| Total Assessment Amount | 0.00 |
| Initial Assessed Amount | 0.00 |
| Liability $ Amount | 0.00 |
| Project $ Amount | 0.00 |
| Liability $ Paid | 0.00 |
| Project $ Completed | 0.00 |
EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued)  S104566437

Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00
Region: 2
Facility Id: 249410
Agency Name: El Cerrito City
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: City Agency
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.915746
Place Longitude: -122.311591
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 2.07-0794
Reg Measure Id: 169157
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
301H: Not reported
Application Fee Amt Received: Not reported
Status: Never Active
Status Date: 02/20/2013
Effective Date: Not reported
Expiration/Review Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
WDR Review - Amend: Not reported
WDR Review - Revise/Renew: Not reported
EL CERRITO CITY OF PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDIN (Continued) S104566437

WDR Review - Rescind: Not reported
WDR Review - No Action Required: Not reported
WDR Review - Pending: Not reported
WDR Review - Planned: Not reported
Status Enrollee: N
Individual/General: I
Fee Code: Not reported
Direction/Voice: Passive
Enforcement Id(EID): 236735
Region: 2
Order / Resolution Number: UNKNOWN
Enforcement Action Type: 13267 Letter
Effective Date: Not reported
Adoption/Issuance Date: Not reported
Achieve Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
ACL Issuance Date: Not reported
EPL Issuance Date: Not reported
Status: Historical
Title: Enforcement - 2 07-0794
Description: Not reported
Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: Not reported
# Of Programs: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 7
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 07-0794

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 770141
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP: >10K-100K LBS, 20+ EMPLOYEES
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 770141
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 770141
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 770141
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
Region: CONTRA COSTA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S113158467</td>
<td>envid:</td>
<td>446 ft.</td>
<td>Site 6 of 10 in cluster C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative: Higher</td>
<td>Actual: 69 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAZNET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>CITY OF EL CERRITO PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING UST LOCTAION</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
<td>S113158467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10900 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/8</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.084 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAZNET:**

- envid: S113158467
- Year: 2012
- GEPAD: CAL000351962
- Contact: WILLIAM (BILL) DRISCOLL
- Telephone: 5105597039
- Mailing Name: Not reported
- Mailing Address: 10890 SAN PABLO AVE
- Mailing City, St, Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945302321
- Gen County: Contra Costa
- TSD EPA ID: CAD980884183
- TSD County: Sacramento
- Waste Category: Not reported
- Disposal Method: Storage, Bulking, And/Or Transfer Off Site--No Treatment/Recovery (H010-H129) Or (H131-H135)
- Tons: 0.65469
- Facility County: Contra Costa

---

**HAZNET:**

- envid: S113158467
- Year: 2012
- GEPAD: CAL000351962
- Contact: WILLIAM (BILL) DRISCOLL
- Telephone: 5105597039
- Mailing Name: Not reported
- Mailing Address: 10890 SAN PABLO AVE
- Mailing City, St, Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945302321
- Gen County: Contra Costa
- TSD EPA ID: CAD980884183
- TSD County: Sacramento
- Waste Category: Not reported
- Disposal Method: Storage, Bulking, And/Or Transfer Off Site--No Treatment/Recovery (H010-H129) Or (H131-H135)
- Tons: 0.02919
- Facility County: Contra Costa

---

**HAZNET:**

- envid: S113158467
- Year: 2012
- GEPAD: CAL000351962
- Contact: WILLIAM (BILL) DRISCOLL
- Telephone: 5105597039
- Mailing Name: Not reported
- Mailing Address: 10890 SAN PABLO AVE
- Mailing City, St, Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945302321
- Gen County: Contra Costa
- TSD EPA ID: NVT330010000
- TSD County: 99
- Waste Category: Not reported
- Disposal Method: Landfill Or Surface Impoundment That Will Be Closed As Landfill( To Include On-Site Treatment And/Or Stabilization)
- Tons: 0.125
- Facility County: Contra Costa

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>59 ft.</td>
<td>0.093 mi.</td>
<td>490 ft. Site 2 of 2 in cluster B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DESALVO CHIROPRACTIC (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evid</th>
<th>S113051002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID</td>
<td>CAL000076703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>DOUGLAS A DE SALVO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>11100 SAN PABLO AVE STE 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City,St,Zip</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category</td>
<td>Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method</td>
<td>Recycler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>0.1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evid</th>
<th>S113051002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID</td>
<td>CAL000076703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>DOUGLAS A DE SALVO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>11100 SAN PABLO AVE STE 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City,St,Zip</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category</td>
<td>Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method</td>
<td>Recycler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evid</th>
<th>S113051002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID</td>
<td>CAL000076703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>DOUGLAS A DE SALVO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>11100 SAN PABLO AVE STE 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City,St,Zip</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category</td>
<td>Photochemicals/photoprocessing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method</td>
<td>Recycler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>2.07999999999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOHERTY’S RENTAL (Continued)

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id: T0601300501
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0601300501
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: SUE LOYD
Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
City: MARTINEZ
Email: slloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0601300501
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 04/26/2002

Global Id: T0601300501
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 08/29/1989

Global Id: T0601300501
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 06/22/1994

Global Id: T0601300501
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 07/01/1997

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: Other
Date: 08/29/1989
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/12/2002
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: Other
Date: 08/29/1989
Action: Leak Reported
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Date: 08/29/1989
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/12/2002
Action: Preliminary Site Assessment Report

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 04/19/2002
Action: Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 03/08/2002
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300501
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 12/12/2002
Action: Staff Letter

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0541
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 70131
How Discovered: Tank Closure
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 6/22/1994
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: 7/1/1997
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

SWEEPS UST:
Status: Not reported
Comp Number: 70131
Number: Not reported
Board Of Equalization: 44-002587
Referral Date: Not reported
Action Date: Not reported
Created Date: Not reported
Owner Tank Id: Not reported
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-070131-000001
Tank Status: Not reported
Capacity: 5000
Active Date: Not reported
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: PRODUCT
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Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: 3

Status: Not reported
Comp Number: 70131
Number: Not reported
Board Of Equalization: 44-002587
Referral Date: Not reported
Action Date: Not reported
Created Date: Not reported
Owner Tank Id: Not reported
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-070131-000002
Tank Status: Not reported
Capacity: 5000
Active Date: Not reported
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: PRODUCT
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

Status: Not reported
Comp Number: 70131
Number: Not reported
Board Of Equalization: 44-002587
Referral Date: Not reported
Action Date: Not reported
Created Date: Not reported
Owner Tank Id: Not reported
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-070131-000004
Tank Status: Not reported
Capacity: 8000
Active Date: Not reported
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: PRODUCT
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

ENF:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 221465
Agency Name: Doherty’s Truck & Auto Rental
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: Privately-Owned Business
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.915528
Place Longitude: -122.311602
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
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### DOHERTY’S RENTAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS Desc 2:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility:</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID:</td>
<td>2 07-0541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id:</td>
<td>167688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type:</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice:</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID):</td>
<td>238709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number:</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type:</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>12/12/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOHERTY’S RENTAL (Continued)  S102428861

Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: Not reported
# Of Programs1: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00

Region: 2
Facility Id: 221465
Agency Name: Doherty’s Truck & Auto Rental
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: Privately-Owned Business
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.915528
Place Longitude: -122.311602
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 207-0541
Reg Measure Id: 167688
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
### DOHERTY’S RENTAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S102428861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Facility ID:** 770131
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

**HIST CORTESE:**
- **Region:** CORTESE
- **Facility County Code:** 7
- **Reg By:** LTNKA
- **Reg Id:** 07-0541

**CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:**
- **Facility ID:** 770131
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE

---

**INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE**
- **Facility ID:** 770131
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE

---

**Facility County Code:** CORTESE
- **Reg By:** LTNKA
- **Reg Id:** 07-0541

**Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES

---

**Region:** CONTRA COSTA

---

**Facility ID:** 770131
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 10 of 10 in cluster C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### DOHERTY'S RENTAL (Continued)

- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

#### Site Information:

- **Facility ID:** 770131
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

#### Contact Information:

- **Mailing City, St, Zip:** EL CERRITO, CA 94530
- **Mailing Address:** 10895 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Mailing Name:** BEATRICE DOHERTY/PRES-OWNER
- **Telephone:** 5102346025
- **Envid:** S113056196
- **Year:** 2007
- **Gepaid:** CAL000091582
- **Waste Category:** Unspecified oil-containing waste
- **Disposal Method:** Discharge To Sewer/Potw Or Npdes (With Prior Storage--With Or Without Treatment)
- **Tons:** 0.58
- **Facility County:** Contra Costa

#### Site Information:

- **Mailing City, St, Zip:** EL CERRITO, CA 94530
- **Mailing Address:** 10895 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Mailing Name:** BEATRICE DOHERTY/PRES-OWNER
- **Telephone:** 5102346025
- **Envid:** S113056196
- **Year:** 2003
- **Gepaid:** CAL000091582
- **Waste Category:** Unspecified organic liquid mixture
- **Disposal Method:** Recycler
- **Tons:** 1.66
- **Facility County:** Contra Costa

#### Site Information:

- **Mailing City, St, Zip:** EL CERRITO, CA 94530
- **Mailing Address:** 10895 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Mailing Name:** BEATRICE DOHERTY
- **Telephone:** 5102346025
- **Envid:** S113056196
- **Year:** 1997
- **Gepaid:** CAL000091582
- **Waste Category:** Unspecified oil-containing waste
- **Disposal Method:** Recycler
- **Tons:** 0.58
- **Facility County:** Contra Costa
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Gen County:  Not reported  
TSD EPA ID:  CAD980887418  
TSD County:  Not reported  
Waste Category:  Aqueous solution with total organic residues less than 10 percent  
Disposal Method:  Transfer Station  
Tons:  .2293  
Facility County:  7  

envid:  S113056196  
Year:  1997  
GEPaid:  CAL000091582  
Contact:  BEATRICE DOHERTY  
Telephone:  5102346025  
Mailing Name:  Not reported  
Mailing Address:  10895 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip:  EL CERRITO, CA 945302337  
Gen County:  Not reported  
TSD EPA ID:  CAT080013352  
TSD County:  Not reported  
Waste Category:  Tank bottom waste  
Disposal Method:  Recycler  
Tons:  .4170  
Facility County:  7  

envid:  S113056196  
Year:  1996  
GEPaid:  CAL000091582  
Contact:  BEATRICE DOHERTY  
Telephone:  5102346025  
Mailing Name:  Not reported  
Mailing Address:  10895 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip:  EL CERRITO, CA 945302337  
Gen County:  Not reported  
TSD EPA ID:  CAD980887418  
TSD County:  Not reported  
Waste Category:  Aqueous solution with total organic residues less than 10 percent  
Disposal Method:  Transfer Station  
Tons:  .1876  
Facility County:  7  

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access 4 additional CA_HAZNET: record(s) in the EDR Site Report.

19  STATE OF CA - DEPT. MOTOR VEHICLES  HAZNET  S112856867  
ESE  6400 MANILA AVENUE  N/A  
< 1/8  EL CERRITO, CA  00000  
0.109 mi.  573 ft.  
Relative:  Higher  
Actual:  71 ft.  

HAZNET:  
envid:  S112856867  
Year:  1994  
GEPaid:  CAC000965344  
Contact:  STATE OF CALIF/DMV  
Telephone:  0000000000  
Mailing Name:  Not reported  
Mailing Address:  6400 MANILA AVENUE  
Mailing City,St,Zip:  EL CERRITO, CA 0000000000  
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STATE OF CA - DEPT. MOTOR VEHICLES (Continued)

Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CAL000027741
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Asbestos containing waste
Disposal Method: Disposal, Land Fill
Tons: 55.6248
Facility County: 7

envid: S112856867
Year: 1994
GEPaid: CAC000965344
Contact: STATE OF CALIF/DMV
Telephone: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 6400 MANILA AVENUE
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 0000000000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: NYN200000044
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Polychlorinated biphenyls and material containing PCBs
Disposal Method: Recycler
Tons: .9124
Facility County: 7

envid: S112856867
Year: 1994
GEPaid: CAC000965344
Contact: STATE OF CALIF/DMV
Telephone: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 6400 MANILA AVENUE
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 0000000000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: NYN200000044
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Asbestos containing waste
Disposal Method: Treatment, Incineration
Tons: .0000
Facility County: 7

20 North
< 1/8
0.112 mi.
593 ft.

Relative:
Higher

Actual:
62 ft.

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

Facility ID: 772190
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP: LESS THAN 1000 LBS
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 772190
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HWG GENERAL
Region: CONTRA COSTA
Site: 1 of 3 in cluster D

LUST:
- Region: STATE
- Global Id: T0601300718
- Latitude: 37.91548
- Longitude: -122.311699
- Status: Completed - Case Closed
- Status Date: 05/19/2000
- Lead Agency: Not reported
- Case Worker: BGS
- Local Agency: Not reported
- RB Case Number: 07-0772
- LOC Case Number: Not reported
- File Location: Not reported
- Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
- Potential Contaminants of Concern: Diesel
- Site History: Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
- Global Id: T0601300718
- Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
- Contact Name: SUE LOYD
- Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
- City: MARTINEZ
- Email: slloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
- Phone Number: Not reported

- Global Id: T0601300718
- Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
- Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- City: OAKLAND
- Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
- Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
- Global Id: T0601300718
- Status: Completed - Case Closed
- Status Date: 05/19/2000

- Global Id: T0601300718
- Status: Open - Case Begin Date
- Status Date: 12/07/1998

- Global Id: T0601300718
- Status: Open - Site Assessment
- Status Date: 04/05/1999
COMMERCIAL (Continued)

Regulatory Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12/07/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Leak Discovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12/30/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Leak Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12/07/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Leak Stopped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIST CORTESE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region:</th>
<th>CORTESE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility County Code:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg By:</td>
<td>LTNKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Id:</td>
<td>07-0772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID:</th>
<th>772748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billing Status:</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Status:</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Elements:</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City, St, Zip:</td>
<td>RICHMOND, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County:</td>
<td>CAL000161743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City, St, Zip:</td>
<td>RICHMOND, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>9256251616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City, St, Zip:</td>
<td>RICHMOND, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD EPA ID:</td>
<td>CAL000161743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category:</td>
<td>Waste oil and mixed oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method:</td>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons:</td>
<td>13.3440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative:</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZNET:</td>
<td>S112897358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPAID:</td>
<td>CAC002105048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>10879 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing City, St, Zip:</td>
<td>RICHMOND, CA 945300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen County:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD EPA ID:</td>
<td>CAL000161743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD County:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Category:</td>
<td>Waste oil and mixed oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Method:</td>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons:</td>
<td>13.3440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility County:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

envid: S112897358
Year: 1999
GEPAID: CAC002105048
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ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL (Continued)  

Contact: ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL  
Telephone: 9256251616  
Mailing Name: Not reported  
Mailing Address: 10879 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip: RICHMOND, CA 945300000  
Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAT000646117  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Contaminated soil from site clean-up  
Disposal Method: Disposal, Land Fill  
Tons: 15.1704  
Facility County: 7  

envid: S112897358  
Year: 1999  
GEPAID: CAC002105048  
Contact: ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL  
Telephone: 9256251616  
Mailing Name: Not reported  
Mailing Address: 10879 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip: RICHMOND, CA 945300000  
Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAD0009452657  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Unspecified oil-containing waste  
Disposal Method: Recycler  
Tons: .1751  
Facility County: 7  

envid: S112897358  
Year: 1998  
GEPAID: CAC002105048  
Contact: ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL  
Telephone: 9256251616  
Mailing Name: Not reported  
Mailing Address: 10879 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip: RICHMOND, CA 945300000  
Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAL000161743  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Waste oil and mixed oil  
Disposal Method: Transfer Station  
Tons: 9.6535  
Facility County: 7  

envid: S112897358  
Year: 1998  
GEPAID: CAC002105048  
Contact: ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL  
Telephone: 9256251616  
Mailing Name: Not reported  
Mailing Address: 10879 SAN PABLO AVE  
Mailing City,St,Zip: RICHMOND, CA 945300000  
Gen County: Not reported  
TSD EPA ID: CAD0009466392  
TSD County: Not reported  
Waste Category: Other empty containers 30 gallons or more
ESTATE OF LAILA JAMMAL (Continued)

Disposal Method: Recycler
Tons: 1.6000
Facility County: 7

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access additional CA_HAZNET: detail in the EDR Site Report.

D23 COMMERCIAL LUST S105194273
SE 10879 SAN PABLO AVE ENF N/A
< 1/8 EL CERRITO, CA 94530
0.123 mi. LUST REG 2:
647 ft. Site 3 of 3 in cluster D

Relative: Higher
Actual: 68 ft.
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0772
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 72748
How Discovered: Tank Closure
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 4/5/1999
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: Not reported
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

ENF:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 218137
Agency Name: Commercial
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: Privately-Owned Business
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: Not reported
Place Longitude: Not reported
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
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### COMMERCIAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID:</td>
<td>207-0772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id:</td>
<td>168523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type:</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice:</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID):</td>
<td>2936336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number:</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type:</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>01/12/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Enforcement - 207-0772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Milestone Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs1:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMERCIAL (Continued)

| Liability $ Paid: | 0.00 |
| Project $ Completed: | 0.00 |
| Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: | 0.00 |

Region: 2
Facility Id: 218137
Agency Name: Commercial
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: Privately-Owned Business

# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: Not reported
Place Longitude: Not reported
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported

# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS

# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 207-0772
Reg Measure Id: 168523
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
301H: Not reported
Application Fee Amt Received: Not reported
Status: Never Active
Status Date: 02/20/2013
Effective Date: Not reported
Expiration/Review Date: Not reported
Termination Date: Not reported
### COMMERCIAL (Continued)

- **WDR Review - Amend:** Not reported
- **WDR Review - Revise/Renew:** Not reported
- **WDR Review - Rescind:** Not reported
- **WDR Review - No Action Required:** Not reported
- **WDR Review - Pending:** Not reported
- **WDR Review - Planned:** Not reported
- **Status Enrollee:** N
- **Individual/General:** I
- **Fee Code:** Not reported
- **Direction/Voice:** Passive
- **Enforcement Id(EID):** 239335
- **Region:** 2
- **Order / Resolution Number:** UNKNOWN
- **Enforcement Action Type:** 13267 Letter
- **Effective Date:** 09/02/1999
- **Adoption/Issuance Date:** Not reported
- **Achieve Date:** Not reported
- **Termination Date:** Not reported
- **ACL Issuance Date:** Not reported
- **EPL Issuance Date:** Not reported
- **Status:** Historical
- **Title:** Enforcement - 2 07-0772
- **Description:** Not reported
- **Program:** UST
- **Latest Milestone Completion Date:** Not reported
- **# Of Programs1:** 1
- **Total Assessment Amount:** 0.00
- **Initial Assessed Amount:** 0.00
- **Liability $ Amount:** 0.00
- **Project $ Amount:** 0.00
- **Liability $ Paid:** 0.00
- **Project $ Completed:** 0.00
- **Total $ Paid/Completed Amount:** 0.00

---

### CNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, BUILDING MAINT

**Address:** 1001 S 57TH ST
**City:** RICHMOND, CA 94804

**Relative:** Lower
- **Lower:** 24
- **WWN:** < 1/8
- **< 1/8 mile:** 0.125 mi.
- **Within 660 ft.:**

**Actual:** 51 ft.

**HAZNET:**
- **envid:** S112923184
- **Year:** 2003
- **GEPAYD:** CAC002553739
- **Contact:** ROYLAND HINDSMAN
- **Telephone:** 9253137077
- **Mailing Name:** Not reported
- **Mailing Address:** 2467 WATERBIRD WY
- **Mailing City,St,Zip:** MARTINEZ, CA 94553
- **Gen County:** Not reported
- **TSD EPA ID:** CAD982042475
- **TSD County:** Not reported
- **Waste Category:** Asbestos containing waste
- **Disposal Method:** Disposal, Land Fill
- **Tons:** 0.84
- **Facility County:** Contra Costa

**envid:** S112923184
### CNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, BUILDING MAINT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contra Costa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility County:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tons:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposal Method:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Category:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSD County:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSD EPA ID:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen County:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing City, St, Zip:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEPAID:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Status:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Comp Number:</strong> 8507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Number:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Board Of Equalization:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Referral Date:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Action Date:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Created Date:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Owner Tank Id:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST SWRCB Tank Id:</strong> 07-000-008507-000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Tank Status:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Capacity:</strong> 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Active Date:</strong> Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Tank Use:</strong> M.V. FUEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST STG:</strong> PRODUCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Content:</strong> REG UNLEADED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEEPS UST Number Of Tanks:</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Contra Costa**

**Facility County:**

**Tons:** 0.84

**Disposal Method:** Disposal, Land Fill

**Waste Category:** Other inorganic solid waste

**TSD County:** CAD028409019

**TSD EPA ID:** Not reported

**Gen County:** MARTINEZ, CA 94553

**Mailing City, St, Zip:** MARTINEZ, CA 94553

**Mailing Address:** 2467 WATERBIRD WY

**Mailing Name:** ROYLAND HINDSMAN

**Telephone:** 9253137077

**GEPAID:** CAC002553739

**Contact:** ROYLAND HINDSMAN

**Year:** 2002

**envid:** S112923184

---

**Static Electric, Inc.**

**1490 Kearney St**

**El Cerrito, CA 94530**

**SWEEPS UST:**

**HIST UST:** U001596722

**SWEEPS UST Region:** STATE

---

**STATIC ELECTRIC, INC.**

**1490 KEARNEY ST**

**EL CERRITO, CA 94530**

**SWEEPS UST:**

**HIST UST:** U001596722

**CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST**

---

**CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST**

**HIST UST:**

**REGION:** STATE

---
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STATIC ELECTRIC, INC. (Continued) U001596722

Facility ID: 00000008507
Facility Type: Other
Other Type: ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR
Contact Name: DOUGLAS H. WATSON
Telephone: 4152330777
Owner Name: STATIC ELECTRIC, INC.
Owner Address: 1490 KEARNEY ST.
Owner City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 94530
Total Tanks: 0001

Tank Num: 001
Container Num: 257543
Year Installed: 1965
Tank Capacity: 00001000
Tank Used for: PRODUCT
Type of Fuel: UNLEADED
Container Construction Thickness: Not reported
Leak Detection: None

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 708507
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
Region: CONTRA COSTA

E26 EL CERRITO MILL & LUMBER CO CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST S105036465 N/A
SE 10812 SAN PABLO AVE
1/8-1/4 1/8-1/4 EL CERRITO, CA 94530
0.201 mi. 0.201 mi.
1059 ft. 1059 ft.
Site 1 of 6 in cluster E
Relative:
Higher
Actual:
69 ft.

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 773909
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP GENERAL
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 707736
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 20+ EMPLOYEES
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 707736
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HWG: REPORTED ZERO
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 707736
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
Region: CONTRA COSTA
| E27 | EL CERRITO MILL AND LUMBER | ENVIROSTOR | S112889167 |
| SE | 10812 SAN PABLO AVENUE | VCP | N/A |
| 1/8-1/4 | EL CERRITO, CA 94530 | HAZNET | |
| mi. | | | |
| 0.201 | | | |
| ft. | | | |
| 1059 | | | |
| Site 2 of 6 in cluster E | | | |

Relative: Higher
Actual: 69 ft.

ENVIROSTOR:
- Facility ID: 7240025
- Status: Certified
- Status Date: 08/02/2004
- Site Code: 201395
- Site Type: Voluntary Cleanup
- Site Type Detailed: Voluntary Cleanup
- Acres: 4.1
- NPL: NO
- Regulatory Agencies: SMBRP
- Lead Agency: SMBRP
- Program Manager: Ryan Miya
- Supervisor: Denise Tsuji
- Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
- Assembly: 15
- Senate: 09
- Special Program: Voluntary Cleanup Program
- Restricted Use: NO
- Site Mgmt Req: NONE SPECIFIED
- Funding: Responsible Party
- Latitude: 37.91460
- Longitude: -122.3080
- APN: 503-010-005, 503-010-011, 503-020-005, 503-020-006, 503-121-001, 503-121-002, 503-130-016, 503130016
- Past Use: MANUFACTURING - LUMBER/WOOD PRODUCTS
- Potential COC: Arsenic Benzene Lead TPH-diesel TPH-MOTOR OIL
- Confirmed COC: Arsenic Benzene Lead TPH-diesel TPH-MOTOR OIL
- Potential Description: OTH, SOIL
- Alias Name: Not reported
- Alias Type: Not reported

Completed Info:
- Completed Area Name: Not reported
- Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
- Completed Document Type: Not reported
- Completed Date: Not reported
- Comments: Not reported

Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

VCP:
- Facility ID: 7240025
- Site Type: Voluntary Cleanup
- Site Type Detail: Voluntary Cleanup
- Site Mgmt. Req.: NONE SPECIFIED
EL CERRITO MILL AND LUMBER (Continued)  S112889167

Acres: 4.1
National Priorities List: NO
Cleanup Oversight Agencies: SMBRP
Lead Agency: SBBRP
Lead Agency Description: DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
Project Manager: Ryan Miya
Supervisor: Denise Tsuji
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Site Code: 201395
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
Special Programs Code: Voluntary Cleanup Program
Status: Certified
Status Date: 08/02/2004
Restricted Use: NO
Funding: Responsible Party
Lat/Long: 37.91460 / -122.3080
APN: 503-010-005, 503-010-011, 503-020-005, 503-020-006, 503-121-001, 503-121-002, 503-130-016, 503130016
Past Use: MANUFACTURING - LUMBER/WOOD PRODUCTS
Potential COC: 30001, 30003, 30013, 30024, 3002502
Confirmed COC: 30001,30003,30013,30024,3002502
Potential Description: OTH, SOIL
Alias Name: Not reported
Alias Type: Not reported
Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: Not reported
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Not reported
Completed Date: Not reported
Comments: Not reported
Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

HAZNET:
envid: S112889167
Year: 1998
GEPaid: CAC001410848
Contact: JACK FREETHY
TelephoneNumber: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 10812 SAN PABLO
Mailing City,St,Zip: EL CERRITO, CA 945300000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CAD009466392
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Other empty containers 30 gallons or more
Disposal Method: Recycler
EL CERRITO MILL AND LUMBER (Continued)  S112889167

Tons: .2500  
Facility County: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E28</th>
<th>EL CERRITO MILL &amp; LUMBER CO</th>
<th>HIST UST</th>
<th>U001596712</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10812 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8-1/4</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.201 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3 of 6 in cluster E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative: Higher  
Actual: 69 ft.

| Facility County: | .2500 |
| Facility ID: | 00000067321 |
| Facility Type: | Other |
| Other Type: | LUMBER YARD & MILL |
| Contact Name: | ELMER J. FREETHY |
| Telephone: | 41552500 |
| Owner Name: | EL CERRITO MILL & LUMBER CO |
| Owner Address: | 10812 SAN PABLO AVE |
| Owner City,St,Zip: | EL CERRITO, CA 94530 |
| Total Tanks: | 001 |
| Tank Num: | 1 |
| Year Installed: | 1948 |
| Tank Capacity: | 000000550 |
| Tank Used for: | WASTE |
| Type of Fuel: | 2 |
| Container Construction Thickness: | X |
| Leak Detection: | Visual |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E29</th>
<th>MARSHALLS 0496</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</th>
<th>S117047868</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10794 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8-1/4</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.222 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1174 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4 of 6 in cluster E</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative: Higher  
Actual: 70 ft.

| Facility ID: | 774829 |
| Billing Status: | ACTIVE, BILLABLE |
| Program Status: | CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST |
| Program/Elements: | HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR |
| Region: | CONTRA COSTA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E30</th>
<th>S &amp; T SERVICE</th>
<th>LUST</th>
<th>S106229886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>10793 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8-1/4</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.245 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5 of 6 in cluster E</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative: Higher  
Actual: 67 ft.

| Region: | STATE |
| Global Id: | T0601347816 |
| Latitude: | 37.913467 |
| Longitude: | -122.310613 |
| Case Type: | Not reported |
S & T SERVICE (Continued)

Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 05/26/2004
Lead Agency: Not reported
Case Worker: BGS
Local Agency: Not reported
RB Case Number: 07-0845
LOC Case Number: Not reported
File Location: Not reported
Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline
Site History: Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id: T0601347816
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: PAUL ANDREWS
Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA CO. ENVIR. HEALTH DIV.
Address: 4333 PACHECO BOULEVARD
City: MARTINEZ
Email: pandrews@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0601347816
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 05/26/2004

Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 12/16/2003

Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 03/04/2004

Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 03/05/2004

Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 03/29/2004

Global Id: T0601347816
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 05/10/2004
S & T SERVICE (Continued)

Regulatory Activities:

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: Other
Date: 12/16/2003
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 05/26/2004
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: Other
Date: 02/09/2004
Action: Leak Reported

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: Other
Date: 12/16/2004
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 05/18/2004
Action: * Verbal Communication

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 07/02/2004
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601347816
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 04/02/2004
Action: Staff Letter

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0845
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: Not reported
How Discovered: Tank Closure
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 3/29/2004
Oversight Program: LUST
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: 3/5/2004
Pollution Characterization Began: 5/10/2004
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 771097
S & T SERVICE (Continued)

Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HWG: REPORTED ZERO
Region: CONTRA COSTA

E31
TECKNICA AUTO
CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
S109936129
N/A
SSE
10793 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA 94530
1/8-1/4
0.245 mi.
1291 ft.
Site 6 of 6 in cluster E
Relative:
Higher
Actual:
67 ft.

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

 Facility ID: 773262
 Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
 Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
 Program/Elements: HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES
 Region: CONTRA COSTA

 Facility ID: 773262
 Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
 Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
 Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
 Region: CONTRA COSTA

32
DEL NORTE CLEANERS
ENVIROSTOR
S109935669
NNW
VCP
11299 SAN PABLO AVENUE
DRYCLEANERS
EL CERRITO, CA 94530
1/4-1/2
0.260 mi.
1371 ft.
Relative:
Lower
Actual:
53 ft.

ENVIROSTOR:

 Facility ID: 60001445
 Status: Active
 Status Date: 04/15/2011
 Site Code: 201907
 Site Type: Voluntary Cleanup
 Site Type Detailed: Voluntary Cleanup
 Acres: 2.32
 NPL: NO
 Regulatory Agencies: SMBRP
 Lead Agency: SMBRP
 Program Manager: Milly Pekke
 Supervisor: Daniel Murphy
 Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
 Assembly: 15
 Senate: 09
 Special Program: Not reported
 Restricted Use: NO
 Site Mgmt Req: NONE SPECIFIED
 Funding: Responsible Party
DEL NORTE CLEANERS (Continued)

Latitude: 37.92001  
Longitude: -122.3156  
APN: NONE SPECIFIED  
Past Use: DRY CLEANING  
Potential COC: Perchlorate Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) Trichloroethylene (TCE) Acetone Methylene chloride Toluene 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene Xylenes  
Confirmed COC: 30017-NO 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) Acetone Methylene chloride Toluene Xylenes 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene Trichloroethylene (TCE)  
Potential Description: OTH, SOIL, SV  
Alias Name: 201907  
Alias Type: Project Code (Site Code)  
Alias Name: 60001445  
Alias Type: Envirostor ID Number  
Completed Info:  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Fieldwork  
Completed Date: 03/01/2012  
Comments: The well was purged and sampled on March 1, 2012.  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Report  
Completed Date: 05/17/2012  
Comments: RI Report approved 5/17/2012 and recommended further investigations.  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Workplan  
Completed Date: 08/23/2012  
Comments: Workplan approved on 8/21/2012.  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report  
Completed Date: 03/21/2013  
Comments: Volatile Organic Compound concentrations in soil gas and groundwater beneath the site continue to be of concern to DTSC as they may pose potential impacts to indoor-air quality. Therefore, the DTSC requests further investigation in the vicinity of the former dry-cleaners.  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Report  
Completed Date: 08/02/2012  
Comments: Approved.  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Fieldwork  
Completed Date: 12/18/2012  
Comments: Fieldwork was completed 12/18/2012  
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
The revised plan adequately addressed DTSC comments.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan
Completed Date: 09/26/2013
Comments: The revised plan adequately addressed DTSC comments.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report
Completed Date: 08/26/2013
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 06/13/2014
Comments: Report Approved June 13 2014

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Report
Completed Date: 05/23/2014
Comments: The soil gas sample collected at 5.0 feet in depth during this sampling event showed a PCE concentration (4,500 ug/m^3) which is above the environmental screening level (ESL) of 2,100 ug/m^3 for

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Fieldwork
Completed Date: 06/06/2013
Comments: No document required.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Fieldwork
Completed Date: 01/20/2014
Comments: Groundwater monitoring well MW-6 and injection well IW-1 were installed on October 28 and 29, 2013, and all seven site wells were purged and sampled on December 19, 2013. New wells MW-6 and IW-1 were surveyed on January 7, 2014. Soil gas sampling was conducted on January 20, 2014. No document is required.
vapor intrusion concerns in commercial land use settings. In order to confirm this result, Gribi Associates will conduct another soil gas sampling event.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 09/13/2012
Comments: Completed 9/13/2012

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 10/01/2014
Comments: Cost Estimates Cover Letter for FSY 2014/2015

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 11/15/2011
Comments: Completed November 15, 2011.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 09/04/2013

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Amendment - Order/Agreement
Completed Date: 09/17/2012
Comments: Completed.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Other Report
Completed Date: 05/13/2011
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Workplan
Completed Date: 06/16/2011
Comments: RP Draft was changed to RP final.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Workplan
Completed Date: 06/27/2011
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study
Completed Date: 11/08/2011
DTSC recommends another round of sampling to include evidence of degradation of Vinyl chloride in groundwater. Further investigations required due to increased soil gas concentrations.

DTSC requested for at least one more round of sampling to confirm that the vinyl chloride is degrading and that the chlorinated solvent concentrations remain below actionable levels.

The VCA has been signed by both parties.

Additional work was required therefore a workplan was submitted as a different activity—"Workplan to Install and Sample Groundwater Monitoring Well".

Fieldwork was completed.

Fieldwork was completed.

## DEL NORTE CLEANERS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Sub Area Name</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Pilot/Treatability Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>09/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The most recent data showing increased soil vapor concentrations warrant further investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Document Type</td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Due Date</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Document Type</td>
<td>Removal Action Completion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Due Date</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Document Type</td>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Due Date</td>
<td>12/14/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Revised Date</td>
<td>07/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Document Type</td>
<td>CEQA - Notice of Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Due Date</td>
<td>01/05/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Revised Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Document Type</td>
<td>Removal Action Workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Due Date</td>
<td>12/28/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Revised Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VCP:**
- **Facility ID:** 60001445
- **Site Type:** Voluntary Cleanup
- **Site Type Detail:** Voluntary Cleanup
- **Site Mgmt. Req.:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Acres:** 2.32
- **National Priorities List:** NO
- **Cleanup Oversight Agencies:** SMBRP
- **Lead Agency:** SMBRP
- **Lead Agency Description:** DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
- **Project Manager:** Milly Pekke
- **Supervisor:** Daniel Murphy
- **Division Branch:** Cleanup Berkeley
- **Site Code:** 201907
- **Assembly:** 15
- **Senate:** 09
- **Special Programs Code:** Not reported
- **Status:** Active
- **Status Date:** 04/15/2011
- **Restricted Use:** NO
- **Funding:** Responsible Party
- **Lat/Long:** 37.92001 / -122.3156

...warrant further investigations.
The well was purged and sampled on March 1, 2012.

RI Report approved 5/17/2012 and recommended further investigations.

Workplan approved on 8/21/2012.

Volatile Organic Compound concentrations in soil gas and groundwater beneath the site continue to be of concern to DTSC as they may pose potential impacts to indoor-air quality. Therefore, the DTSC requests further investigation in the vicinity of the former dry-cleaners.

Fieldwork was completed 12/18/2012

This workplan proposes: (1) The collection of two soil gas samples near the former dry cleaning machine on the Site at 5 feet and 8.5 feet; The objective is to evaluate if PCE concentrations in soil gas are still at levels that pose a health risk via indoor air Vapor (2)
DELMAR PUMP STATION (Continued)

The installation, development, and sampling of one additional groundwater monitoring well down gradient on the Site; to evaluate migration of contamination down gradient.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 09/17/2013
Comments: The revisions adequately address DTSC comments.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report
Completed Date: 08/26/2013
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan
Completed Date: 09/26/2013
Comments: The revised plan adequately addressed DTSC comments.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Fieldwork
Completed Date: 01/20/2014
Comments: Groundwater monitoring well MW-6 and injection well IW-1 were installed on October 28 and 29, 2013, and all seven site wells were purged and sampled on December 19, 2013. New wells MW-6 and IW-1 were surveyed on January 7, 2014. Soil gas sampling was conducted on January 20, 2014. No document is required.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 06/13/2014
Comments: Report Approved June 13 2014

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Report
Completed Date: 05/23/2014
Comments: The soil gas sample collected at 5.0 feet in depth during this sampling event showed a PCE concentration (4,500 ug/m^3) which is above the environmental screening level (ESL) of 2,100 ug/m^3 for vapor intrusion concerns in commercial land use settings. In order to confirm this result, Gribi Associates will conduct another soil gas sampling event.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
DELT NOFRNE CLEANERS (Continued)  S109935669

Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 09/13/2012
Comments: Completed 9/13/2012

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 10/01/2014
Comments: Cost Estimates Cover Letter for FSY 2014/2015

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 11/15/2011
Comments: Completed November 15, 2011.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Annual Oversight Cost Estimate
Completed Date: 09/04/2013

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Amendment - Order/Agreement
Completed Date: 09/17/2012
Comments: Completed.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Other Report
Completed Date: 05/13/2011
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Workplan
Completed Date: 06/16/2011
Comments: RP Draft was changed to RP final.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation Workplan
Completed Date: 06/27/2011
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study
Completed Date: 11/08/2011
Comments: Additional work was required therefore a workplan was submitted as a different activity-“Workplan to Install and Sample Groundwater Monitoring Well”.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/19/2011</td>
<td>Fieldwork was completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/2012</td>
<td>Completed 2/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/2011</td>
<td>The VCA has been signed by both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/2014</td>
<td>DTSC requested for at least one more round of sampling to confirm that the vinyl chloride is degrading and that the chlorinated solvent concentrations remain below actionable levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/2014</td>
<td>Fieldwork was on June 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2014</td>
<td>Further investigations required due to increased soil gas concentrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2014</td>
<td>DTSC recommends another round of sampling to include evidence of degradation of Vinyl chloride in groundwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2014</td>
<td>The most recent data showing increased soil vapor concentrations warrant further investigations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEL NORTE CLEANERS (Continued)

Future Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Certification
Future Due Date: 2016
Future Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Removal Action Completion Report
Future Due Date: 2017
Schedule Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Fact Sheets
Schedule Due Date: 12/14/2015
Schedule Revised Date: 07/15/2016
Schedule Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Public Notice
Schedule Due Date: 08/10/2015
Schedule Revised Date: 05/11/2016
Schedule Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: CEQA - Notice of Exemption
Schedule Due Date: 01/05/2016
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Removal Action Workplan
Schedule Due Date: 12/28/2015
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

DRYCLEANERS:
EPA Id: CAL000121968
NAICS Code: 81232
NAICS Description: Drycleaning and Laundry Services (except Coin-Operated)
SIC Code: 7211
SIC Description: Power Laundries, Family and Commercial
Create Date: 04/22/1994
Facility Active: No
Inactive Date: 06/30/2006
Facility Addr2: Not reported
Owner Name: AHMAD ENFERADI
Owner Address: 11299 SAN PABLO AVE SUITE G
Owner Address 2: Not reported
Owner Telephone: 5102334000
Contact Name: AHMAD ENFERADI
Contact Address: PO BOX 1227
Contact Address 2: Not reported
Contact Telephone: 5102334000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address 1: 11299 SAN PABLO AVE SUITE G
Mailing Address 2: Not reported
Mailing City: EL CERRITO
Mailing State: CA
Mailing Zip: 945300000
Owner Fax: Not reported
Region Code: Not reported
F33
SE
1/4-1/2
0.270 mi.
1427 ft.

SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND
10750 SAN PABLO AVENUE
EL CERRITO, CA 94530

ENVIROSTOR
VCP
DRYCLEANERS
EMI

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST

Site 1 of 2 in cluster F

ENVIROSTOR:

Facility ID: 60002171
Status: Active
Status Date: 04/01/2015
Site Code: 202033
Site Type: Voluntary Cleanup
Site Type Detailed: Voluntary Cleanup
Acres: 0.38
NPL: NO
Regulatory Agencies: SMBRP
Lead Agency: SMBRP
Program Manager: Milly Pekke
Supervisor: Daniel Murphy
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
Special Program: Not reported
Restricted Use: NO
Site Mgmt Req: NONE SPECIFIED
Funding: Responsible Party
Latitude: 37.91398
Longitude: -122.3092
APN: 503121022
Past Use: DRY CLEANING, LAUNDRY SERVICES
Potential COC: Tetrachloroethylene (PCE TPH-gas Trichloroethylene (TCE
1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis
Confirmed COC: Tetrachloroethylene (PCE TPH-gas 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis
Trichloroethylene (TCE
Potential Description: IA, SOIL, SV
Alias Name: 503121022
Alias Type: APN
Alias Name: 202033
Alias Type: Project Code (Site Code)
Alias Name: 60002171
Alias Type: Envirostor ID Number
Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: Not reported
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Not reported
Completed Date: Not reported
Comments: Not reported
Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported
### SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND (Continued)

**VCP:**
- Facility ID: 60002171
- Site Type: Voluntary Cleanup
- Site Type Detail: Voluntary Cleanup
- Site Mgmt. Req.: NONE SPECIFIED
- Acres: 0.38
- National Priorities List: NO
- Lead Agency: SMBRP
- Lead Agency Description: DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
- Project Manager: Milly Pekke
- Supervisor: Daniel Murphy
- Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
- Site Code: 202033
- Assembly: 15
- Senate: 09
- Special Programs Code: Not reported
- Status: Active
- Status Date: 04/01/2015
- Restricted Use: NO
- Funding: Responsible Party
- Lat/Long: 37.91398 / -122.3092
- APN: 503121022
- Past Use: DRY CLEANING, LAUNDRY SERVICES
- Potential COC: 30022, 30025, 30027, 30195
- Confirmed COC: 30022, 30025, 30195, 30027
- Potential Description: IA, SOIL, SV
- Alias Name: 503121022
- Alias Type: APN
- Alias Name: 202033
- Alias Type: Project Code (Site Code)
- Alias Name: 60002171
- Alias Type: Envirostor ID Number

**Completed Info:**
- Completed Area Name: Not reported
- Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
- Completed Document Type: Not reported
- Completed Date: Not reported
- Comments: Not reported

**Future Info:**
- Future Area Name: Not reported
- Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
- Future Document Type: Not reported
- Future Due Date: Not reported
- Schedule Area Name: Not reported
- Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
- Schedule Document Type: Not reported
- Schedule Due Date: Not reported
- Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

**DRYCLEANERS:**
- EPA Id: CAD076538016
- NAICS Code: 81232
- NAICS Description: Drycleaning and Laundry Services (except Coin-Operated)
- SIC Code: 7211
- SIC Description: Power Laundries, Family and Commercial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND (Continued)**

- **Create Date:** 05/10/1983
- **Facility Active:** No
- **Inactive Date:** 06/30/2005
- **Facility Addr2:** Not reported
- **Owner Name:** SUNG WOON KIM - OWNER
- **Owner Address:** 10750 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Owner Address 2:** Not reported
- **Owner Telephone:** 5105255434
- **Contact Name:** SUNG WOON KIM - OWNER
- **Contact Address:** 10750 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Contact Address 2:** Not reported
- **Contact Telephone:** 5105255434
- **Mailing Name:** Not reported
- **Mailing Address 1:** 10750 SAN PABLO AVE
- **Mailing Address 2:** Not reported
- **Mailing City:** EL CERRITO
- **Mailing State:** CA
- **Mailing Zip:** 945302622
- **Owner Fax:** Not reported
- **Region Code:** Not reported

- **EPA Id:** CAL000289868
- **NAICS Code:** 81232
- **NAICS Description:** Drycleaning and Laundry Services (except Coin-Operated)
- **SIC Code:** 7211
- **SIC Description:** Power Laundries, Family and Commercial
- **Create Date:** 12/30/2004
- **Facility Active:** No
- **Inactive Date:** 06/30/2013
- **Facility Addr2:** Not reported
- **Owner Name:** KHONE PHOUMMETHEP & TONY WINSPEAR
- **Owner Address:** 1035 KEY ROUTE BLVD
- **Owner Address 2:** Not reported
- **Owner Telephone:** 5105267615
- **Contact Name:** TONY WINSPEAR
- **Contact Address:** 1035 KEY ROUTE BLVD
- **Contact Address 2:** Not reported
- **Contact Telephone:** 5106040004
- **Mailing Name:** Not reported
- **Mailing Address 1:** 1035 KEY ROUTE BLVD
- **Mailing Address 2:** Not reported
- **Mailing City:** ALBANY
- **Mailing State:** CA
- **Mailing Zip:** 94706
- **Owner Fax:** Not reported
- **Region Code:** Not reported

- **EMI:**
  - **Year:** 1987
  - **County Code:** 7
  - **Air Basin:** SF
  - **Facility ID:** 2178
  - **Air District Name:** BA
  - **SIC Code:** 7216
  - **Air District Name:** BAY AREA AQMD
  - **Community Health Air Pollution Info System:** Not reported
  - **Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule:** Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>County Code</th>
<th>Air Basin</th>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>Air District Name</th>
<th>SIC Code</th>
<th>Air District Name</th>
<th>Community Health Air Pollution Info System</th>
<th>Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule</th>
<th>Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr</th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr</th>
<th>Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr</th>
<th>NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr</th>
<th>SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr</th>
<th>Particulate Matter Tons/Yr</th>
<th>Part. Matter 10 Micrometers &amp; Smllr Tons/Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>County Code</td>
<td>Air Basin</td>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>Air District Name</td>
<td>SIC Code</td>
<td>Air District Name</td>
<td>Community Health Air Pollution Info System</td>
<td>Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule</td>
<td>Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr</td>
<td>Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr</td>
<td>NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr</td>
<td>SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr</td>
<td>Particulate Matter Tons/Yr</td>
<td>Part. Matter 10 Micrometers &amp; Smllr Tons/Yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND (Continued)

Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2001
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 2178
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2002
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 2178
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2003
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 2178
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: Not reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0
SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND (Continued)  1001610627

Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0  
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0  
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0  
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0  
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0  
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2004
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 2178
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: None reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0.526
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2005
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 16695
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: None reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0

Year: 2006
County Code: 7
Air Basin: SF
Facility ID: 16695
Air District Name: BA
SIC Code: 7216
Air District Name: BAY AREA AQMD
Community Health Air Pollution Info System: None reported
Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule: Not reported
Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr: .007
Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr: 0
Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr: 0
NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr: 0
SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr: 0
Particulate Matter Tons/Yr: 0
Part. Matter 10 Micrometers & Smllr Tons/Yr: 0
### SUNSHINE CLEANERS & COIN LAUND (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Code</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Basin</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>16695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air District Name</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code</td>
<td>7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air District Name</td>
<td>BAY AREA AQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Air Pollution Info System</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Emission Reporting Rule</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organic Hydrocarbon Gases Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Organic Gases Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0.0468062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide Emissions Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOX - Oxides of Nitrogen Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOX - Oxides of Sulphur Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part. Matter 10 Micrometers &amp; Smllr Tons/Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>770367</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billing Status</td>
<td>INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Status</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Elements</td>
<td>HMBP: 1K-10K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SILVERMAN/SAN PABLO AVENUE INVESTORS PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>10734-10766 SAN PABLO AVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site | 2 of 2 in cluster F |

Relative Information:
- **LUST:**
  - Region: STATE
  - Global Id: T0601352645
  - Latitude: 37.913823
- **Actual:**
  - 61 ft.
### SILVERMAN/SAN PABLO AVENUE INVESTORS PROPERTIES (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name: SILVERMAN/SAN PABLO AVENUE INVESTORS PROPERTIES</th>
<th>EDR ID Number: S106162402</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitude: -122.310238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Type: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date: 01/23/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Worker: BGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Case Number: 07-0840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC Case Number: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Location: Regional Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Contaminants of Concern: Diesel, Waste Oil / Motor / Hydraulic / Lubricating, Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site History: Not reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

**Contact:**

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Contact Type:** Local Agency Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** PAUL ANDREWS
- **Organization Name:** CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- **Address:** 4333 PACHECO BOULEVARD
- **City:** MARTINEZ
- **Email:** pandrews@hsd.co.contra-cost.ca.us
- **Phone Number:** 9256462286

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Contact Type:** Regional Board Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- **Organization Name:** SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- **Address:** 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- **City:** OAKLAND
- **Email:** bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

**Status History:**

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
- **Status Date:** 01/23/2004

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Status:** Open - Case Begin Date
- **Status Date:** 08/11/2003

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
- **Status Date:** 12/19/2003

**Regulatory Activities:**

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Action Type:** Other
- **Date:** 08/11/2003
- **Action:** Leak Discovery

- **Global Id:** T0601352645
- **Action Type:** Other
### SILVERMAN/SAN PABLO AVENUE INVESTORS PROPERTIES  
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began</th>
<th>Date Remediation Action Underway</th>
<th>Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted</th>
<th>Pollution Characterization Began</th>
<th>Preliminary Site Assessment Wokplan Submitted</th>
<th>Oversight Program</th>
<th>Date Leak Confirmed</th>
<th>Oversight Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2003</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>12/19/2003</td>
<td>LUST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LUST REG 2:
- **Region:** 2
- **Facility Id:** 07-0840
- **Facility Status:** Case Closed
- **Case Number:** Not reported
- **How Discovered:** PST
- **Leak Cause:** UNK
- **Leak Source:** UNK
- **Date Leak Confirmed:** 12/19/2003
- **Oversight Program:** LUST
- **Prelim. Site Assessment Wokplan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Preliminary Site Assessment Began:** Not reported
- **Pollution Characterization Began:** 12/19/2003
- **Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Underway:** Not reported
- **Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began:** Not reported

---

### SALKHI PETROLEUM INC DBA EL CERRITO CHEVRON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region: STATE</th>
<th>Global Id: T0601300049</th>
<th>Latitude: 37.921068</th>
<th>Longitude: -122.315764</th>
<th>Case Type: Not reported</th>
<th>Status: Completed - Case Closed</th>
<th>Status Date: 06/20/2001</th>
<th>Lead Agency: Not reported</th>
<th>Case Worker: BGS</th>
<th>Local Agency: Not reported</th>
<th>RB Case Number: 07-0052</th>
<th>LOC Case Number: Not reported</th>
<th>File Location: Not reported</th>
<th>Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)</th>
<th>Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline</th>
<th>Site History: Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:
SALKHI PETROLEUM INC DBA EL CERRITO CHEVRON (Continued)  S110060428

Contact:
Global Id: T0601300049
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0601300049
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: SUE LOYD
Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
City: MARTINEZ
Email: sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0601300049
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 06/20/2001

Global Id: T0601300049
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 02/03/1998

Global Id: T0601300049
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 03/10/1995

Global Id: T0601300049
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 02/15/1996

Global Id: T0601300049
Status: Open - Verification Monitoring
Status Date: 10/25/1995

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T0601300049
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 03/11/1997
Action: * Historical Enforcement

Global Id: T0601300049
Action Type: Other
Date: 11/30/1994
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601300049
Action Type: Other
Date: 02/03/1988
Action: Leak Reported
SALKHI PETROLEUM INC DBA EL CERRITO CHEVRON (Continued)

Global Id: T0601300049
Action Type: Other
Date: 02/03/1988
Action: Leak Discovery

HAZNET:
envid: S110060428
Year: 2013
GEPAID: CAL000384704
Contact: ARASH SALKHI
Telephone: 4157104004
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 7474 REDWOOD BLVD
Mailing City,St,Zip: NOVATO, CA 94945
Gen County: Contra Costa
TSD EPA ID: CAT080013352
TSD County: Los Angeles
Waste Category: Not reported
Disposal Method: Other Recovery Of Reclamation For Reuse Including Acid Regeneration, Organics Recovery Ect
Tons: 0.6255
Facility County: Not reported

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 7
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 07-0052

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 762940
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP: >100K-250K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 762940
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HWG: REPORTED ZERO
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 762940
Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
Region: CONTRA COSTA
### Site 2 of 5 in cluster G

**Relative:** Lower  
**Actual:** 52 ft.

#### LUST REG 2:
- **Region:** 2  
- **Facility Id:** 07-0052  
- **Facility Status:** Case Closed  
- **Case Number:** 62940  
- **How Discovered:** Tank Closure  
- **Leak Cause:** Structure Failure  
- **Leak Source:** Tank  
- **Date Leak Confirmed:** 3/10/1995  
- **Oversight Program:** LUST  
- **Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted:** Not reported  
- **Preliminary Site Assessment Began:** 2/15/1996  
- **Pollution Characterization Began:** Not reported  
- **Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted:** Not reported  
- **Date Remediation Action Underway:** Not reported  
- **Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began:** 10/25/1995

#### SWEEPS UST:
- **Status:** Active  
- **Comp Number:** 62940  
- **Number:** 2  
- **Board Of Equalization:** 44-031913  
- **Referral Date:** 12-08-92  
- **Action Date:** 03-08-93  
- **Created Date:** 07-22-88  
- **Owner Tank Id:** 4  
- **SWRCB Tank Id:** 07-000-062940-000001  
- **Tank Status:** A  
- **Capacity:** 1000  
- **Active Date:** 06-19-92  
- **Tank Use:** OIL  
- **STG:** W  
- **Content:** WASTE OIL  
- **Number Of Tanks:** 4

- **Status:** Active  
- **Comp Number:** 62940  
- **Number:** 2  
- **Board Of Equalization:** 44-031913  
- **Referral Date:** 12-08-92  
- **Action Date:** 03-08-93  
- **Created Date:** 07-22-88  
- **Owner Tank Id:** 1  
- **SWRCB Tank Id:** 07-000-062940-000002  
- **Tank Status:** A  
- **Capacity:** 10000  
- **Active Date:** 12-08-92  
- **Tank Use:** M.V. FUEL  
- **STG:** P  
- **Content:** REG UNLEADED  
- **Number Of Tanks:** Not reported  
- **Status:** Active
### Map Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S105030240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEVRON #6967 (Continued)</th>
<th>S105030240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp Number:</td>
<td>62940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Of Equalization:</td>
<td>44-031913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Date:</td>
<td>12-08-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Date:</td>
<td>03-08-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Date:</td>
<td>07-22-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Tank Id:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB Tank Id:</td>
<td>07-000-062940-000003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Status:</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity:</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Date:</td>
<td>12-08-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Use:</td>
<td>M.V. FUEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STG:</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content:</td>
<td>PRM UNLEADED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Tanks:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status:** Active

| Comp Number:              | 62940      |
| Number:                   | 2          |
| Board Of Equalization:    | 44-031913  |
| Referral Date:            | 12-08-92   |
| Action Date:              | 03-08-93   |
| Created Date:             | 07-22-88   |
| Owner Tank Id:            | 3          |
| SWRCB Tank Id:            | 07-000-062940-000004 |
| Tank Status:              | A          |
| Capacity:                 | 10000      |
| Active Date:              | 12-08-92   |
| Tank Use:                 | M.V. FUEL  |
| STG:                      | P          |
| Content:                  | PRM UNLEADED |
| Number Of Tanks:          | Not reported |

**Status:** Active

---

### Environment

**Location:** El Cerrito, CA 94530

**Facility ID:** 60001942

**Status:** No Further Action

**Site Code:** 201989

**Site Type:** Voluntary Cleanup

**Site Type Detailed:** Voluntary Cleanup

**Acres:** 1

**NPL:** No

**Regulatory Agencies:** SMBRP

**Lead Agency:** SMBRP

**Program Manager:** Patrick Hsieh

**Supervisor:** Daniel Murphy

**Division Branch:** Cleanup Berkeley

**Assembly:** 15

**Senate:** 09

**Special Program:** Not reported

**Restricted Use:** NO

**Site Mgmt Req:** NONE SPECIFIED
OHLONE GARDENS (Continued)

Funding: Responsible Party
Latitude: 37.91372
Longitude: -122.3081
APN: 503121019, 503121020
Past Use: RESIDENTIAL AREA, VEHICLE MAINTENANCE
Potential COC: Lead TPH-diesel TPH-MOTOR OIL 1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC) 1,2,3-Trichloropropane
Confirmed COC: Lead 1,2,3-Trichloropropane TPH-diesel 1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC) TPH-MOTOR OIL

Potential Description: OTH, SOIL
Alias Name: 503121019
Alias Type: APN
Alias Name: 503121020
Alias Type: APN
Alias Name: 201989
Alias Type: Project Code (Site Code)
Alias Name: 60001942
Alias Type: Envirostor ID Number

Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Application
Completed Date: 11/04/2013
Comments: Property owner’s application to DTSC and the Regional Waterboard requesting agency oversight of cleanup activities. Application lists site background information, history, known contamination, oversight services requested and planned use of the property.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Report
Completed Date: 02/13/2014
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement Termination Notification
Completed Date: 06/03/2014
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Correspondence
Completed Date: 11/05/2013
Comments: DTSC letter to property owner informing them that DTSC and the Waterboards have received their application and have determined that DTSC will be the lead agency.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement
Completed Date: 11/26/2013
Comments: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement between DTSC and property owner. The scope of the agreement is a DTSC review of the information and sampling data available at the site followed by a determination by DTSC if additional cleanup investigation or work is needed. DTSC and the proponent will then hold a scoping meeting to discuss what work
### MAP FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OHLONE GARDENS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Requesting Agency</th>
<th>Oversight of Cleanup Activities</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property owner's application to DTSC and the Regional Waterboard</td>
<td>Oversight of cleanup activities</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>11/04/2013</td>
<td>Property owner’s application to DTSC and the Regional Waterboard requesting agency oversight of cleanup activities. Application lists site background information, history, known contamination, oversight services requested and planned use of the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VCP:

| Facility ID | Site Type | Site Type Detail | Site Mgmt. Req. | Acres | National Priorities List | Cleanup Oversight Agencies | Lead Agency | Lead Agency Description | Project Manager | Supervisor | Division Branch | Site Code | Assembly | Senate | Special Programs Code | Funding | Lat/Long | APN | Past Use | Potential COC | Confirmed COC | Potential Description | Alias Name | Alias Type | Alias Name | Alias Type | Alias Name | Alias Type | Completed Info |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------------|---------|----------|-----|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 60001942    | Voluntary Cleanup | Voluntary Cleanup | NONE SPECIFIED | 1 | NO | SMBRP | SMBRP | DTSC - Site Cleanup Program | Patrick Hsieh | Daniel Murphy | Cleanup Berkeley | 201989 | 15 | 09 | Not reported | Responsible Party | 37.91372 / -122.3081 | 503121019, 503121020 | RESIDENTIAL AREA, VEHICLE MAINTENANCE | 30013, 30024, 3002502, 30193, 30571 | 30013,30024,3002502,30193,3002502 | OTH, SOIL | 503121019 | APN | 503121020 | APN | 201989 | Project Code (Site Code) | 60001942 | APN | Envirostor ID Number | PROJECT WIDE | Not reported | Application | 11/04/2013 | Property owner’s application to DTSC and the Regional Waterboard requesting agency oversight of cleanup activities. Application lists site background information, history, known contamination, oversight services requested and planned use of the property. |
OHLONE GARDENS (Continued)

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Report
Completed Date: 02/13/2014
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement Termination Notification
Completed Date: 06/03/2014
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Correspondence
Completed Date: 11/05/2013
Comments: DTSC letter to property owner informing them that DTSC and the Waterboards have received their application and have determined that DTSC will be the lead agency.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement
Completed Date: 11/26/2013
Comments: Voluntary Cleanup Agreement between DTSC and property owner. The scope of the agreement is a DTSC review of the information and sampling data available at the site followed by a determination by DTSC if additional cleanup investigation or work is needed. DTSC and the proponent will then hold a scoping meeting to discuss what work will be needed and how it will be carried out.

Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

HAZNET:
envid: S114002228
Year: 2013
GEPaid: CAC002754239
Contact: OHLONE GARDENS LP
Telephone: 5108414410
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 2220 OXFORD ST
Mailing City,St,Zip: BERKELEY, CA 94704
Gen County: Contra Costa
TSD EPA ID: CAD982042475
TSD County: Solano
Waste Category: Not reported
Disposal Method: Landfill Or Surface Impoundment That Will Be Closed As Landfill(To Include On-Site Treatment And/Or Stabilization)
Tons: 10
FORMER UNIQUE CLEANERS
6109 POTRERO AVENUE
EL CERRITO, CA  95430

SLIC REG 2:
Region:  2
Facility ID:  07S0161
Facility Status:  Not reported
Date Closed:  Not reported
Local Case #:  Not reported
How Discovered:  Not reported
Leak Cause:  Not reported
Leak Source:  Not reported
Date Confirmed:  Not reported
Date Prelim Site Assmnt Workplan Submitted:  Not reported
Date Preliminary Site Assessment Began:  Not reported
Date Pollution Characterization Began:  Not reported
Date Remediation Plan Submitted:  Not reported
Date Remedial Action Underway:  Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began:  Not reported

A&N COMP DRYCLEANERS
6109 POTRERO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA  94530

SLIC:
Region:  STATE
Facility Status:  Open - Inactive
Status Date:  05/01/2003
Global Id:  SL0601385412
Lead Agency:  SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Lead Agency Case Number:  Not reported
Latitude:  37.921189
Longitude:  -122.316482
Case Type:  Cleanup Program Site
Case Worker:  UUU
Local Agency:  Not reported
RB Case Number:  07S0161
File Location:  Not reported
Potential Media Affected:  Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern:  Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)
Site History:  Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:
**A&N COMP DRYCLEANERS** (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA ID:</th>
<th>CAD981966120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address:</td>
<td>POTRERO AVE EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact address:</td>
<td>6109 POTRERO AVE EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact country:</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact telephone:</td>
<td>(415) 548-9091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact email:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Region:</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification:</td>
<td>Non-Generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Handler: Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner/Operator Summary:**

| Owner/operator name: | A&N COMPANY |
| Owner/operator address: | NOT REQUIRED |
| Owner/operator country: | Not reported |
| Owner/operator telephone: | (415) 555-1212 |
| Legal status: | Private |
| Owner/Operator Type: | Owner |
| Owner/Op start date: | Not reported |
| Owner/Op end date: | Not reported |

**Handler Activities Summary:**

| U.S. importer of hazardous waste: | No |
| Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): | No |
| Recycler of hazardous waste: | No |
| Transporter of hazardous waste: | No |
| Treater, storer or disposer of HW: | No |
| Underground injection activity: | No |
| On-site burner exemption: | No |
| Furnace exemption: | No |
| Used oil fuel burner: | No |
| Used oil processor: | No |
| User oil refiner: | No |
| Used oil fuel marketer to burner: | No |
| Used oil Specification marketer: | No |
| Used oil transfer facility: | No |
| Used oil transporter: | No |

**Violation Status:**

No violations found

**DRYCLEANERS:**

| EPA Id: | CAL000259064 |
| NAICS Code: | 81232 |
| NAICS Description: | Drycleaning and Laundry Services (except Coin-Operated) |
### A&N COMP DRYCLEANERS (Continued)

- SIC Code: 7211
- SIC Description: Power Laundries, Family and Commercial
- Create Date: 09/11/2002
- Facility Active: No
- Inactive Date: 06/30/2004
- Facility Addr2: Not reported
- Owner Name: OK CLEANERS
- Owner Address: 6109 POTRERO AVE
- Owner Address 2: Not reported
- Owner Telephone: 5102365681
- Contact Name: XING XIAN HUANG
- Contact Address: 6109 POTRERO AVE
- Contact Address 2: Not reported
- Contact Telephone: 5102365681
- Mailing Name: OK CLEANERS SERVICES
- Mailing Address 1: 6109 POTRERO AVE
- Mailing Address 2: Not reported
- Mailing City: EL CERRITO
- Mailing State: CA
- Mailing Zip: 945300000
- Owner Fax: Not reported
- Region Code: Not reported

### CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

- Facility ID: 770373
- Billing Status: ACTIVE, BILLABLE
- Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- Program/Elements: HWG: LESS THAN 5 TONS/YEAR
- Region: CONTRA COSTA

- Facility ID: 770373
- Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
- Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- Program/Elements: HMBP: LESS THAN 1000 LBS
- Region: CONTRA COSTA

### LUST:

- Region: STATE
- Global Id: T06013000088
- Latitude: 37.921
- Longitude: -122.3162
- Case Type: Not reported
- Status: Completed - Case Closed
- Status Date: 03/18/2005
- Lead Agency: Not reported
- Case Worker: BGS
- Local Agency: Not reported
- RB Case Number: 07-0092
- LOC Case Number: Not reported
- File Location: Not reported
- Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
EL CERRITO CITY OF (Continued)  

Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline  
Site History: Not reported  

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:  

Contact:  
Global Id: T0601300088  
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker  
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI  
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)  
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400  
City: OAKLAND  
Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov  
Phone Number: Not reported  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker  
Contact Name: SUE LOYD  
Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.  
City: MARTINEZ  
Email: sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us  
Phone Number: Not reported  

Status History:  
Global Id: T0601300088  
Status: Completed - Case Closed  
Status Date: 03/18/2005  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Status: Open - Case Begin Date  
Status Date: 12/10/1985  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Status: Open - Site Assessment  
Status Date: 03/24/1994  

Regulatory Activities:  
Global Id: T0601300088  
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT  
Date: 03/18/2005  
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT  
Date: 05/01/2000  
Action: * Historical Enforcement  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Action Type: Other  
Date: 01/02/1986  
Action: Leak Stopped  

Global Id: T0601300088  
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT  
Date: 06/17/2003  
Action: Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling  

Contact:
EL CERRITO CITY OF  (Continued)

Global Id: T06013000088
Action Type: Other
Date: 05/13/1987
Action: Leak Reported

Global Id: T06013000088
Action Type: Other
Date: 12/10/1985
Action: Leak Discovery

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0092
Facility Status: Leak being confirmed
Case Number: 54032
How Discovered: OM
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 3/24/1994
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: Not reported
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 7
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 07-0092

CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:
Facility ID: 774118
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: HMBP: LESS THAN 1000 LBS
Region: CONTRA COSTA

Facility ID: 754032
Billing Status: INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE
Program Status: CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
Program/Elements: UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE
Region: CONTRA COSTA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>Status History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G41</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>1853 ft.</td>
<td>NNW</td>
<td>1/4-1/2</td>
<td>0.351 mi.</td>
<td>Site 5 of 5 in cluster G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relative:**

- Lower: LUST
- Actual: 56 ft.

**LUST:**

- Region: STATE
- Global Id: T0601300593
- Latitude: 37.92198
- Longitude: -122.31486
- Case Type: Not reported
- Status: Completed - Case Closed
- Status Date: 06/04/1998
- Lead Agency: Not reported
- Case Worker: BGS
- Local Agency: Not reported
- RB Case Number: 07-0642
- LOC Case Number: Not reported
- File Location: Not reported
- Potential Media Affect: Soil
- Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline
- Site History: Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

**Contact:**

- Global Id: T0601300593
- Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
- Contact Name: SUE LOYD
- Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
- City: MARTINEZ
- Email: sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
- Phone Number: Not reported

- Global Id: T0601300593
- Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
- Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- City: OAKLAND
- Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
- Phone Number: Not reported

**Status History:**

- Global Id: T0601300593
- Status: Completed - Case Closed
- Status Date: 06/04/1998

- Global Id: T0601300593
- Status: Open - Case Begin Date
- Status Date: 07/23/1991

- Global Id: T0601300593
- Status: Open - Site Assessment
- Status Date: 11/01/1994
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Regulatory Activities:

Global Id: T0601300593
Action Type: Other
Date: 01/29/1992
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T0601300593
Action Type: Other
Date: 01/29/1992
Action: Leak Reported

Global Id: T0601300593
Action Type: Other
Date: 07/23/1991
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601300593
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 06/04/1998
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0642
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 07-0642
How Discovered: OM
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 11/1/1994
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assesment Wokplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assesment Began: Not reported
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

HIST CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 7
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 07-0642

42
SE
1/4-1/2
0.404 mi.
2133 ft.
Relative: Lower
Actual: 58 ft.
EL CERRITO SHELL (Continued)  U001596714

Case Type: Not reported
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 07/26/2010
Lead Agency: Not reported
Case Worker: BGS
Local Agency: Not reported
RB Case Number: 07-0865
LOC Case Number: Not reported
File Location: Regional Board
Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline
Site History: No active remediation required. The site is a low risk case. The residual hydrocarbon concentrations are low, and are expected to attenuate naturally.

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id: T0601391657
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: PAUL ANDREWS
Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA CO. ENVIR. HEALTH DIV.
Address: 4333 PACHECO BOULEVARD
City: MARTINEZ
Email: pandrews@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0601391657
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 07/23/2010

Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 07/26/2010

Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 06/09/2004

Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 07/10/2006

Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 11/28/2006
EL CERRITO SHELL (Continued)

Global Id: T0601391657
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 03/05/2007

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/23/2010
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/13/2008
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: Other
Date: 06/09/2004
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 10/30/2007
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 06/13/2007
Action: Other Workplan

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 03/30/2007
Action: Electronic Reporting Submittal Due

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 02/28/2007
Action: Preliminary Site Assessment Report

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 12/28/2006
Action: Electronic Reporting Submittal Due

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 03/10/2008
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/30/2009
Action: Monitoring Report - Other

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2008</td>
<td>Well Installation Report</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601391657</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>03/10/2008</td>
<td>Fact Sheets - Public Participation</td>
<td>T0601391657</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>04/30/2008</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
<td>T0601391657</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>06/05/2006</td>
<td>Leak Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL CERRITO SHELL (Continued) U001596714

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 03/14/2007
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 10/22/2008
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/31/2007
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601391657
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 07/30/2009
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

SWEETS UST:
Status: Active
Comp Number: 7032
Number: 2
Board Of Equalization: 44-002205
Referral Date: 02-11-92
Action Date: 02-11-92
Created Date: 07-22-88
Owner Tank Id: 1
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-007032-000001
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 10000
Active Date: 02-11-92
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: 4

Status: Active
Comp Number: 7032
Number: 2
Board Of Equalization: 44-002205
Referral Date: 02-11-92
Action Date: 02-11-92
Created Date: 07-22-88
Owner Tank Id: 2
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-007032-000002
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 10000
Active Date: 02-11-92
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: LEADED
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

Status: Active
EL CERRITO SHELL (Continued)

Comp Number: 7032
Number: 2
Board Of Equalization: 44-002205
Referral Date: 02-11-92
Action Date: 02-11-92
Created Date: 07-22-88
Owner Tank Id: 3
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-007032-000003
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 10000
Active Date: 02-11-92
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

Status: Active
Comp Number: 7032
Number: 2
Board Of Equalization: 44-002205
Referral Date: 02-11-92
Action Date: 02-11-92
Created Date: 07-22-88
Owner Tank Id: 4
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-007032-000004
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 550
Active Date: 02-11-92
Tank Use: OIL
STG: W
Content: WASTE OIL
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

HIST UST:
Region: STATE
Facility ID: 0000007032
Facility Type: Gas Station
Other Type: Not reported
Contact Name: MEHRAN (RON) PEJOOH
Telephone: 4155242585
Owner Name: SHELL OIL COMPANY
Owner Address: P.O. BOX 4848
Owner City,St,Zip: ANAHEIM, CA 92803
Total Tanks: 0003

Tank Num: 001
Container Num: 1
Year Installed: Not reported
Tank Capacity: 00010000
Tank Used for: PRODUCT
Type of Fuel: UNLEADED
Container Construction Thickness: 1/4
Leak Detection: Stock Inventor, 10

Tank Num: 002
Container Num: 2
Year Installed: Not reported
EL CERRITO SHELL (Continued)  U001596714

- **Tank Capacity:** 00010000
- **Tank Used for:** PRODUCT
- **Type of Fuel:** REGULAR
- **Container Construction Thickness:** 1/4
- **Leak Detection:** Stock Inventor, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility ID:</strong> 707032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Billing Status:</strong> ACTIVE, BILLABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Status:</strong> CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/Elements:</strong> HMBP: &gt;100K-250K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong> CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility ID:</strong> 707032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Billing Status:</strong> ACTIVE, BILLABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Status:</strong> CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/Elements:</strong> HWG: REPORTED ZERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong> CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H43       LUST        S104809855
NW        N/A
1718 EASTSHORE BLVD
1/4-1/2
EL CERRITO, CA  94530
0.424 mi.
2239 ft.
Site 1 of 3 in cluster H

**Relative:**
**Lower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relative:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actual:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Id:</strong></td>
<td>07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Status:</strong></td>
<td>Case Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Number:</strong></td>
<td>70654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How Discovered:</strong></td>
<td>Tank Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leak Cause:</strong></td>
<td>Structure Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leak Source:</strong></td>
<td>Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Leak Confirmed:</strong></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight Program:</strong></td>
<td>LUST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preliminary Site Assessment Wokplan Submitted:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Preliminary Site Assessment Began:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>9/19/1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pollution Characterization Began:</strong></td>
<td>9/7/1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted:</strong></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Remediation Action Underway:</strong></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began:</strong></td>
<td>11/5/2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H44  EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT
NW  1718 EASTSHORE
1/4-1/2  EL CERRITO, CA  94530
0.424 mi.  CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
2239 ft.  Site 2 of 3 in cluster H

Relative:  Actual:
Lower  55 ft.

LUST:
Region:  STATE
Global Id:  T0601300114
Latitude:  37.922028
Longitude:  -122.316847
Case Type:  Not reported
Status:  Completed - Case Closed
Status Date:  04/25/2003
Lead Agency:  Not reported
Case Worker:  BGS
Local Agency:  Not reported
RB Case Number:  07-0123
LOC Case Number:  Not reported
File Location:  Regional Board
Potential Media Affect:  Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern:  Gasoline
Site History:  Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id:  T0601300114
Contact Type:  Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name:  BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name:  SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address:  1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City:  OAKLAND
Email:  bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number:  Not reported

Global Id:  T0601300114
Contact Type:  Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name:  SUE LOYD
Organization Name:  CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Address:  4333 PACHECO BLVD.
City:  MARTINEZ
Email:  slloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
Phone Number:  Not reported

Status History:
Global Id:  T0601300114
Status:  Completed - Case Closed
Status Date:  04/25/2003

Global Id:  T0601300114
Status:  Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date:  07/18/1988

Global Id:  T0601300114
Status:  Open - Site Assessment
Status Date:  09/19/1991

Global Id:  T0601300114
### EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Date</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/07/1994</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>05/24/2004</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2000</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>07/18/1988</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Leak Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2001</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>02/28/2002</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2001</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>11/06/2001</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/1991</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>02/28/2002</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2000</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td>12/31/2000</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Id:</td>
<td>T0601300114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>03/28/2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>03/06/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>01/31/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>File review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>09/05/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>File review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12/05/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>File review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>04/25/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Closure/No Further Action Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>09/02/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>05/08/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>08/15/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Other Workplan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>04/08/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>04/23/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>File review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT  (Continued)  S102429153

Date: 03/05/1991
Action: Leak Discovery

ENF:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 226269
Agency Name: El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: City Agency
Agency Type: All other facilities
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.922211
Place Longitude: -122.317444
SIC Code 1: Not reported
SIC Desc 1: Not reported
SIC Code 2: Not reported
SIC Desc 2: Not reported
SIC Code 3: Not reported
SIC Desc 3: Not reported
NAICS Code 1: Not reported
NAICS Desc 1: Not reported
NAICS Code 2: Not reported
NAICS Desc 2: Not reported
NAICS Code 3: Not reported
NAICS Desc 3: Not reported
# Of Places: 1
Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 2 07-0123
Reg Measure Id: 168286
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
301H: Not reported
Application Fee Amt Received: Not reported
Status: Never Active
Status Date: 02/20/2013
Effective Date: Not reported
Expiration/Review Date: Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)</th>
<th>S102429153</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice:</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID):</td>
<td>242171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number:</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type:</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>05/09/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Milestone Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs1:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Paid:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Completed:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id:</td>
<td>226269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name:</td>
<td>El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type:</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type:</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type:</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude:</td>
<td>37.922211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.317444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

| # Of Places: | 1 |
| Source Of Facility: | Reg Meas |
| Design Flow: | Not reported |
| Threat To Water Quality: | Not reported |
| Complexity: | Not reported |
| Pretreatment: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 2: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 3: | Not reported |
| Facility Waste Type 4: | Not reported |
| Program: | UST |
| Program Category1: | TANKS |
| Program Category2: | TANKS |
| # Of Programs: | 1 |
| WDID: | 2 07-0123 |
| Reg Measure Id: | 168286 |
| Reg Measure Type: | Unregulated |
| Region: | 2 |
| Order #: | Not reported |
| Npdes# CA#: | Not reported |
| Major-Minor: | Not reported |
| Npdes Type: | Not reported |
| Reclamation: | Not reported |
| Dredge Fill Fee: | Not reported |
| 301H: | Not reported |
| Application Fee Amt Received: | Not reported |
| Status: | Never Active |
| Status Date: | 02/20/2013 |
| Effective Date: | Not reported |
| Expiration/Review Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Amend: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Revise/Renew: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Rescind: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - No Action Required: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Pending: | Not reported |
| WDR Review - Planned: | Not reported |
| Status Enrollee: | N |
| Individual/General: | I |
| Fee Code: | Not reported |
| Direction/Voice: | Passive |
| Enforcement Id(EID): | 240638 |
| Region: | 2 |
| Order / Resolution Number: | UNKNOWN |
| Enforcement Action Type: | 13267 Letter |
| Effective Date: | 03/07/2002 |
| Adoption/Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Achieve Date: | Not reported |
| Termination Date: | Not reported |
| ACL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| EPL Issuance Date: | Not reported |
| Status: | Active |
| Title: | Enforcement - 2 07-0123 |
| Description: | Not reported |
| Program: | UST |
| Latest Milestone Completion Date: | Not reported |
| # Of Programs1: | 1 |
### EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Paid</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Completed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id</td>
<td>226269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude</td>
<td>37.922211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude</td>
<td>-122.317444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID</td>
<td>2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id</td>
<td>168286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Date:</th>
<th>02/20/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice:</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID):</td>
<td>238680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number:</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type:</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>11/06/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Milestone Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs1:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Paid:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Completed:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id:</td>
<td>226269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name:</td>
<td>El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type:</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type:</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type:</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude:</td>
<td>37.922211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.317444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT** (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Places:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility:</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2:</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID:</td>
<td>2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Id:</td>
<td>168286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Measure Type:</td>
<td>Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice:</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID):</td>
<td>238433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number:</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type:</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>06/13/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date:</td>
<td>6/29/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT  (Continued)  S102429153

MAP FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Program: UST
Latest Milestone Completion Date: 6/29/2001
# Of Programs: 1
Total Assessment Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00

Region: 2
Facility Id: 226269
Agency Name: El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency
Place Type: Facility
Place Subtype: Not reported
Facility Type: All other facilities
Agency Type: City Agency
# Of Agencies: 1
Place Latitude: 37.922211
Place Longitude: -122.317444

Facility Id: 2
Region: 0.00
Total $ Paid/Completed Amount: 0.00
Project $ Completed: 0.00
Liability $ Paid: 0.00
Project $ Amount: 0.00
Liability $ Amount: 0.00
Initial Assessed Amount: 0.00
Total Assessment Amount: 1
# Of Programs: 1

Source Of Facility: Reg Meas
Design Flow: Not reported
Threat To Water Quality: Not reported
Complexity: Not reported
Pretreatment: Not reported
Facility Waste Type: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 2: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 3: Not reported
Facility Waste Type 4: Not reported
Program: UST
Program Category1: TANKS
Program Category2: TANKS
# Of Programs: 1
WDID: 2 07-0123
Reg Measure Id: 168286
Reg Measure Type: Unregulated
Region: 2
Order #: Not reported
Npdes# CA#: Not reported
Major-Minor: Not reported
Npdes Type: Not reported
Reclamation: Not reported
Dredge Fill Fee: Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>S102429153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date</td>
<td>10/23/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID)</td>
<td>237479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>07/26/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date</td>
<td>10/23/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Enforcement - 2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Milestone Completion Date</td>
<td>10/23/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessment Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability $ Paid</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project $ Completed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Paid/Completed Amount</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id</td>
<td>226269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>El Cerrito Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Type</td>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Subtype</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>All other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Type</td>
<td>City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Latitude</td>
<td>37.922211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Longitude</td>
<td>-122.317444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Code 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC Desc 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 1</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Code 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS Desc 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR ID Number</td>
<td>S102429153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Of Facility</td>
<td>Reg Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Flow</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat To Water Quality</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 2</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 3</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Waste Type 4</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>UST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category1</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Category2</td>
<td>TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Of Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDID</td>
<td>2 07-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order #:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes# CA#:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Minor</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Npdes Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Fill Fee</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301H</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee Amt Received</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Never Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration/Review Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Amend</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Revise/Renew</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Rescind</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - No Action Required</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Pending</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR Review - Planned</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Enrollee</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/General</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Code</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction/Voice</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Id(EID)</td>
<td>236175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order / Resolution Number</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Action Type</td>
<td>13267 Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>12/01/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption/Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve Date</td>
<td>6/13/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL Issuance Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT (Continued)

**Status:** Historical  
**Title:** Enforcement - 2 07-0123  
**Description:** Not reported  
**Program:** UST  
**Latest Milestone Completion Date:** 6/13/2001  
**# Of Programs:** 1  
**Total Assessment Amount:** 0.00  
**Initial Assessed Amount:** 0.00  
**Liability $ Amount:** 0.00  
**Project $ Amount:** 0.00  
**Liability $ Paid:** 0.00  
**Project $ Completed:** 0.00  
**Total $ Paid/Completed Amount:** 0.00

### HIST CORTESE:

- **Region:** CORTESE  
- **Facility County Code:** 7  
- **Reg By:** LTNKA  
- **Reg Id:** 07-0123

### CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:

- **Facility ID:** 770654  
- **Billing Status:** INACTIVE, NON-BILLABLE  
- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST  
- **Program/Elements:** UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE  
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4-1/2</td>
<td>2325 ft.</td>
<td>0.440 mi.</td>
<td>H45</td>
<td>S102429153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711 EASTSHORE BLVD</td>
<td>-122.318373</td>
<td>37.922944</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO, CA 94530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S101306924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed - Case Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site History: Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact:**  
- **Global Id:** T0601300215  
- **Contact Type:** Local Agency Caseworker  
- **Contact Name:** SUE LOYD

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:
PAY N PAK STORE #229 (Continued)

Organization Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Address: 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
City: MARTINEZ
Email: sloyd@hsd.co.contra-cost.ca.us
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0601300215
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0601300215
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 04/14/1995

Global Id: T0601300215
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 01/08/1986

Global Id: T0601300215
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 01/31/1986

Global Id: T0601300215
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 04/21/1986

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T0601300215
Action Type: Other
Date: 01/08/1986
Action: Leak Reported

Global Id: T0601300215
Action Type: Other
Date: 01/08/1986
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601300215
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 03/07/1986
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300215
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 12/18/1985
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300215
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 06/13/1986
### PAY N PAK STORE #229 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Well Installation Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Id:</td>
<td>T0601300215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>02/11/1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Global Id: | T0601300215 |
| Action Type: | RESPONSE |
| Date: | 02/06/1986 |
| Action: | Other Report / Document |

| Global Id: | T0601300215 |
| Action Type: | ENFORCEMENT |
| Date: | 04/14/1995 |
| Action: | Closure/No Further Action Letter |

| Global Id: | T0601300215 |
| Action Type: | ENFORCEMENT |
| Date: | 01/08/1986 |
| Action: | Staff Letter |

| Global Id: | T0601300215 |
| Action Type: | RESPONSE |
| Date: | 01/08/1986 |
| Action: | Other Report / Document |

| Global Id: | T0601300215 |
| Action Type: | Other |
| Date: | 01/08/1986 |
| Action: | Leak Discovery |

**LUST REG 2:**
- Region: 2
- Facility Id: 07-0232
- Facility Status: Case Closed
- Case Number: 07-0232
- How Discovered: Tank Closure
- Leak Cause: Structure Failure
- Leak Source: Tank
- Date Leak Confirmed: Not reported
- Oversight Program: LUST
- Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: 1/31/1986
- Preliminary Site Assessment Began: 4/21/1986
- Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
- Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
- Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
- Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

**HIST CORTESE:**
- Region: CORTESE
- Facility County Code: 7
- Reg By: LTNKA
- Reg Id: 07-0232
Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
- Global Id: T0601300483
- Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
- Contact Name: BARBARA SIEMINSKI
- Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
- Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
- City: OAKLAND
- Email: bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov

Site History:
USTs and product lines were replaced at the site in 1997. Four soil samples were collected from the base/sidewalls of the tank pit and 9 samples were collected from beneath the fuel island/line areas at depths of up to 10' bgs. Two samples were collected from the tank pit area at 18' bgs (after overexcavation). Concentrations in soil were up to 1,100 ppm TPH, 8.5 ppm benzene, and 4.9 ppm MIBE. A perched groundwater was encountered in the tank pit at 10' bgs. A grab groundwater sample indicated 2,000 ppb of benzene and 2,600 ppb of MtBE. Four soil borings were drilled at the site on 11/10/03, and two tank pit wells (MW-1 and MW-2) were sampled on 11/11/03. Soil samples from borings contained minor concentrations of HC (up to 45 ppm TPH, 0.2 ppm benzene, and 0.12 ppm MIBE). Oil and Grease was ND. Grab groundwater samples from borings located in the dispenser area indicated up to 120,000 ppb of TPH, 10,000 ppb benzene, and ND MIBE (<2,000 ppb). The boring drilled near the UST pit contained 500 ppm TPH, 0.69 benzene, and 120 ppb MIBE, but groundwater samples collected from the pit wells did not contain TPH or benzene and only up to 12 ppb MIBE. Groundwater was encountered at the site at depths ranging from 9 to 24.5' bgs. Sensitive receptor survey conducted February 2005 indicated that there are no surface waters or known domestic, municipal, industrial or irrigation wells within 2,000 feet of the site. CAP approved on 04/01/2009, proposing a combination of ozone and air sparge/soil vapor extraction for site remediation (five to seven ozone injection points along the eastern property boundary, and a 100-foot long and 2-foot wide shallow trench filled with permeable materials and containing horizontal air/ozone injection/vapor recovery lines along the southern property boundary).
### UNOCAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Id:</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Type:</td>
<td>Local Agency Caseworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>SUE LOYD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name:</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>4333 PACHECO BLVD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>MARTINEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us">sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Status History:
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
  - **Date:** 07/02/2014
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Status:** Open - Case Begin Date
  - **Date:** 06/25/1993
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Status:** Open - Eligible for Closure
  - **Date:** 04/22/2013
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Status:** Open - Remediation
  - **Date:** 07/12/2007
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
  - **Date:** 07/11/1997

#### Regulatory Activities:
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Action Type:** RESPONSE
  - **Date:** 11/01/2008
  - **Action:** Soil and Water Investigation Report
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Action Type:** Other
  - **Date:** 06/25/1993
  - **Action:** Leak Discovery
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Action Type:** RESPONSE
  - **Date:** 10/30/2007
  - **Action:** Monitoring Report - Quarterly
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Action Type:** RESPONSE
  - **Date:** 02/29/2008
  - **Action:** CAP/RAP - Feasibility Study Report
- **Global Id:** T0601300483
  - **Action Type:** RESPONSE
  - **Date:** 02/04/2005
### UNOCAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Global Id</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Receptor Survey Report</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>04/30/2010</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13267 Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13267 Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>File review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action Plan / Remedial Action Plan</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>02/29/2008</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Workplan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Sheets - Public Participation</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>02/29/2008</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13267 Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>04/08/2011</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>10/30/2010</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Id:</td>
<td>Action Type:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>08/01/2010</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>07/31/2007</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>07/08/2008</td>
<td>13267 Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>04/30/2008</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>06/25/1993</td>
<td>Leak Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>08/01/2008</td>
<td>13267 Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>04/30/2012</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>10/30/2012</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>01/30/2011</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0601300483</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNOCAL (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/03/2011</td>
<td>Interim Remedial Action Report</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/2010</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/2008</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2006</td>
<td>Notice of Violation</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/1997</td>
<td>Leak Stopped</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2011</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/2007</td>
<td>Monitoring Report - Quarterly</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/29/2008</td>
<td>Other Report / Document</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2008</td>
<td>Other Workplan</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2008</td>
<td>Corrective Action Plan / Remedial Action Plan</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/2013</td>
<td>Well Destruction Report</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/2013</td>
<td>Staff Letter</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNOCAL (Continued)

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 07/08/2005
Action: Well Installation Report

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 02/10/2009
Action: Notification - Public Notice of ROD/RAP/CAP

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 01/12/2009
Action: Notice of Violation

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 01/30/2006
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 03/18/2014
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 06/13/2014
Action: File review

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 10/01/2004
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/20/2005
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/30/2013
Action: Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 10/30/2009
Action: Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 11/30/2012
Action: File Review - Closure

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
### UNOCAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2008</td>
<td>Monitoring Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/2005</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2009</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2013</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2005</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/2009</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/2013</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/2006</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2005</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2013</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2009</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/2005</td>
<td>ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>T0601300483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**UNOCAL**

- **Map ID**
- **Direction**
- **Distance**
- **Elevation**
- **Site**
- **Database(s)**
- **EDR ID Number**
- **EPA ID Number**

---
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UNOCAL (Continued)

Action: Staff Letter
Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/12/2007
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 04/28/2006
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 09/18/2007
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/28/2006
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 12/30/2004
Action: Other Workplan

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 09/20/2005
Action: Other Workplan

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/30/2009
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/07/2008
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 06/16/2011
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 03/30/2012
Action: Well Installation Report

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 07/30/2011
Action: Remedial Progress Report - Regulator Responded
UNOCAL (Continued)

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 05/01/2009
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/28/2006
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: REMEDIATION
Date: 04/20/2009
Action: Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE)

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/02/2014
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 02/08/2005
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 02/08/2005
Action: Site Visit / Inspection / Sampling

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/28/2006
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 05/01/2009
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/28/2006
Action: Other Report / Document

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: REMEDIATION
Date: 04/20/2009
Action: Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE)

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/02/2014
Action: Closure/No Further Action Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 02/08/2005
Action: Staff Letter

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 05/01/2009
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 08/28/2006
Action: Other Report / Document
UNOCAL (Continued)

Date: 01/30/2010
Action: Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 07/28/2009
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: ENFORCEMENT
Date: 12/10/2013
Action: 13267 Requirement

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 04/30/2011
Action: Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 10/30/2010
Action: Monitoring Report - Semi-Annually

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 07/31/2006
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: RESPONSE
Date: 01/30/2007
Action: Monitoring Report - Quarterly

Global Id: T0601300483
Action Type: REMEDIATION
Date: 08/13/2009
Action: In Situ Physical/Chemical Treatment (other than SVE)

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 07-0522
Facility Status: Leak being confirmed
Case Number: 08112
How Discovered: Tank Closure
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: 7/11/1997
Oversight Program: LUST
Prelim. Site Assessment Workplan Submitted: Not reported
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: Not reported
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported
SWEES UST:
Status: Active
Comp Number: 8112
Number: 2
Board Of Equalization: 44-001057
Referral Date: 12-04-91
Action Date: 12-04-91
Created Date: 07-22-88
Owner Tank Id: 3713-SU-1
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-008112-000001
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 10000
Active Date: 12-04-91
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: 2

Status: Not reported
Comp Number: 8112
Number: Not reported
Board Of Equalization: 44-001057
Referral Date: Not reported
Action Date: Not reported
Created Date: Not reported
Owner Tank Id: Not reported
SWRCB Tank Id: 07-000-008112-000002
Tank Status: A
Capacity: 10000
Active Date: 12-04-91
Tank Use: M.V. FUEL
STG: P
Content: REG UNLEADED
Number Of Tanks: Not reported

HIST UST:
Region: STATE
Facility ID: 00000008112
Facility Type: Gas Station
### UNOCAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>MAHMOOD SAIDI BEHNAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>4152371091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Name</td>
<td>UNION OIL CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Address</td>
<td>1 CALIFORNIA ST. SUITE 2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner City, St, Zip</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tanks</td>
<td>0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tank 1
- **Tank Num:** 001
- **Container Num:** 3713-1-1
- **Year Installed:** 1971
- **Tank Capacity:** 00010000
- **Type of Fuel:** PRODUCT
- **Container Construction Thickness:** Not reported
- **Leak Detection:** Stock Inventor, 10

#### Tank 2
- **Tank Num:** 002
- **Container Num:** 3713-2-1
- **Year Installed:** 1971
- **Tank Capacity:** 00010000
- **Type of Fuel:** PRODUCT
- **Container Construction Thickness:** Not reported
- **Leak Detection:** Stock Inventor, 10

#### Tank 3
- **Tank Num:** 003
- **Container Num:** 3713-4-1
- **Year Installed:** Not reported
- **Tank Capacity:** 00000280
- **Type of Fuel:** WASTE OIL
- **Container Construction Thickness:** Not reported
- **Leak Detection:** Stock Inventor

**HIST CORTESE:**
- **Region:** CORTESE
- **Facility County Code:** 7
- **Reg By:** LTNKA
- **Reg Id:** 07-0522

**CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST:**
- **Facility ID:** 708112
- **Billing Status:** ACTIVE, BILLABLE
- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** HMBP: >100K-250K LBS, 0-19 EMPLOYEES
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

- **Facility ID:** 708112
- **Billing Status:** ACTIVE, BILLABLE
- **Program Status:** CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST
- **Program/Elements:** HWG: REPORTED ZERO
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA

- **Facility ID:** 708112
- **Billing Status:** ACTIVE, BILLABLE
### UNOCAL (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status:</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA CO. SITE LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program/Elements:</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### 47 P G & E - EL CERRITO G SUBSTATION

**Location:**
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA
- **Address:** 7140 SCHMIDT LN, EL CERRITO, CA

**Details:**
- **Relative:** SLIC REG 2
- **Actual:** 125 ft.

**Facility Information:**
- **Facility ID:** 07S0127
- **Facility Status:** Not reported
- **Date Closed:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Plan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Underway:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Monitoring Began:** Not reported
- **Date Preliminary Site Assessment Began:** Not reported
- **Date Preliminary Site Assessment Workplan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Pollution Characterization Began:** Not reported
- **How Discovered:** RPR
- **Leak Cause:** Not reported
- **Leak Source:** Not reported
- **Date Confirmed:** Not reported
- **Site Name:** SLIC P G & E - EL CERRITO G SUBSTATION
- **Site Status:** Not reported

---

#### 48 LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.

**Location:**
- **Region:** CONTRA COSTA
- **Address:** HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST, RICHMOND, CA, 94804

**Details:**
- **Relative:** Lower
- **Actual:** 10 ft.

**Facility Information:**
- **Facility ID:** 07S0127
- **Facility Status:** Not reported
- **Date Closed:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Plan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Underway:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Monitoring Began:** Not reported
- **Date Preliminary Site Assessment Began:** Not reported
- **Date Preliminary Site Assessment Workplan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Pollution Characterization Began:** Not reported
- **How Discovered:** RPR
- **Leak Cause:** Not reported
- **Leak Source:** Not reported
- **Date Confirmed:** Not reported
- **Site Name:** LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
- **Site Status:** Deleted
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)

Site City: RICHMOND
Site State: CA
Federal Site: No
Site County: CONTRA COSTA
EPA Region: 09
Date Proposed: 12/30/82
Date Deleted: 9/11/1996
Date Finalized: 09/08/83

Substance Details:
NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: Not reported
Substance: Not reported
CAS #: Not reported
Pathway: Not reported
Scoring: Not reported

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: A020
Substance: CHROMIUM AND COMPOUNDS
CAS #: Not reported
Pathway: GROUND WATER PATHWAY
Scoring: 2

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: A046
Substance: POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS
CAS #: 1336-36-3
Pathway: AIR PATHWAY
Scoring: 3

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: A046
Substance: POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS
CAS #: 1336-36-3
Pathway: GROUND WATER PATHWAY
Scoring: 3

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: A046
Substance: POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS
CAS #: 1336-36-3
Pathway: SURFACE WATER PATHWAY
Scoring: 4

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: C132
Substance: HYDROCARBONS
CAS #: 308067-53-0
Pathway: AIR PATHWAY
Scoring: 2

NPL Status: Deleted from the Final NPL
Substance ID: D004
Substance: ARSENIC
CAS #: 7440-38-2
Pathway: GROUND WATER PATHWAY
### LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>NPL Status</th>
<th>Substance ID</th>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>CAS #</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>D008</td>
<td>LEAD (PB)</td>
<td>7439-92-1</td>
<td>GROUND WATER PATHWAY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>D008</td>
<td>LEAD (PB)</td>
<td>7439-92-1</td>
<td>SURFACE WATER PATHWAY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>U188</td>
<td>PHENOL</td>
<td>108-95-2</td>
<td>Air PATHWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>U188</td>
<td>PHENOL</td>
<td>108-95-2</td>
<td>GROUND WATER PATHWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>W001</td>
<td>HEAVY METALS</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>GROUND WATER PATHWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted from the Final NPL</td>
<td>W005</td>
<td>WASTE OILS</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>GROUND WATER PATHWAY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Details:**

Conditions at listing December 1982): The Liquid Gold Oil Corp. Site covers 17 acres of filled marshland within the City of Richmond, California. Liquid Gold was registered with the State of California as a waste oil pickup business. It purchased used oil and resold it for uses such as fuel, lubricating oil, and dust control. Several deteriorating buildings and 27 storage tanks of various sizes are on about 2 acres. Oily wastes found on the ground, as well as liquid wastes stored in the tanks, contain lead, chromium, nickel, and phenols. The site is within 1,000 feet of the San Francisco Bay and overlies shallow ground water, which has no known beneficial uses at present. Status July 1983): The site has been the subject of numerous State enforcement actions, and Liquid Gold has ceased operations at this location. The State is working with the landowner, Southern Pacific...
**LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)**

Transportation Co., to clean up the Liquid Gold facility. In May 1983, Southern Pacific completed removing the storage tanks and their contents from the facility. The State expects to receive a cleanup plan from Southern Pacific in August 1983.

**Site Status Details:**
- **NPL Status:** Deleted
- **Proposed Date:** 12/30/1982
- **Final Date:** 09/08/1983
- **Deleted Date:** 09/11/1996

**Narratives Details:**
- **NPL Name:** LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
- **City:** RICHMOND
- **State:** CA

**CERCLIS:**
- **Site ID:** 0902660
- **EPA ID:** CAT000646208
- **Facility County:** CONTRA COSTA
- **Short Name:** LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP
- **Congressional District:** 11
- **IFMS ID:** 0947
- **SMSA Number:** 7360
- **USGC Hydro Unit:** 18050002
- **Federal Facility:** Not a Federal Facility
- **DMNSN Number:** 18.00000
- **Site Orphan Flag:** N
- **RCRA ID:** Y
- **USGS Quadrangle:** Not reported
- **Site Init By Prog:** Not reported
- **NFRAP Flag:** Not reported
- **Parent ID:** Not reported
- **RST Code:** Not reported
- **EPA Region:** 09
- **Classification:** Industrial Waste Treatment
- **Site Settings Code:** UR
- **NPL Status:** Deleted from the Final NPL
- **DMNSN Unit Code:** ACRE
- **RBRAC Code:** Not reported
- **RResp Fed Agency Code:** Not reported
- **Non NPL Status:** Not reported
- **Non NPL Status Date:** / /  
- **Site Fips Code:** 06013
- **CC Concurrence Date:** 09/27/95
- **CC Concurrence FY:** 1995
- **Alias EPA ID:** Not reported
- **Site FUDS Flag:** Not reported

**CERCLIS Site Contact Name(s):**
- **Contact ID:** 9000109.00000
- **Contact Name:** Richard Martyn
- **Contact Tel:** (415) 972-3038
- **Contact Title:** On-Scene Coordinator (OSC)
- **Contact Email:** Not reported
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)

Contact ID: 13003854.00000
Contact Name: Leslie Ramirez
Contact Tel: (415) 972-3978
Contact Title: Site Assessment Manager (SAM)
Contact Email: Not reported

Contact ID: 13003858.00000
Contact Name: Sharon Murray
Contact Tel: (415) 972-4250
Contact Title: Site Assessment Manager (SAM)
Contact Email: Not reported

Contact ID: 13004003.00000
Contact Name: Carl Brickner
Contact Tel: Not reported
Contact Title: Site Assessment Manager (SAM)
Contact Email: Not reported

Contact ID: 13004162.00000
Contact Name: Rachelle Thompson
Contact Tel: (415) 972-3962
Contact Title: Remedial Project Manager (RPM)
Contact Email: Not reported

CERCLIS Site Alias Name(s):
Alias ID: 101
Alias Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP
Alias Address: Not reported

Alias ID: 102
Alias Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Alias Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
Alias Comments: Not reported

Site Description: LIQUID GOLD, RICHMOND, CA, PURCHASED USED OIL & SOLD IT FOR FINED USES (FUEL/LUBRICATING OILS). LOCATED NEXT TO SF BAY AND MARSH. SAMPLING DISCLOSED CONTAMINATION OF SOIL AND GROUND WATERS. RESULT OF SPILLS & LEAKS FROM STORAGE TANKS.

CERCLIS Assessment History:
Action Code: 001
Action: DISCOVERY
Date Started: / /  
Date Completed: 10/01/79
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
Date Started: / /
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Date Completed: 02/01/80
Priority Level: Higher priority for further assessment
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: SITE INSPECTION
Date Started: 02/01/80
Date Completed: 12/01/82
Priority Level: Higher priority for further assessment
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM PACKAGE
Date Started: / /
Date Completed: 12/01/82
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: PROPOSAL TO NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST
Date Started: / /
Date Completed: 12/30/82
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: FINAL LISTING ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST
Date Started: / /
Date Completed: 09/08/83
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
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Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: STATE ORDER
Date Started: 11/18/87
Date Completed: 01/13/88
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: State Enforcement
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY NEGOTIATIONS
Date Started: 11/18/87
Date Completed: 01/13/88
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: State Enforcement
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 001
Action: REMOVAL ASSESSMENT
Date Started: 09/19/90
Date Completed: 09/19/90
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report.

Action Code: 002
Action: REMOVAL ASSESSMENT
Date Started: 03/01/91
Date Completed: 03/01/91
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: Federal Enforcement
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
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Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: POTENTIALLY RESPONSIBLE PARTY REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
Date Started: 09/20/83
Date Completed: 06/21/93
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: PRP Response Under State
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: ADMINISTRATIVE RECORDS
Date Started: 06/21/93
Date Completed: 06/21/93
Priority Level: Admin Record Compiled for a Remedial Event
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: REMEDIAL DESIGN/REMEDIAL ACTION NEGOTIATIONS
Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 06/21/93
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: State Enforcement
Planning Status: Alternate
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: RECORD OF DECISION
Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 06/21/93
Priority Level: Final Remedy Selected at Site
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: Federal Enforcement
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: POTENTIAL RESPONSIBLE PARTY REMEDIAL DESIGN
Date Started: 06/18/93
Date Completed: 01/11/94
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: PRP Response Under State
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: POTENTIAL RESPONSIBLE PARTY REMEDIAL ACTION
Date Started: 01/11/94
Date Completed: 08/14/95
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: PRP Response Under State
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: PRELIMINARY CLOSE-OUT REPORT PREPARED
Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 09/27/95
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Not reported
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: DELETION FROM NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST
Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 09/11/96
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: ADMINISTRATIVE/VOLUNTARY COST RECOVERY
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Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 02/04/99 
Priority Level: Not reported 
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE 
Primary Responsibility: Federal Enforcement 
Planning Status: Not reported 
Urgency Indicator: Not reported 
Action Anomaly: Not reported 

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001 
Action: PREPARATION OF COST DOCUMENT PACKAGE 
Date Started: / / 
Date Completed: 05/26/00 
Priority Level: Not reported 
Operable Unit: SITEWIDE 
Primary Responsibility: Federal Enforcement 
Planning Status: Not reported 
Urgency Indicator: Not reported 
Action Anomaly: Not reported 

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 002 
Action: FIVE-YEAR REVIEW 
Date Started: 08/01/00 
Date Completed: 09/12/00 
Priority Level: Not reported 
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE 
Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed 
Planning Status: Primary 
Urgency Indicator: Not reported 
Action Anomaly: Not reported 

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 003 
Action: FIVE-YEAR REVIEW 
Date Started: 03/01/10 
Date Completed: 09/21/10 
Priority Level: Not reported 
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE 

EPA ID Number: 1009966369 
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Primary Responsibility: EPA Fund-Financed
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Action Code: 001
Action: OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Date Started: 09/27/95
Date Completed: / / 
Priority Level: Not reported
Operable Unit: OVERALL SITE
Primary Responsibility: PRP Response Under State
Planning Status: Primary
Urgency Indicator: Not reported
Action Anomaly: Not reported

For detailed financial records, contact EDR for a Site Report:

Federal Register Details:
Fed Register Date: 09/11/96
Fed Register Volume: 61
Page Number: 47825
Fed Register Date: 09/08/83
Fed Register Volume: 48
Page Number: 40658
Fed Register Date: 12/30/82
Fed Register Volume: 47
Page Number: 58476

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access
30 additional US CERCLIS Financial: record(s) in the EDR Site Report.

CORRACTS:

EPA ID: CAT000646208
EPA Region: 09
Area Name: ENTIRE FACILITY
Actual Date: 19800201
Action: CA075HI - CA Prioritization, Facility or area was assigned a high corrective action priority
NAICS Code(s): Not reported
Original schedule date: Not reported
Schedule end date: Not reported

US ENG CONTROLS:

EPA ID: CAT000646208
Site ID: 0902660
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP. (Continued)

EPA Region: 09
County: CONTRA COSTA
Event Code: Not reported
Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported

Action ID: 001
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Action Completion date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media: Debris
Engineering Control: Disposal
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported

Action ID: 001
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Action Completion date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media: Groundwater
Engineering Control: Monitoring
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported

Action ID: 001
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Action Completion date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media: Sediment
Engineering Control: Consolidate
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported

Action ID: 001
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Action Completion date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media: Sediment
Engineering Control: Disposal
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported

Action ID: 001
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Action Completion date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media: Debris
Engineering Control: Disposal
Contact Name: Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported
Latitude: Not reported
Longitude: Not reported
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Contaminated Media : Soil  
Engineering Control: Cap  
Contact Name: Not reported  
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported  
Latitude: Not reported  
Longitude: Not reported  

US INST CONTROL:  
EPA ID: CAT000646208  
Site ID: 0902660  
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.  
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION  
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST  
RICHMOND, CA 94804  
EPA Region: 09  
County: CONTRA COSTA  
Event Code: Not reported  
Inst. Control: Deed Restriction  
Actual Date: 06/30/1993  
Complett. Date: 06/21/1993  
Operable Unit: 01  
Contaminated Media : Debris  
Contact Name: Not reported  
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported  
Latitude: Not reported  
Longitude: Not reported  

EPA ID: CAT000646208  
Site ID: 0902660  
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.  
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION  
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST  
RICHMOND, CA 94804  
EPA Region: 09  
County: CONTRA COSTA  
Event Code: Not reported  
Inst. Control: Institutional Controls, (N.O.S.)  
Actual Date: 06/30/1993  
Complett. Date: 06/21/1993  
Operable Unit: 01  
Contaminated Media : Debris  
Contact Name: Not reported  
Contact Phone and Ext: Not reported  
Latitude: Not reported  
Longitude: Not reported  

EPA ID: CAT000646208  
Site ID: 0902660  
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.  
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION  
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST  
RICHMOND, CA 94804  
EPA Region: 09  
County: CONTRA COSTA  
Event Code: Not reported  
Inst. Control: Deed Restriction
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Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Complet. Date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media : Groundwater
Contact Name : Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext : Not reported
Latitude : Not reported
Longitude : Not reported

EPA ID: CAT000646208
Site ID: 0902660
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
EPA Region: 09
County: CONTRA COSTA
Event Code: Not reported
Inst. Control: Institutional Controls, (N.O.S.)
Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Complet. Date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media : Groundwater
Contact Name : Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext : Not reported
Latitude : Not reported
Longitude : Not reported

EPA ID: CAT000646208
Site ID: 0902660
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
EPA Region: 09
County: CONTRA COSTA
Event Code: Not reported
Inst. Control: Deed Restriction
Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Complet. Date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media : Sediment
Contact Name : Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext : Not reported
Latitude : Not reported
Longitude : Not reported

EPA ID: CAT000646208
Site ID: 0902660
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
EPA Region: 09
County: CONTRA COSTA
Event Code: Not reported
Inst. Control: Institutional Controls, (N.O.S.)
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Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Complet. Date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media : Soil
Contact Name : Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext : Not reported
Latitude : Not reported
Longitude : Not reported

EPA ID: CAT000646208
Site ID: 0902660
Name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Action Name: RECORD OF DECISION
Address: HOFFMAN BLVD & S 47TH ST
RICHMOND, CA 94804
EPA Region: 09
County: CONTRA COSTA
Event Code: Not reported
Inst. Control: Institutional Controls, (N.O.S.)
Actual Date: 06/30/1993
Complet. Date: 06/21/1993
Operable Unit: 01
Contaminated Media : Soil
Contact Name : Not reported
Contact Phone and Ext : Not reported
Latitude : Not reported
Longitude : Not reported

RCRA NonGen / NLR:
Date form received by agency: 08/14/1980
Facility name: LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP.
Facility address: HOFFMAN BLVD AND SO. 47TH ST.
RICHMOND, CA 94804
EPA ID: CAT000646208
Mailing address: 1696 MARTINEZ ST.
SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577
Contact: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Contact address: HOFFMAN BLVD AND SO. 47TH ST.
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Contact country: US
Contact telephone: (415) 635-5626
Contact email: Not reported
EPA Region: 09
Land type: Other land type
Classification: Non-Generator
Description: Handler: Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste

Owner/Operator Summary:
Owner/operator name: BRYAN FABIAN
Owner/operator address: 1696 MARTINEZ ST.
SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577
Owner/operator country: Not reported
Owner/operator telephone: (415) 635-5626
Legal status: Private
Owner/Operator Type: Owner
Owner/Op start date: Not reported
Owner/Op end date: Not reported

Owner/operator name: BRYAN FABIAN
Owner/operator address: 1696 MARTINEZ ST.
CITY NOT REPORTED, CA 99999
Owner/operator country: Not reported
Owner/operator telephone: (415) 635-5626
Legal status: Private
Owner/Operator Type: Operator
Owner/Op start date: Not reported
Owner/Op end date: Not reported

Handler Activities Summary:
U.S. importer of hazardous waste: No
Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): No
Recycler of hazardous waste: No
Transporter of hazardous waste: Yes
Treater, storer or disposer of HW: No
Underground injection activity: No
On-site burner exemption: No
Furnace exemption: No
Used oil fuel burner: No
Used oil processor: No
User oil refiner: No
Used oil fuel marketer to burner: No
Used oil Specification marketer: No
Used oil transfer facility: No
Used oil transporter: No

Corrective Action Summary:
Event date: 02/01/1980
Event: CA029SF

Event date: 02/01/1980
Event: CA049PA

Event date: 02/01/1980
Event: CA Prioritization, Facility or area was assigned a high corrective
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action priority.
Event date: 02/01/1980
Event: CA074HI

Event date: 12/01/1982
Event: CA049SI

Facility Has Received Notices of Violations:
Regulation violated: Not reported
Area of violation: Generators - General
Date violation determined: 09/08/1987
Date achieved compliance: 12/03/1987
Violation lead agency: State

Enforcement action: WRITTEN INFORMAL
Enforcement action date: 10/05/1987
Enf. disposition status: Not reported
Enf. disp. status date: Not reported
Enforcement lead agency: State
Proposed penalty amount: Not reported
Final penalty amount: Not reported
Paid penalty amount: Not reported

Evaluation Action Summary:
Evaluation date: 09/08/1987
Evaluation: NON-FINANCIAL RECORD REVIEW
Area of violation: Generators - General
Date achieved compliance: 12/03/1987
Evaluation lead agency: State

Evaluation date: 11/29/1986
Evaluation: COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION ON-SITE
Area of violation: Not reported
Date achieved compliance: Not reported
Evaluation lead agency: State

Evaluation date: 11/20/1985
Evaluation: COMPLIANCE EVALUATION INSPECTION ON-SITE
Area of violation: Not reported
Date achieved compliance: Not reported
Evaluation lead agency: State

ROD:
Full-text of USEPA Record of Decision(s) is available from EDR.
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Cleanup Oversight Agencies: SMBRP
Lead Agency Description: DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
Project Manager: Lynn Nakashima
Supervisor: Barbara Cook
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Site Code: 202002
Site Mgmt. Req.: NONE SPECIFIED
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
Special Program Status: Not reported
Status: Active
Status Date: 12/22/2005
Restricted Use: NO
Funding: Responsible Party
Latitude: 37.91037
Longitude: -122.3266
APN: 560010043
Past Use: LANDFILL - CONSTRUCTION, MANUFACTURING - CHEMICALS
Potential COC: * ORGANIC LIQUIDS WITH METALS Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM
Confirmed COC: NONE SPECIFIED
Potential Description: SOIL
Alias Name: Not reported
Alias Type: Not reported
Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: Not reported
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Not reported
Completed Date: Not reported
Comments: Not reported

Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

ENVIROSTOR:
Facility ID: 7490012
Status: Active
Status Date: 12/22/2005
Site Code: 202002
Site Type: State Response
Site Type Detailed: State Response or NPL
Acres: 3.3
NPL: NO
Regulatory Agencies: SMBRP
Lead Agency: SMBRP
Program Manager: Lynn Nakashima
Supervisor: Barbara Cook
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Program:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Use:</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Mgmt Req:</td>
<td>NONE SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>37.91037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.3266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN:</td>
<td>560010043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Use:</td>
<td>LANDFILL - CONSTRUCTION, MANUFACTURING - CHEMICALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential COC:</td>
<td>ORGANIC LIQUIDS WITH METALS Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed COC:</td>
<td>NONE SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Description:</td>
<td>SOIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Info:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Document Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Document Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Revised Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COTERSE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region:</th>
<th>COTERSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envirostor Id:</td>
<td>7490012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Facility Type:</td>
<td>STATE RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanup Status:</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>12/22/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code:</td>
<td>200060, 202001, 202002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>37.91037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.3266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enf Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat R:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag:</td>
<td>envirostor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Discharge System No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID Id:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Id No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Ult Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facility ID:** 80001815
**Status:** Refer: SMBRP
**Status Date:** 10/19/2012
**Site Type:** Corrective Action
**Site Type Detailed:** Corrective Action
**Acres:** 0.5
**NPL:** DELISTED
**Regulatory Agencies:** SMBRP
**Lead Agency:** SMBRP
**Program Manager:** Lynn Nakashima
**Supervisor:** Barbara Cook
**Division Branch:** Cleanup Berkeley
**Assembly:** 15
**Senate:** 09
**Special Program:** Not reported
**Restricted Use:** NO
**Site Mgmt Req:** NONE SPECIFIED
**Funding:** Not reported
**Latitude:** 37.90956
**Longitude:** -122.3236
**APN:** NONE SPECIFIED
**Past Use:** MANUFACTURING - OTHER, RECYCLING - USED OIL
**Potential COC:** Lead Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) TPH-MOTOR OIL Chromium VI Mercury and compounds Nickel Zinc
**Confirmed COC:** Lead Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) Mercury and compounds Chromium VI Zinc Nickel TPH-MOTOR OIL Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
**Potential Description:** SOIL
**Alias Name:** CAT000646208
**Alias Type:** EPA Identification Number
**Alias Name:** 200060
**Alias Type:** Project Code (Site Code)
**Alias Name:** 07290039
**Alias Type:** Envirostor ID Number
**Alias Name:** 80001815
**Alias Type:** Envirostor ID Number

**Completed Info:**
- **Completed Area Name:** PROJECT WIDE
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Document Type:** Preliminary Assessment Report
- **Completed Date:** 02/01/1980
- **Comments:** Not reported

**Completed Info:**
- **Completed Area Name:** PROJECT WIDE
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Document Type:** Preliminary Assessment Report
- **Completed Date:** 12/01/1982
- **Comments:** Not reported

**Future Area Name:** Not reported
**Future Sub Area Name:** Not reported
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Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

Facility ID: 7290039
Status: Active
Status Date: 06/13/2013
Site Code: 200060
Site Type: Federal Superfund
Site Type Detailed: State Response or NPL
Acres: 18
NPL: DELISTED
Regulatory Agencies: SMBRP, US EPA
Lead Agency: SMBRP
Program Manager: Lynn Nakashima
Supervisor: Barbara Cook
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
Special Program: Not reported
Restricted Use: YES
Site Mgmt Req: DAY, ELD, HOS, EX, GW, NOWN, NDAM, NUSE, NDEV, NSUB, SCH, FOOD, RES
Funding: Responsible Party
Latitude: 37.91010
Longitude: -122.3235
APN: 40992-1, 560010043
Past Use: MANUFACTURING - OTHER, RECYCLING - USED OIL
Potential COC: Lead Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs TPH-MOTOR OIL Chromium VI Mercury and compounds Nickel Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Zinc
Confirmed COC: Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Chromium VI Mercury and compounds Nickel Lead TPH-MOTOR OIL Zinc
Not reported
Potential Description: SED, SOIL
Alias Name: Not reported
Alias Type: Not reported
Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: Not reported
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Not reported
Completed Date: Not reported
Comments: Not reported
Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported
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Calsite:
Region: BERKELEY
Facility ID: 07290039
Facility Type: NPRP
Type: NPL SITE, RP-FUNDED
Branch: NC
Branch Name: NORTH COAST
File Name: Not reported
State Senate District: 06012005
Status: ANNUAL WORKPLAN (AWP) - ACTIVE SITE
Lead Agency: DEPT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL
NPL: Delisted
SIC Code: 29
SIC Name: MANU - PETROLEUM & COAL PRODUCTS
Access: Not reported
Cortese: Not reported
Hazardous Ranking Score: Not reported
Date Site Hazard Ranked: Not reported
Groundwater Contamination: Not reported
Staff Member Responsible for Site: HATIQEE
Supervisor Responsible for Site: Not reported
Region Water Control Board: SF
Region Water Control Board Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY
Lat/Long Direction: Not reported
Lat/Long (dms): 0 0 0 / 0 0 0
Lat/Long Method: Not reported
Lat/Long Description: Not reported
State Assembly District Code: 14
State Senate District Code: 09
Facility ID: 07290039
Activity: RA
Activity Name: REMOVAL ACTION
AWP Code: TANK
Proposed Budget: 0
AWP Completion Date: Not reported
Revised Due Date: Not reported
Comments Date: 10311982
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0
Estimated Size: Not reported
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported
Activity Status: COM
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
Liquids Removed (Gals): 0
Liquids Treated (Gals): 0
Action Included Capping: Not reported
Well Decommissioned: Not reported
Action Included Fencing: Not reported
Removal Action Certification: Not reported
Activity Comments: Not reported
For Commercial Reuse: 0
For Industrial Reuse: 0
For Residential Reuse: 0
Unknown Type: 0
Facility ID: 07290039
Activity: RA
Activity Name: REMOVAL ACTION
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AWP Code: TANK  
Proposed Budget: 0  
AWP Completion Date: Not reported  
Revised Due Date: Not reported  
Comments Date: 05301983  
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0  
Estimated Size: Not reported  
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported  
Activity Status: COM  
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE  
Liquids Removed (Gals): 0  
Liquids Treated (Gals): 0  
Action Included Capping: Not reported  
Well Decommissioned: Not reported  
Action Included Fencing: Not reported  
Removal Action Certification: Not reported  
Activity Comments: Not reported  
For Commercial Reuse: 0  
For Industrial Reuse: 0  
For Residential Reuse: 0  
Unknown Type: 0  
Facility ID: 07290039  
Activity: RA  
Activity Name: REMOVAL ACTION  
AWP Code: SOIL  
Proposed Budget: 0  
AWP Completion Date: Not reported  
Revised Due Date: Not reported  
Comments Date: 12301985  
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0  
Estimated Size: Not reported  
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported  
Activity Status: COM  
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE  
Liquids Removed (Gals): 0  
Liquids Treated (Gals): 0  
Action Included Capping: Not reported  
Well Decommissioned: Not reported  
Action Included Fencing: Not reported  
Removal Action Certification: Not reported  
Activity Comments: Not reported  
For Commercial Reuse: 0  
For Industrial Reuse: 0  
For Residential Reuse: 0  
Unknown Type: 0  
Facility ID: 07290039  
Activity: ORDER  
Activity Name: I/SE, IORSE, FFA, FFSRA, VCA, EA  
AWP Code: CNSNT  
Proposed Budget: 0  
AWP Completion Date: Not reported  
Revised Due Date: Not reported  
Comments Date: 01301988  
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0  
Estimated Size: Not reported  
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported  
Activity Status: COM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Status:</th>
<th>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID:</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name:</td>
<td>REMOVAL ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code:</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date:</td>
<td>12301989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status:</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status:</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID:</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name:</td>
<td>REMOVAL ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code:</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date:</td>
<td>12301989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status:</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status:</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments:</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF WOODEN BUILDING AND ROLLS OF ROOFING MATERIAL, BOTH CONTAINASBESTOS. QUANTITIES UNKNOWN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Commercial Reuse</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>RIFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION / FEASIBILITY STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date</td>
<td>12041992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>CEQA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>CEQA INCLUDING NEGATIVE DECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date</td>
<td>06081993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>RAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name</td>
<td>REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN / RECORD OF DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)  S101272697

AWP Completion Date: Not reported
Revised Due Date: Not reported
Comments Date: 06081993
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0
Estimated Size: Not reported
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported
Activity Status: COM
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
Liquids Removed (Gals): CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
Liquids Treated (Gals): 0
Action Included Capping: Not reported
Well Decommissioned: Not reported
Action Included Fencing: Not reported
Removal Action Certification: Not reported
Activity Comments: Not reported
For Commercial Reuse: 0
For Industrial Reuse: 0
For Residential Reuse: 0
Unknown Type: 0
Facility ID: 07290039
Activity: DES
Activity Name: DESIGN
AWP Code: Not reported
Proposed Budget: 0
AWP Completion Date: Not reported
Revised Due Date: 01101994
Comments Date: Not reported
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0
Estimated Size: Not reported
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported
Activity Status: COM
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
Liquids Removed (Gals): 0
Liquids Treated (Gals): 0
Action Included Capping: Not reported
Well Decommissioned: Not reported
Action Included Fencing: Not reported
Removal Action Certification: Not reported
Activity Comments: Not reported
For Commercial Reuse: 0
For Industrial Reuse: 0
For Residential Reuse: 0
Unknown Type: 0
Facility ID: 07290039
Activity: DES
Activity Name: DESIGN
AWP Code: COVER
Proposed Budget: 0
AWP Completion Date: Not reported
Revised Due Date: Not reported
Comments Date: 01101994
Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0
Estimated Size: Not reported
Request to Delete Activity: Not reported
Activity Status: COM
Definition of Status: CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
Liquids Removed (Gals): 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)**

- **Liquids Treated (Gals):** 0
- **Action Included Capping:** Not reported
- **Well Decommissioned:** Not reported
- **Action Included Fencing:** Not reported
- **Removal Action Certification:** Not reported
- **Activity Comments:** Not reported
- **For Commercial Reuse:** 0
- **For Industrial Reuse:** 0
- **For Residential Reuse:** 0
- **Unknown Type:** 0
- **Facility ID:** 07290039
- **Activity:** RMDL
- **Activity Name:** REMEDIAL ACTION (RAP REQUIRED)
- **AWP Code:** CAP
- **Proposed Budget:** 0
- **AWP Completion Date:** Not reported
- **Revised Due Date:** Not reported
- **Comments Date:** 08141995
- **Est Person-Yrs to complete:** 0
- **Estimated Size:** Not reported
- **Request to Delete Activity:** Not reported
- **Activity Status:** COM
- **Definition of Status:** CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
- **Liquids Removed (Gals):** 0
- **Liquids Treated (Gals):** 0
- **Action Included Capping:** X
- **Well Decommissioned:** Not reported
- **Action Included Fencing:** Not reported
- **Removal Action Certification:** N
- **Activity Comments:** LETTER APPROVING REMEDIAL ACTION. CAP WAS REGRADED IN AREAS WHEREPONDING HAD OCCURRED IN 02/95. CONFIRMATION INSPECTION.
- **For Commercial Reuse:** 0
- **For Industrial Reuse:** 0
- **For Residential Reuse:** 0
- **Unknown Type:** 0
- **Facility ID:** 07290039
- **Activity:** DEED
- **Activity Name:** DEED RESTRICTIONS
- **AWP Code:** Not reported
- **Proposed Budget:** 0
- **AWP Completion Date:** Not reported
- **Revised Due Date:** Not reported
- **Comments Date:** 09131995
- **Est Person-Yrs to complete:** 0
- **Estimated Size:** Not reported
- **Request to Delete Activity:** Not reported
- **Activity Status:** COM
- **Definition of Status:** CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
- **Liquids Removed (Gals):** 0
- **Liquids Treated (Gals):** 0
- **Action Included Capping:** Not reported
- **Well Decommissioned:** Not reported
- **Action Included Fencing:** Not reported
- **Removal Action Certification:** Not reported
- **Activity Comments:** Not reported
- **For Commercial Reuse:** 0
- **For Industrial Reuse:** 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIIK GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)**

- **For Residential Reuse:** 0
- **Unknown Type:** 0
- **Facility ID:** 07290039
- **Activity:** CERT
- **Activity Name:** CERTIFICATION
- **AWP Code:** Not reported
- **Proposed Budget:** 0
- **AWP Completion Date:** Not reported
- **Revised Due Date:** Not reported
- **Comments Date:** 09231995
- **Est Person-Yrs to complete:** 0
- **Estimated Size:** L
- **Request to Delete Activity:** Not reported
- **Activity Status:** COM
- **Definition of Status:** CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
- **Liquids Removed (Gals):** 770
- **Liquids Treated (Gals):** 0
- **Action Included Capping:** X
- **Well Decommissioned:** Not reported
- **Action Included Fencing:** Not reported
- **Removal Action Certification:** N
- **Activity Comments:** INTERIM REMEDIAL MEASURE EXCAVATED AND DISPOSED HIGHLY CONTAMINATED SOIL AND REMAINING BUILDINGS ON THE SITE. THE SITE HAS A TWO FOOTED VEGETATED SOIL CAP.

- **For Commercial Reuse:** 0
- **For Industrial Reuse:** 0
- **For Residential Reuse:** 18
- **Unknown Type:** 0
- **Facility ID:** 07290039
- **Activity:** ORDER
- **Activity Name:** I/SE, IORSE, FFA, FFSRA, VCA, EA
- **AWP Code:** OM
- **Proposed Budget:** 0
- **AWP Completion Date:** Not reported
- **Revised Due Date:** Not reported
- **Comments Date:** 09231995
- **Est Person-Yrs to complete:** 0
- **Estimated Size:** Not reported
- **Request to Delete Activity:** Not reported
- **Activity Status:** COM
- **Definition of Status:** CERTIFIED / OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
- **Liquids Removed (Gals):** 0
- **Liquids Treated (Gals):** 0
- **Action Included Capping:** Not reported
- **Well Decommissioned:** Not reported
- **Action Included Fencing:** Not reported
- **Removal Action Certification:** Not reported
- **Activity Comments:** Not reported

- **For Commercial Reuse:** 0
- **For Industrial Reuse:** 0
- **For Residential Reuse:** 0
- **Unknown Type:** 0
- **Facility ID:** 07290039
- **Activity:** 5YEAR
- **Activity Name:** FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REQUIRED BY CERCLA
- **AWP Code:** Not reported
- **Proposed Budget:** 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S101272697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWP Completion Date:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date:</td>
<td>06301998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status:</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status:</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID:</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>5YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name:</td>
<td>FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REQUIRED BY CERCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date:</td>
<td>06272003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status:</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status:</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Treated (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Capping:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Decommissioned:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Included Fencing:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Action Certification:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Comments:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Commercial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Industrial Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Reuse:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Type:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID:</td>
<td>07290039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>5YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name:</td>
<td>FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REQUIRED BY CERCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Code:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budget:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP Completion Date:</td>
<td>06302008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Due Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Person-Yrs to complete:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Size:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Delete Activity:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Status:</td>
<td>COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Status:</td>
<td>CERTIFIED / OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids Removed (Gals):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liquid Gold Oil Corp (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/14/9995</td>
<td>Comments: vegetated cover and the construction of fencing around the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/9995</td>
<td>Comments: vegetated cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/9983</td>
<td>Comments: The Site was listed on the Federal National Priorities List (NPL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/9983</td>
<td>Comments: Delisted from the National Priorities List (NPL) by the US EPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/9996</td>
<td>Comments: Recorded Deed Restriction limiting use to park, open space, commercial or industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/31/9995</td>
<td>Comments: Certified Site. Signed O&amp;M Agreement which provides for ongoing groundwater monitoring and maintenance of cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/9995</td>
<td>Comments: Excavation and removal of 760 cubic yards of oil-contaminated soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/9991</td>
<td>Comments: Completed RA. A wooden building contaminated with lead and asbestos was removed from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/9983</td>
<td>Comments: Conducted stabilization actions that included removal of 25 storage tanks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Info:**
The site encompasses about 22 acres along San Francisco Bay and is owned by the Southern Pacific Transportation Company. From 1974 to 1982, the site was leased by Liquid Gold Oil Corporation to store, re-refine and recycle oil and other substances. The hazardous substances stored in over 20 storage tanks and drums included waste motor oil, organic solvents, bunker oil, diesel fuel, oil-water emulsions and mixtures and tank bottom waste. As a result of site operations, hazardous substances leaked or spilled onto the ground and were discharged into ponds, sumps and ditches and drained into wetland areas. Soil, sediments, surface water and groundwater were contaminated with oil and grease, phenols, lead, nickel, copper, chromium, zinc, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and other substances.
LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP (Continued)

Comments Date: 06012005
Comments: Change in site status - Cert to AWP. Union Pacific identified to
Comments Date: 06012005
Comments: DTSC that sampling in a closed Gun Club located on this property
Comments Date: 06012005
Comments: has found elevated levels of lead. Union Pacific has submitted
Comments Date: 06012005
Comments: a Removal Action Workplan to clean up this contamination.
Comments Date: 06012005
Comments: Document is currently under review.
Comments Date: 06081993
Comments: Approved RAP.
Comments Date: 06272003
Comments: Completed Five-Year Review. The groundwater monitoring network
Comments Date: 06272003
Comments: at the site has been reduced to six wells which are to be
Comments Date: 06272003
Comments: sampled every two years. Cap inspections are to be done every two years.
Comments Date: 06272003
Comments: Completed Five-Year Review.
Comments Date: 08141995
Comments: Completed RA which consisted of the excavation and removal of
Comments Date: 08141995
Comments: sediments from selected wetland areas, the construction of a
ID Name: CALSTARS CODE
ID Value: 200060
ID Name: BEP DATABASE PCODE
ID Value: P21038
Alternate Name: LIQUID GOLD LIQUID GOLD OIL CORP
Special Programs Code: Not reported
Special Programs Name: Not reported

DEED:
Envirostor ID: 7290039
Area: PROJECT WIDE
Sub Area: Not reported
Site Type: FEDERAL SUPERFUND
Status: ACTIVE
Agency: Not reported
Covenant Uploaded: Not reported
Deed Date(s): 09/13/1995

CORTESE:
Region: CORTESE
Envirostor Id: 7290039
Site/Facility Type: FEDERAL SUPERFUND - DELISTED
Cleanup Status: ACTIVE - LAND USE RESTRICTIONS
Status Date: 06/13/2013
Site Code: 200060
Latitude: 37.910109
Longitude: -122.32353
Owner: Not reported
Enf Type: Not reported
Swat R: Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag:</th>
<th>envirostor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Discharge System No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID Id:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Id No:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Uit Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HWP:**
- **EPA Id:** CAT000646208
- **Cleanup Status:** UNKNOWN
- **Latitude:** 37.90825
- **Longitude:** -122.3260
- **Facility Type:** Historical - Non-Operating
- **Facility Size:** Not reported
- **Team:** Not reported
- **.Supervisor:** Not reported
- **Site Code:** Not reported
- **Assembly District:** 15
- **Senate District:** 09
- **Public Information Officer:** Not reported

**Alias:**
- **EPA Id:** CAT000646208
- **Facility Type:** Historical - Non-Operating
- **Alias Type:** Envirostor ID Number
- **Alias:** 07290039

**51 HARBORFRONT TRACT**
- **RESPONSE:** 70000178
- **Site Type:** State Response
- **Site Type Detail:** State Response or NPL
- **Acres:** 10
- **National Priorities List:** NO
- **Cleanup Oversight Agencies:** SMBRP
- **Lead Agency Description:** DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
- **Project Manager:** Lynn Nakashima
- **Supervisor:** Barbara Cook
- **Division Branch:** Cleanup Berkeley
- **Site Code:** 201734
- **Site Mgmt. Req.:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Assembly:** 15
- **Senate:** 09
- **Special Program Status:** Not reported
- **Status:** Active
- **Status Date:** 07/01/2005
- **Restricted Use:** NO
- **Funding:** Orphan Funds
- **Latitude:** 37.91234
- **Longitude:** -122.3281
**HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)**

**APN:** NONE SPECIFIED  
**Past Use:** METAL PLATING - CHROME, METAL PLATING - CHROME  
**Potential COC:** Benzene Trichloroethylene (TCE) Chromium VI 1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)  
1,1-Dichloroethylene 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis)  
**Confirmed COC:** Trichloroethylene (TCE) Chromium VI 1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)  
1,1-Dichloroethylene 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis) Benzene 30153-NO  
**Potential Description:** OTH, UE  
**Alias Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Alias Type:** Alternate Name  
**Alias Name:** 110033613711  
**Alias Type:** EPA (FRS #)  
**Alias Name:** 201598  
**Alias Type:** Site Code - Historical  
**Alias Name:** 201734  
**Alias Type:** Project Code (Site Code)  
**Alias Name:** 70000178  
**Alias Type:** Envirostor ID Number  
**Completed Info:**  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Date:** 01/12/2011  
**Comments:** Stop work order/termination of contract letter issued requesting final invoices within 30 days.  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Date:** 05/26/2011  
**Comments:** Signed work order No. 1  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** Correspondence  
**Completed Date:** 07/28/2010  
**Comments:** DTSC letter responding to comments received from property owner's environmental consultant.  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Date:** 11/12/2009  
**Comments:** Work Order  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** Correspondence  
**Completed Date:** 05/18/2010  
**Comments:** Letter to waste management  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
**Completed Document Type:** Correspondence  
**Completed Date:** 01/16/2013  
**Comments:** Letter identifying that ERRG has completed all work and ordered to stop work, and submit final invoices.

**05/18/2010**  
**Completed Date:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Letter to waste management  
**07/28/2010**  
**Completed Date:** Correspondence  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** DTSC letter responding to comments received from property owner's environmental consultant.  
**01/12/2011**  
**Completed Date:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Stop work order/termination of contract letter issued requesting final invoices within 30 days.  
**05/26/2011**  
**Completed Date:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Signed work order No. 1  
**11/12/2009**  
**Completed Date:** State/Federal Funded Site Work Order  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Work Order  
**05/18/2010**  
**Completed Date:** Correspondence  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Letter to waste management  
**01/16/2013**  
**Completed Date:** Correspondence  
**Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Sub Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome  
**Comments:** Letter identifying that ERRG has completed all work and ordered to stop work, and submit final invoices.
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)  

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)  
Completed Date: 04/04/2011  
Comments: Approved CFA

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract  
Completed Date: 05/16/2011  
Comments: Executed contract 10-T1123

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Letter - Demand  
Completed Date: 05/08/2014  
Comments: Letter to property owner requesting payment agreed to in settlement agreement.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Access Agreement  
Completed Date: 01/14/2010  
Comments: Access agreement to allow DTSC to conduct sampling and pilot test on Pacific Hard Chrome property.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)  
Completed Date: 04/17/2008  
Comments: CFA for contract extension.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: *Site Inspection (SI) Workplan  
Completed Date: 10/07/2005  
Comments: Workplan for investigation of business area located to the east of Zeneca/Former Stauffer Chemical site. Includes soil, groundwater and soil gas sampling to be conducted in two phases.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Supplemental Site Investigation Workplan  
Completed Date: 12/20/2005  
Comments: Workplan Amendment No. 1 adds additional laboratory analysis to original workplan.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report  
Completed Date: 10/10/2006  
Comments: Final approval via email.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome  
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported  
Completed Document Type: Information Request Letter  
Completed Date: 01/02/2007
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued) S107736425

Consultant to property owner provided decommissioning and UST Closure Summary to DTSC.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Well Installation Workplan
Completed Date: 02/02/2007
Comments: Workplan to install 6 shallow groundwater wells, 3 CPT and surface soil sampling. Also includes quarterly groundwater sampling.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Fact Sheets
Completed Date: 02/02/2007
Comments: DTSC prepared fact sheet. Describes previous sampling conducted and proposed sampling activities.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: *Correspondence - Received
Completed Date: 07/06/2007
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Workplan
Completed Date: 05/12/2008
Comments: Approval letter for workplan

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 12/06/2007
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Imminent and/or Subst. Endangerment Determination
Completed Date: 05/01/2006
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 06/29/2010
Comments: Contract extension.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Completed Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Sub Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Document Type</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/20/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Approved g.w. monitoring report letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/28/2010</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Approval of Pre-Design Characterization Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/2010</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Field work began week of 2/22/2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2009</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2008</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Site Characterization Report</td>
<td>DTSC prepared document in-house. No DTSC letter was prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan
- **Completed Date:** 08/25/2010
- **Comments:** Not reported

### Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Study Report
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 11/08/2011
- **Comments:** Report approved as submitted.

### Completed Document Type: Fact Sheets
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Document Type:** Fact Sheets
- **Completed Date:** 08/05/2010
- **Comments:** Work Notice hand delivered to surrounding businesses.

### Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 08/23/2010
- **Comments:** Work notice was distributed on 8/5/2010.

### Completed Document Type: Other Report
- **Completed Area Name:** PROJECT WIDE
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 11/10/2010
- **Comments:** No DTSC letter. Consultation with GSU was done.

### Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 11/08/2011
- **Comments:** Report approved as submitted.

### Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 01/20/2012
- **Comments:** Report approved as submitted.

### Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Study Report
- **Completed Area Name:** Pacific Hard Chrome
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** 06/01/2012
- **Comments:** Not reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>07/07/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No letter required or RP submittal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>10/06/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No letter prepared. Field work conducted and completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No DTSC letter - field work was conducted by ERRG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>01/20/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No final DTSC letter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>06/27/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Work notice for groundwater sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Well Decommissioning Workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>09/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Revised Work Plan approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>10/26/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Work Notice for Well Closures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Well Decommissioning Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>12/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Report describes the steps taken to decommission eight on-site wells and two wells located within the Harbor Front Tract Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>04/29/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Executed Agreement - Time Extension Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)  S107736425

Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 04/26/2007
Comments: ERRG 2007 Contract

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)
Completed Date: 11/28/2009
Comments: Contract extension to 6/30/2010

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)
Completed Date: 04/07/2012
Comments: Contract extension approved on 4/7/2012

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 12/30/2009
Comments: Contract amendment to add funding and extend term of contract.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 09/25/2007
Comments: ERRG contract

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 05/08/2008
Comments: Contract amendment 1 for time extension to 1/31/2009

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 12/08/2008
Comments: Contract Amendment to add time.

Future Area Name: Not reported
Future Sub Area Name: Not reported
Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

ENVIROSTOR:
Facility ID: 70000178
Status: Active
Status Date: 07/01/2005
Site Code: 201734
Site Type: State Response
Site Type Detailed: State Response or NPL
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

Completed Info:
Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Work Order
Completed Date: 01/12/2011
Comments: Stop work order/termination of contract letter issued requesting final invoices within 30 days.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Work Order
Completed Date: 05/26/2011
Comments: Signed work order No. 1

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Correspondence
Completed Date: 07/28/2010
Comments: DTSC letter responding to comments received from property owner’s environmental consultant.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Work Order
Completed Date: 11/12/2009
### Project: HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

#### Project Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Sub Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Document Type</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>05/18/2010</td>
<td>Work Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>01/16/2013</td>
<td>Letter identifying ERRG has completed all work and ordered to stop work, and submit final invoices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)</td>
<td>04/04/2011</td>
<td>Approved CFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Letter - Demand</td>
<td>05/08/2014</td>
<td>Letter to property owner requesting payment agreed to in settlement agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Access Agreement</td>
<td>01/14/2010</td>
<td>Access agreement to allow DTSC to conduct sampling and pilot test on Pacific Hard Chrome property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)</td>
<td>04/17/2008</td>
<td>CFA for contract extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>*Site Inspection (SI) Workplan</td>
<td>10/07/2005</td>
<td>Workplan for investigation of business area located to the east of Zeneca/Former Stauffer Chemical site. Includes soil, groundwater and soil gas sampling to be conducted in two phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

Completed Document Type: Supplemental Site Investigation Workplan
Completed Date: 12/20/2005
Comments: Workplan Amendment No. 1 adds additional laboratory analysis to original workplan.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report
Completed Date: 10/10/2006
Comments: Final approval via email.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Information Request Letter
Completed Date: 01/02/2007
Comments: Consultant to property owner provided decommissioning and UST Closure Summary to DTSC.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Well Installation Workplan
Completed Date: 02/02/2007
Comments: Workplan to install 6 shallow groundwater wells, 3 CPT and surface soil sampling. Also includes quarterly groundwater sampling.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Fact Sheets
Completed Date: 02/02/2007
Comments: DTSC prepared fact sheet. Describes previous sampling conducted and proposed sampling activities.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Well Completion Report
Completed Date: 11/15/2007
Comments: Approved final document was based on revisions provided on Oct. 11, Nov. 1 and Nov. 2

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: *Correspondence - Received
Completed Date: 07/06/2007
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Workplan
Completed Date: 05/12/2008
Comments: Approval letter for workplan

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 12/06/2007
Comments: Not reported
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Imminent and/or Subst. Endangerment Determination
Completed Date: 05/01/2006
Comments: Not reported

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: State/Federal Funded Site Contract
Completed Date: 06/29/2010
Comments: Contract extension.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Monitoring Report
Completed Date: 03/20/2008
Comments: Approved g.w. monitoring report letter.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report
Completed Date: 06/30/2008
Comments: Final document approval included with stop work order and completion of contract.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Site Characterization Report
Completed Date: 07/08/2009
Comments: Letter approves final report and includes stop work order. A ground water pilot study will be prepared to evaluate treatment options for hexavalent chromium found in the ground water.

Completed Area Name: PROJECT WIDE
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Public Participation Plan / Community Relations Plan
Completed Date: 05/05/2009
Comments: Area wide plan was prepared with site specific information in appendices. Attached letter contains EnviroStor link to plan.

Completed Area Name: Pacific Hard Chrome
Completed Sub Area Name: Not reported
Completed Document Type: Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan
Completed Date: 02/03/2010
Comments: Document approval letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>02/22/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Field work began week of 2/22/2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Other Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>05/28/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Approval of Pre-Design Characterization Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Pilot Study/Treatability Workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>08/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>08/10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>No DTSC letter - field implementation began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Pilot/Treatability Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>11/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Report approved as submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>08/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Work Notice hand delivered to surrounding businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Fact Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>08/23/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Work notice was distributed on 8/5/2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>PROJECT WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Other Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>11/10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>No DTSC letter. Consultation with GSU was done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>12/04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Field work was completed. No DTSC letter needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Completed Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Sub Area Name</th>
<th>Completed Document Type</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2011</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>06/01/2012</td>
<td>No DTSC letter required or RP submittal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
<td>01/20/2012</td>
<td>No final DTSC letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/2012</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
<td>06/27/2011</td>
<td>Work notice for groundwater sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/2012</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Well Decommissioning Workplan</td>
<td>09/07/2012</td>
<td>Revised Work Plan approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2012</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Work Notice</td>
<td>10/26/2012</td>
<td>Work Notice for Well Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name:</td>
<td>Pacific Hard Chrome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>Well Decommissioning Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>12/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Report describes the steps taken to decommission eight on-site wells and two wells located within the Harbor Front Tract Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>04/29/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Executed Agreement - Time Extension Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>04/26/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>ERRG 2007 Contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>11/28/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Contract extension to 6/30/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract Fiscal Approval (CFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>04/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Contract extension approved on 4/7/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>12/30/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Contract amendment to add funding and extend term of contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>PROJECT WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>09/25/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>ERRG contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>05/08/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Contract amendment 1 for time extension to 1/31/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Area Name:</th>
<th>Pacific Hard Chrome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type:</td>
<td>State/Federal Funded Site Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date:</td>
<td>12/08/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Contract Amendment to add time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Area Name:</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Sub Area Name:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HARBORFRONT TRACT (Continued)

Future Document Type: Not reported
Future Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Sub Area Name: Not reported
Schedule Document Type: Not reported
Schedule Due Date: Not reported
Schedule Revised Date: Not reported

CORTES:
Region: CORTESE
Envirostor Id: 70000178
Site/Facility Type: STATE RESPONSE
Cleanup Status: ACTIVE
Status Date: 07/01/2005
Site Code: 201734
Latitude: 37.912343
Longitude: -122.32812
Owner: Not reported
Enf Type: Not reported
Swat R: Not reported
Flag: envirostor
Order No: Not reported
Waste Discharge System No: Not reported
Effective Date: Not reported
Region 2: Not reported
WID Id: Not reported
Solid Waste Id No: Not reported
Waste Management Util Name: Not reported

ICI AMERICAS INC AG PLANT
RESPONSE S102628252
1415 47TH ST S
RICHMOND, CA 94804
1/2-1
0.968 mi.
5111 ft.
Site 1 of 3 in cluster I

Relative: Lower
Actual: 18 ft.

Facility ID: 7280002
Site Type: State Response
Site Type Detail: State Response or NPL
Acres: 86
National Priorities List: NO
Cleanup Oversight Agencies: SMBRP
Lead Agency Description: DTSC - Site Cleanup Program
Project Manager: Lynn Nakashima
Supervisor: Barbara Cook
Division Branch: Cleanup Berkeley
Site Code: 201955
Site Mgmt. Req.: DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NDAM, SCH, RES, DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NDAM, SCH, RES, DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NUSE, SCH, RES
Assembly: 15
Senate: 09
Special Program Status: Not reported
Status: Active
Status Date: 11/06/2004
### MAP FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ICI AMERICAS INC AG PLANT (Continued)**

**MAP FINDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Use</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>37.91189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>-122.3314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Use</td>
<td>ILLEGAL DUMPING, MANUFACTURING - CHEMICALS, MANUFACTURING - PESTICIDES, RESEARCH - WEAPONS, WASTE - INDUSTRIAL TREATMENT FACILITY, WASTE WATER PONDS, HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE - TANKS/CONTAINERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential COC</td>
<td>Arsenic Benzene DDD DDE DDT Lead Mercury (elemental Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Tetrachloroethylene (PCE Trichloroethylene (TCE Vinyl chloride Beryllium and compounds Cadmium and compounds Carbon disulfide Copper and compounds Nickel Selenium Sulfuric Acid Toluene Zinc 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed COC</td>
<td>Sulfuric Acid Selenium Toluene Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Tetrachloroethylene (PCE Trichloroethylene (TCE Vinyl chloride Beryllium and compounds Cadmium and compounds Carbon disulfide Copper and compounds Nickel Arsenic Benzene DDD DDE DDT Lead Mercury (elemental Zinc 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Description</td>
<td>OTH, SED, SOIL, SV, SOIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Document Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Document Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Due Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Sub Area Name</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Document Type</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Due Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Revised Date</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIROSTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility ID</td>
<td>7280002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date</td>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>201955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>State Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type Detailed</td>
<td>State Response or NPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Agencies</td>
<td>SMBRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>SMBRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Lynn Nakashima</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ICI AMERICAS INC AG PLANT (Continued)

**Superior:** Barbara Cook  
**Division Branch:** Cleanup Berkeley  
**Assembly:** 15  
**Senate:** 09  
**Special Program:** Not reported  
**Restricted Use:** YES  
**Site Mgmt Req:** DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NDAM, SCH, RES, DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NDAM, SCH, RES, DAY, ELD, HOS, LUC, EX, GW, NOWN, NUSE, SCH, RES  
**Funding:** Responsible Party  
**Latitude:** 37.91189  
**Longitude:** -122.3314  
**APN:** 560-050-007, 560-050-016, 560-050-020, 560-050-021, 560-050-022, 560010046, 560010047, 560022019, 560023026, 560026002, 560027005, 560028007, 560050007, 560050008, 560050019, 560050021, 560050022, 560050023  
**Past Use:** ILLEGAL DUMPING, MANUFACTURING - CHEMICALS, MANUFACTURING - PESTICIDES, RESEARCH - WEAPONS, WASTE - INDUSTRIAL TREATMENT FACILITY, WASTE WATER PONDS, HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE - TANKS/CONTAINERS  
**Potential COC:** Arsenic Benzene DDD DDE DDT Lead Mercury (elemental Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Tetrachloroethylene (PCE Trichloroethylene (TCE Vinyl chloride Beryllium and compounds Cadmium and compounds Carbon disulfide Copper and compounds Nickel Selenium Sulfuric Acid Toluene Zinc Arsenic Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Tetrachloroethylene (PCE Trichloroethylene (TCE 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis  
**Confirmed COC:** Sulfuric Acid Selenium Tolune Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs Tetrachloroethylene (PCE Trichloroethylene (TCE Vinyl chloride Beryllium and compounds Cadmium and compounds Carbon disulfide Copper and compounds Nickel Arsenic Benzene DDD DDE DDT Lead Mercury (elemental Zinc Arsenic Tetrachloroethylene (PCE 1,2-Dichloroethylene (cis Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs Trichloroethylene (TCE  
**Potential Description:** OTH, SED, SOIL, SV, SOIL  
**Alias Name:** Not reported  
**Alias Type:** Not reported  
**Completed Info:**  
- **Completed Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Completed Document Type:** Not reported  
- **Comments:** Not reported  
- **Future Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Future Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Future Document Type:** Not reported  
- **Future Due Date:** Not reported  
- **Schedule Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Schedule Sub Area Name:** Not reported  
- **Schedule Document Type:** Not reported  
- **Schedule Due Date:** Not reported  
- **Schedule Revised Date:** Not reported  

### LUST:

**Region:** STATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Id:</th>
<th>T0601300531</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>37.9149179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.3331764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Type:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Completed - Case Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Date:</td>
<td>05/18/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Worker:</td>
<td>BGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Case Number:</td>
<td>07-0575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC Case Number:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Location:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Media Affect:</td>
<td>Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Contaminants of Concern:</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site History:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

**Contact:**
- **Global Id:** T0601300531
- **Contact Type:** Local Agency Caseworker
- **Contact Name:** SUE LOYD
- **Organization Name:** CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
- **Address:** 4333 PACHECO BLVD.
- **City:** MARTINEZ
- **Email:** sloyd@hsd.co.contra-costa.ca.us
- **Phone Number:** Not reported

**Global Id:** T0601300531
**Contact Type:** Regional Board Caseworker
**Contact Name:** BARBARA SIEMINSKI
**Organization Name:** SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
**Address:** 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
**City:** OAKLAND
**Email:** bsieminski@waterboards.ca.gov
**Phone Number:** Not reported

**Status History:**
- **Global Id:** T0601300531
  - **Status:** Completed - Case Closed
  - **Status Date:** 05/18/1998

- **Global Id:** T0601300531
  - **Status:** Open - Case Begin Date
  - **Status Date:** 09/07/1991

- **Global Id:** T0601300531
  - **Status:** Open - Site Assessment
  - **Status Date:** 07/27/1994

**Regulatory Activities:**
- **Global Id:** T0601300531
  - **Action Type:** Other
  - **Date:** 09/07/1991
  - **Action:** Leak Discovery

- **Global Id:** T0601300531
ICI AMERICAS INC AG PLANT (Continued)  S102628252

Action Type: Other  Date: 06/30/1992  Action: Leak Reported

Global Id: T0601300531  Action Type: Other  Date: 09/07/1991  Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0601300531  Action Type: ENFORCEMENT  Date: 05/18/1998  Action: Clean Up Fund - Case Closure Review Summary Report (RSR) - #2118.11

LUST REG 2:
Region: 2  Facility Id: 07-0575  Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 04650  How Discovered: Tank Closure  Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK  Date Leak Confirmed: Not reported  Oversight Program: LUST
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported  Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported  Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

SLIC:
Region: STATE  Facility Status: Open - Remediation
Status Date: 07/01/2002  Global Id: SL20250868
Lead Agency: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)  Lead Agency Case Number: Not reported
Latitude: 37.9181503365907  Longitude: -122.328107357025
Case Type: Cleanup Program Site  Case Worker: CSF
Local Agency: Not reported  RB Case Number: 07S0147
File Location: Not reported  Potential Media Affected: Not reported
Potential Contaminants of Concern: Not reported  Site History: Case transferred to DTSC in 2005

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

DEED:
Envirostor ID: 7280002  Area: LOT 2  Sub Area: Not reported
ICI AMERICAS INC AG PLANT (Continued)  

Site Type: STATE RESPONSE  
Status: ACTIVE  
Agency: Not reported  
Covenant Uploaded: Not reported  
Deed Date(s): 04/26/2004

Envirostor ID: 7280002  
Area: LOT 3  
Sub Area: Not reported  
Site Type: STATE RESPONSE  
Status: ACTIVE  
Agency: Not reported  
Covenant Uploaded: Not reported  
Deed Date(s): 04/26/2004

CORTES:  
Region:  
Envirostor Id: 7280002  
Site/Facility Type: STATE RESPONSE  
Cleanup Status: ACTIVE - LAND USE RESTRICTIONS  
Status Date: 11/06/2004  
Site Code: 201567, 201621, 201622, 201623, 201624, 201624, 201955  
Latitude: 37.911897  
Longitude: -122.33147  
Owner: Not reported  
Enf Type: Not reported  
Swat R: Not reported  
Flag: envirostor  
Order No: Not reported  
Waste Discharge System No: Not reported  
Effective Date: Not reported  
Region 2: Not reported  
WID Id: Not reported  
Solid Waste Id No: Not reported  
Waste Management Util Name: Not reported

HIST CORTES:  
Region:  
Facility County Code: 7  
Reg By: LTNKA  
Reg Id: 07-0575

Region:  
Facility County Code: 7  
Reg By: LTNKA  
Reg Id: 3200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Site 2 of 3 in cluster I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.968 mi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5111 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CalSite:
- Region: BERKELEY
- Facility ID: 07280002
- Facility Type: RP
- Type: RESPONSIBLE PARTY
- Branch: NC
- Branch Name: NORTH COAST
- File Name: Not reported
- State Senate District: 11062004
- Status: ANNUAL WORKPLAN (AWP) - ACTIVE SITE
- Lead Agency: DEPT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL
- NPL: Not Listed
- SIC Code: 28
- SIC Name: MANU - CHEMICALS & ALLIED PRODUCTS
- Access: Controlled
- Cortese: Not reported
- Hazardous Ranking Score: Not reported
- Date Site Hazard Ranked: Not reported
- Groundwater Contamination: Confirmed
- Staff Member Responsible for Site: LNAKASHI
- Region Water Control Board: SF
- Region Water Control Board Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY
- Lat/Long Direction: Not reported
- Lat/Long (dms): 0 0 0 / 0 0 0
- Lat/Long Method: Not reported
- Lat/Long Description: Not reported
- State Assembly District Code: 14
- State Senate District Code: 09
- Facility ID: 07280002
- Activity: DISC
- Activity Name: DISCOVERY
- AWP Code: Not reported
- Proposed Budget: 0
- AWP Completion Date: Not reported
- Revised Due Date: Not reported
- Comments Date: 01061980
- Est Person-Yrs to complete: 0
- Estimated Size: Not reported
- Request to Delete Activity: Not reported
- Activity Status: REFRW
- Definition of Status: PROPERTY/SITE REFERRED TO RWQCB
- Liquids Removed (Gals): 0
- Liquids Treated (Gals): 0
- Action Included Capping: Not reported
- Well Decommissioned: Not reported
- Action Included Fencing: Not reported
- Removal Action Certification: Not reported
- Activity Comments: Not reported
- For Commercial Reuse: 0
- For Industrial Reuse: 0
- For Residential Reuse: 0
Facility identified. Questionnaire sent.

The Site is located south of Interstate 580, east of the University of California Berkeley Richmond Field Station and along the San Francisco Bay shoreline. Historically, this site was divided into three main areas: the manufacturing plant area, the Western Research Center and the unimproved open space area. Stauffer Chemical Co., and later Zeneca Inc. manufactured sulfuric acid and pesticides at the site from the late 1800's until the late 1990's. Cherokee Simeon Ventures (CSV) purchased the 76 acre site from Zeneca Inc. in 2002 to develop the property. The property is divided into four areas, now known as Lots 1, 2, 3, and East Stege Marsh (also referred to as the "marsh" or habitat enhancement area). Lot 1 was developed into commercial space and is now known as the Campus Bay Business Park. Lots 2 and 3 are currently undeveloped and are zoned for light and heavy industry uses. Collectively, Lots 1, 2 and 3 generally make up what is known as the Upland area. East Stege Marsh is located between Lot 1 and San Francisco Bay and is currently undergoing habitat restoration. The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) was the lead environmental agency overseeing the restoration and cleanup of the entire Zeneca Site. However, in November 2004, the regulatory oversight of the Upland Area (Lots 1, 2 and 3) was transferred to DTSC. This change was made based upon the experience and expertise of each regulatory agency. The Water Board continues to be responsible for managing the work associated with the habitat restoration and the management of sediments in the marsh and freshwater lagoons of East Stege Marsh.
### ZENECA RICHMOND AG PRODUCTS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/08/1980</td>
<td>Questionnaire received. Past &amp; present RWQCB monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/1987</td>
<td>Completed Site Screening. CERCLIS Site. US EPA is recommending further action and is, therefore, the lead agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/1980</td>
<td>Facility drive-by to determine site boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1980</td>
<td>Site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1981</td>
<td>Disposal area of Abandoned Site Program (ASP) interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/1981</td>
<td>Stauffer is an identified abandoned site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>The regulatory oversight of the Upland Area (Lots 1,2 and 3) was transferred to DTSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/1980</td>
<td>Questionnaire received. Past &amp; present RWQCB monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/1987</td>
<td>Completed Site Screening. CERCLIS Site. US EPA is recommending further action and is, therefore, the lead agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/1980</td>
<td>Facility drive-by to determine site boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1980</td>
<td>Site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1981</td>
<td>Disposal area of Abandoned Site Program (ASP) interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/1981</td>
<td>Stauffer is an identified abandoned site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>The regulatory oversight of the Upland Area (Lots 1,2 and 3) was transferred to DTSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/1980</td>
<td>Questionnaire received. Past &amp; present RWQCB monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/1987</td>
<td>Completed Site Screening. CERCLIS Site. US EPA is recommending further action and is, therefore, the lead agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/1980</td>
<td>Facility drive-by to determine site boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1980</td>
<td>Site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1981</td>
<td>Disposal area of Abandoned Site Program (ASP) interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/1981</td>
<td>Stauffer is an identified abandoned site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>The regulatory oversight of the Upland Area (Lots 1,2 and 3) was transferred to DTSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I54**

ICI AMERICAS, RICHMOND

WSW

1415 S 47TH STREET

RICHMOND, CA 94804

0.96 mi.

5111 ft.

Site 3 of 3 in cluster I

**Relative:** Lower

**Actual:** 18 ft.

**Toxic Pits** S100925066

N/A

**Hydro Geological Assessment Report Due:** 04/30/91

**Final Hydro Geological Assessment Review Completed:** / /
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>EDR ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S112980385</td>
<td>FE FORBES COMPANY</td>
<td>5926 ALAMEDA AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>1010693352</td>
<td>JUSPO PROPERTY</td>
<td>723 AND 725 LIBERTY</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>FTTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S117286204</td>
<td>THERESA HOUSKA</td>
<td>1238 LIBERTY STREET UNIT'S A &amp; B</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114600084</td>
<td>CHEVRON</td>
<td>11319 SAN PABLO</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114633153</td>
<td>HOME DEPOT</td>
<td>11909 939 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114690439</td>
<td>SHELL</td>
<td>9889 SAN PABLO</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114633152</td>
<td>HOME DEPOT</td>
<td>11909 39 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S113068673</td>
<td>THE HOME DEPOT #643</td>
<td>11939 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114633149</td>
<td>HOME DEPOT</td>
<td>0 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S113069999</td>
<td>CHEVRON 96463</td>
<td>10192 SAN PABLO AVE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO</td>
<td>S114614017</td>
<td>EL CERRITO REDEVELOPMENT AGNCY</td>
<td>SAN PABLO &amp; EASTSHORE</td>
<td>94530</td>
<td>RGA LUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CERRITO AND RICHMOND</td>
<td>S109548271</td>
<td>MACDONALD SAN PABLO WALL 45TH PLUME</td>
<td>SAN PABLO WALL 45TH PLUME</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>RESPONSE, ENVIROSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1010736034</td>
<td>CATELLUS COMMERCIAL CENTER</td>
<td>23RD STREET RAILYARD</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>FINDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003877990</td>
<td>PETER KIEWET &amp; SONS</td>
<td>SOUTH 26TH ST &amp; PIERSON AVE</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003878426</td>
<td>DREW SALES</td>
<td>7TH &amp; CASTRO</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1001231329</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>HWY_580 AT CENTRAL AVE</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>RCRA-SOG, HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>S110732387</td>
<td>CARLSON BLVD IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>CARLSON BLVD FROM TEHAMA AVE TO SAN JOSE AVE</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>NPDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003879389</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD-RICHMOND</td>
<td>CORNER OF HENSLEY &amp; CASTRO ST</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003878557</td>
<td>KAISER ALUM &amp; CHEM CO SHIPYARD #2</td>
<td>CUTTING AND WRIGHT TO THE BAY</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003878419</td>
<td>BLAIR SOUTHERN PACIFIC LDFL</td>
<td>FOOT OF S 51ST ST</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1003878423</td>
<td>COOPERS CHEMICAL CO</td>
<td>2 GIANT RD</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>S100633414</td>
<td>LIQUID GOLD</td>
<td>WEST OF BAYVIEW EXIT ON I-580</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CA BOND EXP. PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>S113180651</td>
<td>S. COREY CUNNINGHAM</td>
<td>SAN PABLO ST @ CENTRAL RICH-</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>S113074345</td>
<td>FUTURE IMAGING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>344 B SAN MATEO STREET</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>HAZNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>1000434401</td>
<td>CHEVRON USA RICHMOND REF</td>
<td>841 STANDARD AVE</td>
<td>94804</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP, CORRACTS, RAATS, FINDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To maintain currency of the following federal and state databases, EDR contacts the appropriate governmental agency on a monthly or quarterly basis, as required.

**Number of Days to Update:** Provides confirmation that EDR is reporting records that have been updated within 90 days from the date the government agency made the information available to the public.

### STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

#### Federal NPL site list

**NPL:** National Priority List  
National Priorities List (Superfund). The NPL is a subset of CERCLIS and identifies over 1,200 sites for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. NPL sites may encompass relatively large areas. As such, EDR provides polygon coverage for over 1,000 NPL site boundaries produced by EPA's Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC) and regional EPA offices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/26/2015</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07/09/2015</td>
<td>10/19/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NPL Site Boundaries**

**Sources:**

- EPA’s Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC)
  - Telephone: 202-564-7333
- EPA Region 1  
  - Telephone: 617-918-1143
  - EPA Region 6  
    - Telephone: 214-655-6659
- EPA Region 3  
  - Telephone: 215-814-5418
  - EPA Region 7  
    - Telephone: 913-551-7247
- EPA Region 4  
  - Telephone: 404-562-8033
  - EPA Region 8  
    - Telephone: 303-312-6774
- EPA Region 5  
  - Telephone: 312-886-6686
  - EPA Region 9  
    - Telephone: 415-947-4246
- EPA Region 10  
  - Telephone: 206-553-8665

**Proposed NPL:** Proposed National Priority List Sites

A site that has been proposed for listing on the National Priorities List through the issuance of a proposed rule in the Federal Register. EPA then accepts public comments on the site, responds to the comments, and places on the NPL those sites that continue to meet the requirements for listing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/26/2015</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07/09/2015</td>
<td>10/19/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NPL LIENS:** Federal Superfund Liens

Federal Superfund Liens. Under the authority granted the USEPA by CERCLA of 1980, the USEPA has the authority to file liens against real property in order to recover remedial action expenditures or when the property owner received notification of potential liability. USEPA compiles a listing of filed notices of Superfund Liens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/02/1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Delisted NPL site list

Delisted NPL: National Priority List Deletions
The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425.(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

Date of Government Version: 03/26/2015  Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2015  Telephone: N/A
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/09/2015
Number of Days to Update: 75  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal CERCLIS list

FEDERAL FACILITY: Federal Facility Site Information listing
A listing of National Priority List (NPL) and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) sites found in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Database where EPA Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office is involved in cleanup activities.

Date of Government Version: 03/26/2015  Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2015  Telephone: 703-603-8704
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2015
Number of Days to Update: 64  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

CERCLIS: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
CERCLIS contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the USEPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons, pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLIS contains sites which are either proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites which are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013  Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013  Telephone: 703-412-9810
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014  Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Number of Days to Update: 94  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List

CERCLIS-NFRAP: CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned
Archived sites are sites that have been removed and archived from the inventory of CERCLIS sites. Archived status indicates that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL), unless information indicates this decision was not appropriate or other considerations require a recommendation for listing at a later time. This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013  Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013  Telephone: 703-412-9810
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014  Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Number of Days to Update: 94  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list

CORRACTS: Corrective Action Report
CORRACTS identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.
Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list

RCRA-TSDF: RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal

RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Transporters are individuals or entities that move hazardous waste from the generator offsite to a facility that can recycle, treat, store, or dispose of the waste. TSDFs treat, store, or dispose of the waste.

Federal RCRA generators list

RCRA-LQG: RCRA - Large Quantity Generators

RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Large quantity generators (LQGs) generate over 1,000 kilograms (kg) of hazardous waste, or over 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

RCRA-SQG: RCRA - Small Quantity Generators

RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Small quantity generators (SQGs) generate between 100 kg and 1,000 kg of hazardous waste per month.

RCRA-CESQG: RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators

RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs) generate less than 100 kg of hazardous waste, or less than 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.
Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries

LUCIS: Land Use Control Information System
LUCIS contains records of land use control information pertaining to the former Navy Base Realignment and Closure properties.

| Date of Government Version: 05/28/2015 | Source: Department of the Navy |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2015 | Telephone: 843-820-7326 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 13 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

US ENG CONTROLS: Engineering Controls Sites List
A listing of sites with engineering controls in place. Engineering controls include various forms of caps, building foundations, liners, and treatment methods to create pathway elimination for regulated substances to enter environmental media or effect human health.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: 703-603-0695 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 68 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

US INST CONTROL: Sites with Institutional Controls
A listing of sites with institutional controls in place. Institutional controls include administrative measures, such as groundwater use restrictions, construction restrictions, property use restrictions, and post remediation care requirements intended to prevent exposure to contaminants remaining on site. Deed restrictions are generally required as part of the institutional controls.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: 703-603-0695 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 68 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

Federal ERNS list

ERNS: Emergency Response Notification System
Emergency Response Notification System. ERNS records and stores information on reported releases of oil and hazardous substances.

| Date of Government Version: 03/30/2015 | Source: National Response Center, United States Coast Guard |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/31/2015 | Telephone: 202-267-2180 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 63 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Annually |

State- and tribal - equivalent NPL

RESPONSE: State Response Sites
Identifies confirmed release sites where DTSC is involved in remediation, either in a lead or oversight capacity. These confirmed release sites are generally high-priority and high potential risk.

| Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015 | Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/04/2015 | Telephone: 916-323-3400 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 30 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Quarterly |

State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS
ENVIROSTOR: EnviroStor Database
The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's (SMBRP's) EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.

Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/04/2015
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015
Number of Days to Update: 30
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists

SWF/LF (SWIS): Solid Waste Information System
Active, Closed and Inactive Landfills. SWF/LF records typically contain an inventory of solid waste disposal facilities or landfills. These may be active or inactive facilities or open dumps that failed to meet RCRA Section 4004 criteria for solid waste landfills or disposal sites.

Date of Government Version: 08/17/2015
Source: Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/18/2015
Telephone: 916-341-6320
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Last EDR Contact: 08/18/2015
Number of Days to Update: 16
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

LUST REG 2: Fuel Leak List

Date of Government Version: 09/30/2004
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region (2)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/20/2004
Telephone: 510-622-2433
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/2004
Last EDR Contact: 09/19/2011
Number of Days to Update: 30
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/02/2012
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

LUST REG 3: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz counties.

Date of Government Version: 05/19/2003
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region (3)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/19/2003
Telephone: 805-542-4786
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2003
Last EDR Contact: 07/18/2011
Number of Days to Update: 14
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/31/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 4: Underground Storage Tank Leak List
Los Angeles, Ventura counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board's LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 09/07/2004
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/07/2004
Telephone: 213-576-6710
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2004
Last EDR Contact: 09/06/2011
Number of Days to Update: 35
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/19/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
LUST REG 5: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database

Date of Government Version: 07/01/2008  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2008  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008  
Number of Days to Update: 9  
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region (5)  
Telephone: 916-464-4834  
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 6L: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 09/09/2003  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2003  
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/07/2003  
Number of Days to Update: 27  
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Lahontan Region (6)  
Telephone: 530-542-5572  
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigation
Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Modoc, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Trinity counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2001  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/28/2001  
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/29/2001  
Number of Days to Update: 29  
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast (1)  
Telephone: 707-570-3769  
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST: Geotracker’s Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Report
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports. LUST records contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. Not all states maintain these records, and the information stored varies by state. For more information on a particular leaking underground storage tank sites, please contact the appropriate regulatory agency.

Date of Government Version: 06/15/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 27  
Source: State Water Resources Control Board  
Telephone: see region list  
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

LUST REG 7: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara counties.

Date of Government Version: 02/26/2004  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/26/2004  
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/24/2004  
Number of Days to Update: 27  
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region (7)  
Telephone: 760-776-8943  
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 6V: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing

Date of Government Version: 06/07/2005  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/07/2005  
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/29/2005  
Number of Days to Update: 22  
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Victorville Branch Office (6)  
Telephone: 760-241-7365  
Last EDR Contact: 09/01/2011  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
LUST REG 8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8). For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 02/14/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/15/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/28/2005
Number of Days to Update: 41
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8)
Telephone: 909-782-4496
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LUST REG 9: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Report
Orange, Riverside, San Diego counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

Date of Government Version: 03/01/2001
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/23/2001
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/21/2001
Number of Days to Update: 28
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region (9)
Telephone: 858-637-5595
Last EDR Contact: 09/26/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/09/2012
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

INDIAN LUST R10: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

Date of Government Version: 02/03/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/12/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 29
Source: EPA Region 10
Telephone: 206-553-2857
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R9: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Arizona, California, New Mexico and Nevada

Date of Government Version: 01/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/09/2015
Number of Days to Update: 32
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 415-972-3372
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

Date of Government Version: 04/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/05/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 48
Source: EPA Region 8
Telephone: 303-312-6271
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R7: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska

Date of Government Version: 03/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/28/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 55
Source: EPA Region 7
Telephone: 913-551-7003
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R6: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in New Mexico and Oklahoma.

Date of Government Version: 03/17/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 52
Source: EPA Region 6
Telephone: 214-665-6597
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies
INDIAN LUST R1: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
A listing of leaking underground storage tank locations on Indian Land.
Date of Government Version: 02/03/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/30/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 53
Source: EPA Region 1
Telephone: 617-918-1313
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INDIAN LUST R4: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Florida, Mississippi and North Carolina.
Date of Government Version: 09/30/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/03/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 10
Source: EPA Region 4
Telephone: 404-562-8677
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

INDIAN LUST R5: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
Leaking underground storage tanks located on Indian Land in Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin.
Date of Government Version: 04/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 24
Source: EPA, Region 5
Telephone: 312-886-7439
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC: Statewide SLIC Cases
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 06/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 866-480-1028
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigations
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 04/03/2003
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/07/2003
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/25/2003
Number of Days to Update: 18
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (1)
Telephone: 707-576-2220
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC REG 2: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
Date of Government Version: 09/30/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/20/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/2004
Number of Days to Update: 30
Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region (2)
Telephone: 510-286-0457
Last EDR Contact: 09/19/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/02/2012
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SLIC REG 3: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 11/17/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/18/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005
Number of Days to Update: 47
Source: Region Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4)
Telephone: 213-576-6600
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC REG 6V: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 05/24/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/25/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/16/2005
Number of Days to Update: 22
Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Victorville Branch
Telephone: 619-241-6583
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SLIC REG 7: SLIC List
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 11/24/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/29/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005
Number of Days to Update: 36
Source: California Regional Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region
Telephone: 760-346-7491
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC REG 8: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
SLIC REG 9: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

State and tribal registered storage tank lists

FEMA UST: Underground Storage Tank Listing
A listing of all FEMA owned underground storage tanks.

UST: Active UST Facilities
Active UST facilities gathered from the local regulatory agencies

AST: Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities
A listing of aboveground storage tank petroleum storage tank locations.

INDIAN UST R4: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 4 (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Tribal Nations)

INDIAN UST R5: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 5 (Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin and Tribal Nations).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>03/17/2015</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>EPA Region 6</td>
<td>214-665-7591</td>
<td>07/22/2015</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>04/30/2015</td>
<td>05/05/2015</td>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>EPA Region 8</td>
<td>303-312-6137</td>
<td>07/22/2015</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>05/06/2015</td>
<td>05/19/2015</td>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>EPA Region 10</td>
<td>206-553-2857</td>
<td>07/22/2015</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>02/03/2015</td>
<td>04/30/2015</td>
<td>06/22/2015</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>EPA Region 1</td>
<td>617-918-1313</td>
<td>07/31/2015</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDIAN UST R6: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**

The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 6 (Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas and 65 Tribes).

**INDIAN UST R7: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**

The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 7 (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and 9 Tribal Nations).

**INDIAN UST R8: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**

The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 8 (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming and 27 Tribal Nations).

**INDIAN UST R10: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**


**INDIAN UST R1: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**

The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and ten Tribal Nations).

**INDIAN UST R9: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land**

The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 9 (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, the Pacific Islands, and Tribal Nations).
### State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites

**INDIAN VCP R1: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing**
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 1.

| Date of Government Version: 09/29/2014 | Source: EPA, Region 1 |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/01/2014 | Telephone: 617-918-1102 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 11/06/2014 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 36 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

**VCP: Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties**
Contains low threat level properties with either confirmed or unconfirmed releases and the project proponents have request that DTSC oversee investigation and/or cleanup activities and have agreed to provide coverage for DTSC’s costs.

| Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015 | Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/03/2015 | Telephone: 916-323-3400 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 30 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Quarterly |

**INDIAN VCP R7: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing**
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 7.

| Date of Government Version: 03/20/2008 | Source: EPA, Region 7 |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/22/2008 | Telephone: 913-551-7365 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 05/19/2008 | Last EDR Contact: 04/20/2009 |
| Number of Days to Update: 27 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 07/20/2009 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

### State and tribal Brownfields sites

**BROWNFIELDS: Considered Brownfields Sites Listing**
A listing of sites the SWRCB considers to be Brownfields since these are sites have come to them through the MOA Process.

| Date of Government Version: 06/08/2015 | Source: State Water Resources Control Board |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/09/2015 | Telephone: 916-323-7905 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 31 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies |

### ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

**Local Brownfield lists**

**US BROWNFIELDS: A Listing of Brownfields Sites**
Brownfields are real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties takes development pressures off of undeveloped, open land, and both improves and protects the environment. Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) stores information reported by EPA Brownfields grant recipients on brownfields properties assessed or cleaned up with grant funding as well as information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments performed by EPA Regions. A listing of ACRES Brownfield sites is obtained from Cleanups in My Community. Cleanups in My Community provides information on Brownfields properties for which information is reported back to EPA, as well as areas served by Brownfields grant programs.
Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites

WMUDS/SWAT: Waste Management Unit Database
Waste Management Unit Database System. WMUDS is used by the State Water Resources Control Board staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards for program tracking and inventory of waste management units. WMUDS is composed of the following databases: Facility Information, Scheduled Inspections Information, Waste Management Unit Information, SWAT Program Information, SWAT Report Summary Information, SWAT Report Summary Data, Chapter 15 (formerly Subchapter 15) Information, Chapter 15 Monitoring Parameters, TPCA Program Information, RCRA Program Information, Closure Information, and Interested Parties Information.

SWRCY: Recycler Database
A listing of recycling facilities in California.

HAULERS: Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
A listing of registered waste tire haulers.

INDIAN ODI: Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
Location of open dumps on Indian land.

DEBRIS REGION 9: Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations
A listing of illegal dump sites location on the Torres Martinez Indian Reservation located in eastern Riverside County and northern Imperial County, California.
ODI: Open Dump Inventory
An open dump is defined as a disposal facility that does not comply with one or more of the Part 257 or Part 258 Subtitle D Criteria.

Date of Government Version: 06/30/1985
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/09/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/17/2004
Number of Days to Update: 39
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 800-424-9346
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2004
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites

US HIST CDL: National Clandestine Laboratory Register
A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

Date of Government Version: 02/25/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/25/2015
Number of Days to Update: 15
Source: Drug Enforcement Administration
Telephone: 202-307-1000
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

HIST CAL-SITES: CalSites Database
The CalSites database contains potential or confirmed hazardous substance release properties. In 1996, California EPA reevaluated and significantly reduced the number of sites in the CalSites database. No longer updated by the state agency. It has been replaced by ENVIROSTOR.

Date of Government Version: 08/08/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/03/2006
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/24/2006
Number of Days to Update: 21
Source: Department of Toxic Substance Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 02/23/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 05/25/2009
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SCH: School Property Evaluation Program
This category contains proposed and existing school sites that are being evaluated by DTSC for possible hazardous materials contamination. In some cases, these properties may be listed in the CalSites category depending on the level of threat to public health and safety or the environment they pose.

Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/04/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 30
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs
A listing of drug lab locations. Listing of a location in this database does not indicate that any illegal drug lab materials were or were not present there, and does not constitute a determination that the location either requires or does not require additional cleanup work.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/18/2015
Number of Days to Update: 8
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-255-6504
Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies
TOXIC PITS: Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites
Toxic PITS Cleanup Act Sites. TOXIC PITS identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/1995
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/30/1995
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/26/1995
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-227-4364
Last EDR Contact: 01/26/2009
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 04/27/2009
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

US CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs
A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

Date of Government Version: 02/25/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/25/2015
Number of Days to Update: 15
Source: Drug Enforcement Administration
Telephone: 202-307-1000
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

SWEEPS UST: SWEEPS UST Listing
Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System. This underground storage tank listing was updated and maintained by a company contacted by the SWRCB in the early 1990’s. The listing is no longer updated or maintained. The local agency is the contact for more information on a site on the SWEEPS list.

Date of Government Version: 06/01/1994
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/11/2005
Number of Days to Update: 35
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/03/2005
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

UST MENDOCINO: Mendocino County UST Database
A listing of underground storage tank locations in Mendocino County.

Date of Government Version: 09/23/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/23/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/01/2009
Number of Days to Update: 8
Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 707-463-4466
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

HIST UST: Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database
The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites. Refer to local/county source for current data.

Date of Government Version: 10/15/1990
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/25/1991
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/12/1991
Number of Days to Update: 18
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-341-5851
Last EDR Contact: 07/26/2001
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CA FID UST: Facility Inventory Database
The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive underground storage tank locations from the State Water Resource Control Board. Refer to local/county source for current data.
Local Land Records

LIENS: Environmental Liens Listing
A listing of property locations with environmental liens for California where DTSC is a lien holder.

Date of Government Version: 06/11/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/16/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 28
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LIENS 2: CERCLA Lien Information
A Federal CERCLA ("Superfund") lien can exist by operation of law at any site or property at which EPA has spent Superfund monies. These monies are spent to investigate and address releases and threatened releases of contamination. CERCLIS provides information as to the identity of these sites and properties.

Date of Government Version: 02/18/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/18/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 37
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-564-6023
Last EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

DEED: Deed Restriction Listing
Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Facility Sites with Deed Restrictions & Hazardous Waste Management Program Facility Sites with Deed / Land Use Restriction. The DTSC Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program (SMBRP) list includes sites cleaned up under the program's oversight and generally does not include current or former hazardous waste facilities that required a hazardous waste facility permit. The list represents deed restrictions that are active. Some sites have multiple deed restrictions. The DTSC Hazardous Waste Management Program (HWMP) has developed a list of current or former hazardous waste facilities that have a recorded land use restriction at the local county recorder's office. The land use restrictions on this list were required by the DTSC HWMP as a result of the presence of hazardous substances that remain on site after the facility (or part of the facility) has been closed or cleaned up. The types of land use restriction include deed notice, deed restriction, or a land use restriction that binds current and future owners.

Date of Government Version: 06/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 35
Source: DTSC and SWRCB
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Records of Emergency Release Reports

HMIRS: Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
Hazardous Materials Incident Report System. HMIRS contains hazardous material spill incidents reported to DOT.

Date of Government Version: 06/24/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 68
Source: U.S. Department of Transportation
Telephone: 202-366-4555
Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

CHMIRS: California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
California Hazardous Material Incident Reporting System. CHMIRS contains information on reported hazardous material incidents (accidental releases or spills).
LDS: Land Disposal Sites Listing
The Land Disposal program regulates the discharge of waste to land for treatment, storage and disposal in waste management units.

MCS: Military Cleanup Sites Listing
The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards partner with the Department of Defense (DoD) through the Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) to oversee the investigation and remediation of water quality issues at military facilities.

SPILLS 90: SPILLS90 data from FirstSearch
Spills 90 includes those spill and release records available exclusively from FirstSearch databases. Typically, they may include chemical, oil and/or hazardous substance spills recorded after 1990. Duplicate records that are already included in EDR incident and release records are not included in Spills 90.

Other Ascertainable Records
RCRA NonGen / NLR: RCRA - Non Generators / No Longer Regulated
RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste.

FUDS: Formerly Used Defense Sites
The listing includes locations of Formerly Used Defense Sites properties where the US Army Corps of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.
DOD: Department of Defense Sites
This data set consists of federally owned or administered lands, administered by the Department of Defense, that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005  Source: USGS
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/10/2006  Telephone: 888-275-8747
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007  Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 62  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

FEDLAND: Federal and Indian Lands

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/06/2006  Telephone: 888-275-8747
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007  Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 339  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: N/A

SCRD DRYCLEANERS: State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing
The State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners was established in 1998, with support from the U.S. EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation. It is comprised of representatives of states with established drycleaner remediation programs. Currently the member states are Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Date of Government Version: 03/07/2011  Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/09/2011  Telephone: 615-532-8599
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/02/2011  Last EDR Contact: 05/21/2015
Number of Days to Update: 54  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US FIN ASSUR: Financial Assurance Information
All owners and operators of facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste are required to provide proof that they will have sufficient funds to pay for the clean up, closure, and post-closure care of their facilities.

Date of Government Version: 03/09/2015  Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2015  Telephone: 202-566-1917
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/25/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 15  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

EPA WATCH LIST: EPA WATCH LIST
EPA maintains a "Watch List" to facilitate dialogue between EPA, state and local environmental agencies on enforcement matters relating to facilities with alleged violations identified as either significant or high priority. Being on the Watch List does not mean that the facility has actually violated the law only that an investigation by EPA or a state or local environmental agency has led those organizations to allege that an unproven violation has in fact occurred. Being on the Watch List does not represent a higher level of concern regarding the alleged violations that were detected, but instead indicates cases requiring additional dialogue between EPA, state and local agencies - primarily because of the length of time the alleged violation has gone unaddressed or unresolved.

Date of Government Version: 08/30/2013  Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/21/2014  Telephone: 617-520-3000
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/17/2014  Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015
Number of Days to Update: 98  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
2020 COR ACTION: 2020 Corrective Action Program List

The EPA has set ambitious goals for the RCRA Corrective Action program by creating the 2020 Corrective Action Universe. This RCRA cleanup baseline includes facilities expected to need corrective action. The 2020 universe contains a wide variety of sites. Some properties are heavily contaminated while others were contaminated but have since been cleaned up. Still others have not been fully investigated yet, and may require little or no remediation. Inclusion in the 2020 Universe does not necessarily imply failure on the part of a facility to meet its RCRA obligations.

TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act
Toxic Substances Control Act. TSCA identifies manufacturers and importers of chemical substances included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory list. It includes data on the production volume of these substances by plant site.

TRIS: Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
Toxic Release Inventory System. TRIS identifies facilities which release toxic chemicals to the air, water and land in reportable quantities under SARA Title III Section 313.

SSTS: Section 7 Tracking Systems
Section 7 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended (92 Stat. 829) requires all registered pesticide-producing establishments to submit a report to the Environmental Protection Agency by March 1st each year. Each establishment must report the types and amounts of pesticides, active ingredients and devices being produced, and those having been produced and sold or distributed in the past year.

ROD: Records Of Decision
Record of Decision. ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid in the cleanup.

RMP: Risk Management Plans
When Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, it required EPA to publish regulations and guidance for chemical accident prevention at facilities using extremely hazardous substances. The Risk Management Program Rule (RMP Rule) was written to implement Section 112(r) of these amendments. The rule, which built upon existing industry codes and standards, requires companies of all sizes that use certain flammable and toxic substances to develop a Risk Management Program, which includes a(n): Hazard assessment that details the potential effects of an accidental release, an accident history of the last five years, and an evaluation of worst-case and alternative accidental releases; Prevention program that includes safety precautions and maintenance, monitoring, and employee training measures; and Emergency response program that spells out emergency health care, employee training measures and procedures for informing the public and response agencies (e.g., the fire department) should an accident occur.

RAATS: RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
RCRA Administration Action Tracking System. RAATS contains records based on enforcement actions issued under RCRA pertaining to major violators and includes administrative and civil actions brought by the EPA. For administration actions after September 30, 1995, data entry in the RAATS database was discontinued. EPA will retain a copy of the database for historical records. It was necessary to terminate RAATS because a decrease in agency resources made it impossible to continue to update the information contained in the database.

PRP: Potentially Responsible Parties
A listing of verified Potentially Responsible Parties

PADS: PCB Activity Database System
PCB Activity Database. PADS identifies generators, transporters, commercial storers and/or brokers and disposers of PCB's who are required to notify the EPA of such activities.

ICIS: Integrated Compliance Information System
The Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) supports the information needs of the national enforcement and compliance program as well as the unique needs of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.
FTTS: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
FTTS tracks administrative cases and pesticide enforcement actions and compliance activities related to FIFRA, TSCA and EPCRA (Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act). To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Number of Days to Update: 25
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: EPA/Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances
Telephone: 202-566-1667

FTTS INSP: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
A listing of FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) inspections and enforcements.

Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Number of Days to Update: 25
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-566-1667

MLTS: Material Licensing Tracking System
MLTS is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of approximately 8,100 sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements. To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 03/31/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015
Number of Days to Update: 63
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Telephone: 301-415-7169

COAL ASH DOE: Steam-Electric Plant Operation Data
A listing of power plants that store ash in surface ponds.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/22/2009
Number of Days to Update: 76
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Department of Energy
Telephone: 202-586-8719

COAL ASH EPA: Coal Combustion Residues Surface Impoundments List
A listing of coal combustion residues surface impoundments with high hazard potential ratings.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 40
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: N/A

PCB TRANSFORMER: PCB Transformer Registration Database
The database of PCB transformer registrations that includes all PCB registration submittals.

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/19/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/10/2012
Number of Days to Update: 83
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-566-0517

RADINFO: Radiation Information Database
The Radiation Information Database (RADINFO) contains information about facilities that are regulated by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations for radiation and radioactivity.
HIST FTTS: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
A complete administrative case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

HIST FTTS INSP: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Inspection & Enforcement Case Listing
A complete inspection and enforcement case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

DOT OPS: Incident and Accident Data
Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety Incident and Accident data.

CONSENT: Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
Major legal settlements that establish responsibility and standards for cleanup at NPL (Superfund) sites. Released periodically by United States District Courts after settlement by parties to litigation matters.

BRS: Biennial Reporting System
The Biennial Reporting System is a national system administered by the EPA that collects data on the generation and management of hazardous waste. BRS captures detailed data from two groups: Large Quantity Generators (LQG) and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities.
INDIAN RESERV: Indian Reservations
This map layer portrays Indian administered lands of the United States that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005  Source: USGS
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/08/2006  Telephone: 202-208-3710
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007  Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

UMTRA: Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
Uranium ore was mined by private companies for federal government use in national defense programs. When the mills shut down, large piles of the sand-like material (mill tailings) remain after uranium has been extracted from the ore. Levels of human exposure to radioactive materials from the piles are low; however, in some cases tailings were used as construction materials before the potential health hazards of the tailings were recognized.

Date of Government Version: 09/14/2010  Source: Department of Energy
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/07/2011  Telephone: 505-845-0011
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/01/2012  Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Number of Days to Update: 146  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LEAD SMELTER 1: Lead Smelter Sites
A listing of former lead smelter site locations.

Date of Government Version: 11/25/2014  Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/26/2014  Telephone: 703-603-8787
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/29/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 64  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LEAD SMELTER 2: Lead Smelter Sites
A list of several hundred sites in the U.S. where secondary lead smelting was done from 1931 and 1964. These sites may pose a threat to public health through ingestion or inhalation of contaminated soil or dust

Date of Government Version: 04/05/2001  Source: American Journal of Public Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/27/2010  Telephone: 703-305-6451
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/02/2010  Last EDR Contact: 12/02/2009
Number of Days to Update: 36  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

US AIRS (AFS): Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem (AFS)
The database is a sub-system of Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS). AFS contains compliance data on air pollution point sources regulated by the U.S. EPA and/or state and local air regulatory agencies. This information comes from source reports by various stationary sources of air pollution, such as electric power plants, steel mills, factories, and universities, and provides information about the air pollutants they produce. Action, air program, air program pollutant, and general level plant data. It is used to track emissions and compliance data from industrial plants.

Date of Government Version: 07/22/2015  Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015  Telephone: 202-564-2496
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 40  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

US AIRS MINOR: Air Facility System Data
A listing of minor source facilities.

Date of Government Version: 07/22/2015  Source: EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015  Telephone: 202-564-2496
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/02/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 40  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/22/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually
US MINES: Mines Master Index File
Contains all mine identification numbers issued for mines active or opened since 1971. The data also includes violation information.
Date of Government Version: 05/14/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/03/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 91
Source: Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration
Telephone: 303-231-5959
Last EDR Contact: 09/01/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

US MINES 2: Ferrous and Nonferrous Metal Mines Database Listing
This map layer includes ferrous (ferrous metal mines are facilities that extract ferrous metals, such as iron ore or molybdenum) and nonferrous (Nonferrous metal mines are facilities that extract nonferrous metals, such as gold, silver, copper, zinc, and lead) metal mines in the United States.
Date of Government Version: 12/05/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/29/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/18/2008
Number of Days to Update: 49
Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-648-7709
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US MINES 3: Active Mines & Mineral Plants Database Listing
Active Mines and Mineral Processing Plant operations for commodities monitored by the Minerals Information Team of the USGS.
Date of Government Version: 04/14/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/08/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/13/2011
Number of Days to Update: 97
Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-648-7709
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FINDS: Facility Index System/Facility Registry System
Facility Index System. FINDS contains both facility information and 'pointers' to other sources that contain more detail. EDR includes the following FINDS databases in this report: PCS (Permit Compliance System), AIRS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System), DOCKET (Enforcement Docket used to manage and track information on civil judicial enforcement cases for all environmental statutes), FURS (Federal Underground Injection Control), C-DOCKET (Criminal Docket System used to track criminal enforcement actions for all environmental statutes), FFIS (Federal Facilities Information System), STATE (State Environmental Laws and Statutes), and PADS (PCB Activity Data System).
Date of Government Version: 01/18/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/27/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/25/2015
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: EPA
Telephone: (415) 947-8000
Last EDR Contact: 06/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

CA BOND EXP. PLAN: Bond Expenditure Plan
Department of Health Services developed a site-specific expenditure plan as the basis for an appropriation of Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act funds. It is not updated.
Date of Government Version: 01/01/1989
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/1994
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/02/1994
Number of Days to Update: 6
Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 916-255-2118
Last EDR Contact: 05/31/1994
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CORTES: "Cortese" Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List
The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board (LUST), the Integrated Waste Board (SWF/LS), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Cal-Sites).
DRYCLEANERS: Cleaner Facilities
A list of drycleaner related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes:
- power laundries, family and commercial; garment pressing and cleaner's agents; linen supply; coin-operated laundries and cleaning; drycleaning plants, except rugs; carpet and upholster cleaning; industrial launderers; laundry and garment services.

Date of Government Version: 02/18/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/20/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20

Source: Department of Toxic Substance Control
Telephone: 916-327-4498
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

EMI: Emissions Inventory Data
Toxics and criteria pollutant emissions data collected by the ARB and local air pollution agencies.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/25/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/28/2014
Number of Days to Update: 34

Source: California Air Resources Board
Telephone: 916-322-2990
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

ENF: Enforcement Action Listing

Date of Government Version: 04/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/01/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12

Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-445-9379
Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Financial Assurance 1: Financial Assurance Information Listing
Financial Assurance information

Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/06/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 28

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-255-3628
Last EDR Contact: 07/24/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Financial Assurance 2: Financial Assurance Information Listing
A listing of financial assurance information for solid waste facilities. Financial assurance is intended to ensure that resources are available to pay for the cost of closure, post-closure care, and corrective measures if the owner or operator of a regulated facility is unable or unwilling to pay.

Date of Government Version: 08/17/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/18/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 16

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board
Telephone: 916-341-6066
Last EDR Contact: 08/14/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

HAZNET: Facility and Manifest Data
Facility and Manifest Data. The data is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year by the DTSC. The annual volume of manifests is typically 700,000 - 1,000,000 annually, representing approximately 350,000 - 500,000 shipments. Data are from the manifests submitted without correction, and therefore many contain some invalid values for data elements such as generator ID, TSD ID, waste category, and disposal method. This database begins with calendar year 1993.
HIST CORTESE: Hazardous Waste & Substance Site List
The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

HWP: EnviroStor Permitted Facilities Listing
Detailed information on permitted hazardous waste facilities and corrective action ("cleanups") tracked in EnviroStor.

HWT: Registered Hazardous Waste Transporter Database
A listing of hazardous waste transporters. In California, unless specifically exempted, it is unlawful for any person to transport hazardous wastes unless the person holds a valid registration issued by DTSC. A hazardous waste transporter registration is valid for one year and is assigned a unique registration number.

MINES: Mines Site Location Listing
A listing of mine site locations from the Office of Mine Reclamation.

MWMP: Medical Waste Management Program Listing
The Medical Waste Management Program (MWMP) ensures the proper handling and disposal of medical waste by permitting and inspecting medical waste Offsite Treatment Facilities (PDF) and Transfer Stations (PDF) throughout the state. MWMP also oversees all Medical Waste Transporters.

NPDES: NPDES Permits Listing
A listing of NPDES permits, including stormwater.
Date of Government Version: 08/17/2015  Source: State Water Resources Control Board  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/18/2015  Telephone: 916-445-9379  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/11/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/18/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 24  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015  

PEST LIC: Pesticide Regulation Licenses Listing  
A listing of licenses and certificates issued by the Department of Pesticide Regulation. The DPR issues licenses and/or certificates to: Persons and businesses that apply or sell pesticides; Pest control dealers and brokers; Persons who advise on agricultural pesticide applications.  
Date of Government Version: 06/07/2015  Source: Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/10/2015  Telephone: 916-445-4038  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/10/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 34  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly  

PROC: Certified Processors Database  
A listing of certified processors.  
Date of Government Version: 06/15/2015  Source: Department of Conservation  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2015  Telephone: 916-323-3836  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 27  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly  

NOTIFY 65: Proposition 65 Records  
Listings of all Proposition 65 incidents reported to counties by the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This database is no longer updated by the reporting agency.  
Date of Government Version: 10/21/1993  Source: State Water Resources Control Board  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/01/1993  Telephone: 916-445-3846  
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/1993  Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 18  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned  

UIC: UIC Listing  
A listing of wells identified as underground injection wells, in the California Oil and Gas Wells database.  
Date of Government Version: 11/19/2014  Source: Department of Conservation  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/15/2014  Telephone: 916-445-2408  
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/29/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/19/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 45  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies  

WASTEWATER PITS: Oil Wastewater Pits Listing  
Water officials discovered that oil producers have been dumping chemical-laden wastewater into hundreds of unlined pits that are operating without proper permits. Inspections completed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board revealed the existence of previously unidentified waste sites. The water board’s review found that more than one-third of the region’s active disposal pits are operating without permission.  
Date of Government Version: 04/15/2015  Source: RWQCB, Central Valley Region  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/17/2015  Telephone: 559-445-5577  
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/23/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 67  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies  

WDS: Waste Discharge System  
Sites which have been issued waste discharge requirements.
EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

EDR Exclusive Records

EDR MGP: EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants
The EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plant Database includes records of coal gas plants (manufactured gas plants) compiled by EDR’s researchers. Manufactured gas sites were used in the United States from the 1800’s to 1950’s to produce a gas that could be distributed and used as fuel. These plants used whale oil, rosin, coal, or a mixture of coal, oil, and water that also produced a significant amount of waste. Many of the byproducts of the gas production, such as coal tar (oily waste containing volatile and non-volatile chemicals), sludges, oils and other compounds are potentially hazardous to human health and the environment. The byproduct from this process was frequently disposed of directly at the plant site and can remain or spread slowly, serving as a continuous source of soil and groundwater contamination.

EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives

RGA LF: Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Landfill database provides a list of landfills derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery in California.

RGA LUST: Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank database provides a list of LUST incidents derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the State Water Resources Control Board in California.
COUNTY RECORDS

ALAMEDA COUNTY:

Contaminated Sites
A listing of contaminated sites overseen by the Toxic Release Program (oil and groundwater contamination from chemical releases and spills) and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program (soil and ground water contamination from leaking petroleum USTs).

Date of Government Version: 07/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12

Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 08/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Underground Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Alameda county.

Date of Government Version: 07/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12

Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

AMADOR COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List

Date of Government Version: 06/05/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2015
Number of Days to Update: 31

Source: Amador County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-223-6439
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

BUTTE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing

Date of Government Version: 11/20/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/24/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 44

Source: Public Health Department
Telephone: 530-538-7149
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CALVERAS COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing

Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 17

Source: Calaveras County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-754-6399
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

COLUSA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 06/11/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/13/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2014
Number of Days to Update: 24
Source: Health & Human Services
Telephone: 530-458-0396
Last EDR Contact: 08/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY:
Site List
List includes sites from the underground tank, hazardous waste generator and business plan/2185 programs.
Date of Government Version: 05/26/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015
Number of Days to Update: 13
Source: Contra Costa Health Services Department
Telephone: 925-646-2286
Last EDR Contact: 08/03/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

DEL NORTE COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility list
Date of Government Version: 05/20/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/03/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 31
Source: Del Norte County Environmental Health Division
Telephone: 707-465-0426
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

EL DORADO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 05/26/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7
Source: El Dorado County Environmental Management Department
Telephone: 530-621-6623
Last EDR Contact: 08/03/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FRESNO COUNTY:
CUPA Resources List
Certified Unified Program Agency. CUPA's are responsible for implementing a unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste management regulatory program. The agency provides oversight of businesses that deal with hazardous materials, operate underground storage tanks or aboveground storage tanks.
Date of Government Version: 07/13/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/14/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20
Source: Dept. of Community Health
Telephone: 559-445-3271
Last EDR Contact: 07/06/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

HUMBOLDT COUNTY:
### CUPA Facility List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>CUPA Facility List</td>
<td>Humboldt County Environmental Health</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>12/07/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo County</td>
<td>CUPA Facility List</td>
<td>San Diego Border Field Office</td>
<td>760-339-2777</td>
<td>08/07/2015</td>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>Underground Storage Tank Sites &amp; Tank Listing</td>
<td>Kern County Environment Health Services Department</td>
<td>661-862-8700</td>
<td>08/07/2015</td>
<td>11/23/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings County</td>
<td>CUPA Facility List</td>
<td>Kings County Department of Public Health</td>
<td>559-584-1411</td>
<td>05/21/2015</td>
<td>09/07/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING
GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list
Date of Government Version: 08/11/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/14/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20
Source: Lake County Environmental Health
Telephone: 707-263-1164
Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LOS ANGELES COUNTY:
San Gabriel Valley Areas of Concern
San Gabriel Valley areas where VOC contamination is at or above the MCL as designated by region 9 EPA office.
Date of Government Version: 03/30/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/31/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/23/2009
Number of Days to Update: 206
Source: EPA Region 9
Telephone: 415-972-3178
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

HMS: Street Number List
Industrial Waste and Underground Storage Tank Sites.
Date of Government Version: 11/24/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/30/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/04/2015
Number of Days to Update: 33
Source: Department of Public Works
Telephone: 626-458-3517
Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

List of Solid Waste Facilities
Solid Waste Facilities in Los Angeles County.
Date of Government Version: 07/20/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/21/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 13
Source: La County Department of Public Works
Telephone: 818-458-5185
Last EDR Contact: 07/21/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

City of Los Angeles Landfills
Landfills owned and maintained by the City of Los Angeles.
Date of Government Version: 01/01/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/10/2015
Number of Days to Update: 14
Source: Engineering & Construction Division
Telephone: 213-473-7869
Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Site Mitigation List
Industrial sites that have had some sort of spill or complaint.
Date of Government Version: 01/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/29/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/10/2015
Number of Days to Update: 40
Source: Community Health Services
Telephone: 323-890-7806
Last EDR Contact: 07/15/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

City of El Segundo Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in El Segundo city.
City of El Segundo Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in the city of El Segundo.

City of Long Beach Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Long Beach.

City of Torrance Underground Storage Tank
Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Torrance.

MADERA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
A listing of sites included in the county's Certified Unified Program Agency database. California's Secretary for Environmental Protection established the unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory program as required by chapter 6.11 of the California Health and Safety Code. The Unified Program consolidates the administration, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities.

MARIN COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Sites
Currently permitted USTs in Marin County.

MERCED COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.

MONO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List

MONTEREY COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program listing from the Environmental Health Division.

Date of Government Version: 06/30/2015  Source: Monterey County Health Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2015  Telephone: 831-796-1297
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/16/2015  Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Number of Days to Update: 9  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

NAPA COUNTY:

Sites With Reported Contamination
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.

Date of Government Version: 12/05/2011  Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/06/2011  Telephone: 707-253-4269
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/07/2012  Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015
Number of Days to Update: 63  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Closed and Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites
Underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.

Date of Government Version: 01/15/2008  Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/16/2008  Telephone: 707-253-4269
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/08/2008  Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015
Number of Days to Update: 23  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

NEVADA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.

Date of Government Version: 06/03/2015  Source: Community Development Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/04/2015  Telephone: 530-265-1467
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/22/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Number of Days to Update: 48  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

ORANGE COUNTY:

List of Industrial Site Cleanups
Petroleum and non-petroleum spills.
List of Underground Storage Tank Cleanups
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Cleanups (LUST).

Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/10/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/11/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 32  
Source: Health Care Agency  
Telephone: 714-834-3446  
Last EDR Contact: 05/06/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/24/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

List of Underground Storage Tank Facilities
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Facilities (UST).

Date of Government Version: 08/01/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/11/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 23  
Source: Health Care Agency  
Telephone: 714-834-3446  
Last EDR Contact: 08/11/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

PLACER COUNTY:

Master List of Facilities
List includes aboveground tanks, underground tanks and cleanup sites.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/05/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 29  
Source: Placer County Health and Human Services  
Telephone: 530-745-2363  
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

RIVERSIDE COUNTY:

Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Riverside County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).

Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 17  
Source: Department of Environmental Health  
Telephone: 951-358-5055  
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tank Tank List
Underground storage tank sites located in Riverside county.

Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 17  
Source: Department of Environmental Health  
Telephone: 951-358-5055  
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SACRAMENTO COUNTY:
Toxic Site Clean-Up List
List of sites where unauthorized releases of potentially hazardous materials have occurred.

Date of Government Version: 05/07/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 10
Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management
Telephone: 916-875-8406
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Master Hazardous Materials Facility List
Any business that has hazardous materials on site - hazardous material storage sites, underground storage tanks, waste generators.

Date of Government Version: 05/07/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7
Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management
Telephone: 916-875-8406
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY:

Hazardous Material Permits
This listing includes underground storage tanks, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers.

Date of Government Version: 06/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7
Source: San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division
Telephone: 909-387-3041
Last EDR Contact: 08/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SAN DIEGO COUNTY:

Hazardous Materials Management Division Database
The database includes: HE58 - This report contains the business name, site address, business phone number, establishment 'H' permit number, type of permit, and the business status. HE17 - In addition to providing the same information provided in the HE58 listing, HE17 provides inspection dates, violations received by the establishment, hazardous waste generated, the quantity, method of storage, treatment/disposal of waste and the hauler, and information on underground storage tanks. Unauthorized Release List - Includes a summary of environmental contamination cases in San Diego County (underground tank cases, non-tank cases, groundwater contamination, and soil contamination are included.)

Date of Government Version: 09/23/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/24/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/17/2013
Number of Days to Update: 23
Source: Hazardous Materials Management Division
Telephone: 619-338-2268
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Solid Waste Facilities
San Diego County Solid Waste Facilities.

Date of Government Version: 10/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/21/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/29/2014
Number of Days to Update: 38
Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 619-338-2299
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies
Environmental Case Listing

The listing contains all underground tank release cases and projects pertaining to properties contaminated with hazardous substances that are actively under review by the Site Assessment and Mitigation Program.

Date of Government Version: 03/23/2010  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/15/2010  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/09/2010  
Number of Days to Update: 24  
Source: San Diego County Department of Environmental Health  
Telephone: 619-338-2371  
Last EDR Contact: 06/03/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY:

Local Oversight Facilities

A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

Date of Government Version: 09/19/2008  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/19/2008  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/29/2008  
Number of Days to Update: 10  
Source: Department Of Public Health San Francisco County  
Telephone: 415-252-3920  
Last EDR Contact: 08/06/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tank Information

Underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

Date of Government Version: 11/29/2010  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2011  
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/15/2011  
Number of Days to Update: 5  
Source: Department of Public Health  
Telephone: 415-252-3920  
Last EDR Contact: 08/06/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY:

San Joaquin Co. UST

A listing of underground storage tank locations in San Joaquin county.

Date of Government Version: 06/22/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/06/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 10  
Source: Environmental Health Department  
Telephone: N/A  
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List

Cupa Facility List.

Date of Government Version: 05/22/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/26/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/10/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 15  
Source: San Luis Obispo County Public Health Department  
Telephone: 805-781-5596  
Last EDR Contact: 05/20/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SAN MATEO COUNTY:

Business Inventory

List includes Hazardous Materials Business Plan, hazardous waste generators, and underground storage tanks.
Fuel Leak List
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Mateo county.

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program Listing from the Environmental Health Services division.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY:
Cupa Facility List
Cupa facility list

HIST LUST - Fuel Leak Site Activity Report
A listing of open and closed leaking underground storage tanks. This listing is no longer updated by the county. Leaking underground storage tanks are now handled by the Department of Environmental Health.

LOP Listing
A listing of leaking underground storage tanks located in Santa Clara county.

Hazardous Material Facilities
Hazardous material facilities, including underground storage tank sites.
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing.

Date of Government Version: 05/22/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/26/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/08/2015
Number of Days to Update: 13
Source: Santa Cruz County Environmental Health
Telephone: 831-464-2761
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SHASTA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List.

Date of Government Version: 06/12/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/16/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/10/2015
Number of Days to Update: 24
Source: Shasta County Department of Resource Management
Telephone: 530-225-5789
Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SOLANO COUNTY:

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Solano county.

Date of Government Version: 06/19/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20
Source: Solano County Department of Environmental Management
Telephone: 707-784-6770
Last EDR Contact: 06/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Storage Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Solano county.

Date of Government Version: 06/19/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/30/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7
Source: Solano County Department of Environmental Management
Telephone: 707-784-6770
Last EDR Contact: 06/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SONOMA COUNTY:

Cupa Facility List
Cupa Facility list

Date of Government Version: 06/22/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 18
Source: County of Sonoma Fire & Emergency Services Department
Telephone: 707-565-1174
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Sonoma county.
Date of Government Version: 07/01/2015  Source: Department of Health Services
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2015  Telephone: 707-565-6565
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/14/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SUTTER COUNTY:
Underground Storage Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Sutter county.
Date of Government Version: 06/05/2015  Source: Sutter County Department of Agriculture
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/09/2015  Telephone: 530-822-7500
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/06/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

TUOLUMNE COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list
Date of Government Version: 07/13/2015  Source: Division of Environmental Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/28/2015  Telephone: 209-533-5633
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/24/2015
Number of Days to Update: 6  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

VENTURA COUNTY:
Business Plan, Hazardous Waste Producers, and Operating Underground Tanks
The BWT list indicates by site address whether the Environmental Health Division has Business Plan (B), Waste Producer (W), and/or Underground Tank (T) information.
Date of Government Version: 07/27/2015  Source: Ventura County Environmental Health Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/17/2015  Telephone: 805-654-2813
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 17  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Inventory of Illegal Abandoned and Inactive Sites
Ventura County Inventory of Closed, Illegal Abandoned, and Inactive Sites.
Date of Government Version: 12/01/2011  Source: Environmental Health Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/01/2011  Telephone: 805-654-2813
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/19/2012  Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015
Number of Days to Update: 49  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Ventura County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).
Date of Government Version: 05/29/2008  Source: Environmental Health Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/24/2008  Telephone: 805-654-2813
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008  Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 37  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
Medical Waste Program List
To protect public health and safety and the environment from potential exposure to disease causing agents, the Environmental Health Division Medical Waste Program regulates the generation, handling, storage, treatment and disposal of medical waste throughout the County.

Date of Government Version: 07/27/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/29/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 36
Source: Ventura County Resource Management Agency
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Tank Closed Sites List
Ventura County Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites (UST)/Underground Tank Closed Sites List.

Date of Government Version: 05/27/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/06/2015
Number of Days to Update: 19
Source: Environmental Health Division
Telephone: 805-654-2813
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

YOLO COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Comprehensive Facility Report
Underground storage tank sites located in Yolo county.

Date of Government Version: 07/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/13/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 9
Source: Yolo County Department of Health
Telephone: 530-666-8646
Last EDR Contact: 07/06/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

YUBA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing for Yuba County.

Date of Government Version: 08/04/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: Yuba County Environmental Health Department
Telephone: 530-749-7523
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

OTHER DATABASE(S)
Depending on the geographic area covered by this report, the data provided in these specialty databases may or may not be complete. For example, the existence of wetlands information data in a specific report does not mean that all wetlands in the area covered by the report are included. Moreover, the absence of any reported wetlands information does not necessarily mean that wetlands do not exist in the area covered by the report.

CT MANIFEST: Hazardous Waste Manifest Data
Facility and manifest data. Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a tsd facility.

Date of Government Version: 07/30/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/19/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/03/2013
Number of Days to Update: 45
Source: Department of Energy & Environmental Protection
Telephone: 860-424-3375
Last EDR Contact: 05/18/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
NJ MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

NY MANIFEST: Facility and Manifest Data
Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a TSD facility.
Date of Government Version: 08/01/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/06/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/24/2015
Number of Days to Update: 18
Source: Department of Environmental Conservation
Telephone: 518-402-8651
Last EDR Contact: 08/06/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

PA MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/18/2015
Number of Days to Update: 25
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: 717-783-8990
Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

RI MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/19/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2015
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Department of Environmental Management
Telephone: 401-222-2797
Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

WI MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/19/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 19
Source: Department of Natural Resources
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/11/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

Oil/Gas Pipelines
Source: PennWell Corporation
Telephone: 281-546-1505
Petroleum Bundle (Crude Oil, Refined Products, Petrochemicals, Gas Liquids (LPG/NGL), and Specialty Gases (Miscellaneous)) N = Natural Gas Bundle (Natural Gas, Gas Liquids (LPG/NGL), and Specialty Gases (Miscellaneous)). This map includes information copyrighted by PennWell Corporation. This information is provided on a best effort basis and PennWell Corporation does not guarantee its accuracy nor warrant its fitness for any particular purpose. Such information has been reprinted with the permission of PennWell.

Electric Power Transmission Line Data
Source: PennWell Corporation
Telephone: 800-823-6277
This map includes information copyrighted by PennWell Corporation. This information is provided on a best effort basis and PennWell Corporation does not guarantee its accuracy nor warrant its fitness for any particular purpose. Such information has been reprinted with the permission of PennWell.

Sensitive Receptors: There are individuals deemed sensitive receptors due to their fragile immune systems and special sensitivity to environmental discharges. These sensitive receptors typically include the elderly, the sick, and children. While the location of all sensitive receptors cannot be determined, EDR indicates those buildings and facilities - schools, daycares, hospitals, medical centers, and nursing homes - where individuals who are sensitive receptors are likely to be located.
AHA Hospitals:
Source: American Hospital Association, Inc.
Telephone: 312-280-5991
The database includes a listing of hospitals based on the American Hospital Association’s annual survey of hospitals.

Medical Centers: Provider of Services Listing
Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Telephone: 410-786-3000
A listing of hospitals with Medicare provider number, produced by Centers of Medicare & Medicaid Services, a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Nursing Homes
Source: National Institutes of Health
Telephone: 301-594-6248
Information on Medicare and Medicaid certified nursing homes in the United States.

Public Schools
Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300
The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on elementary and secondary public education in the United States. It is a comprehensive, annual, national statistical database of all public elementary and secondary schools and school districts, which contains data that are comparable across all states.

Private Schools
Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300
The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on private school locations in the United States.

Daycare Centers: Licensed Facilities
Source: Department of Social Services
Telephone: 916-657-4041

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2003 & 2011 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100-year and 500-year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

NWI: National Wetlands Inventory. This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2002, 2005 and 2010 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

STREET AND ADDRESS INFORMATION

© 2010 Tele Atlas North America, Inc. All rights reserved. This material is proprietary and the subject of copyright protection and other intellectual property rights owned by or licensed to Tele Atlas North America, Inc. The use of this material is subject to the terms of a license agreement. You will be held liable for any unauthorized copying or disclosure of this material.
STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

FOR

ENVIRONMENTAL DUE DILIGENCE
Basics provides the environmental knowledge and expertise you can rely on.

Education, licenses, registrations, certifications, and memberships.

Basics Environmental, Inc. (Basics) is a minority owned business Enterprise (MBE) specializing in Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessments, Environmental Compliance Audits, Environmental Marketing, and Environmental Communications.

Donavan Tom, Principal Consultant, is an expert in performing "Phase I & II" environmental site assessments, environmental audits, and reviews for real estate and financial transactions. Mr. Tom meets the definition of “Environmental Professional” as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency's Final Rule (40 CFR 312.21) and has the specific qualifications based on education, training and experience to develop and perform the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Mr. Tom is also a National Registered Environmental Property Assessor #213165 and holds a Masters in Business Administration (M.B.A.) in Management and Marketing from Golden Gate University and a Bachelors of Science (B.S.) in Biomedical Physics from the University of California at Berkeley.

Mr. Tom has also been very active within the environmental industry for over twenty years. As such, Mr. Tom has been a member of the Professional Environmental Marketing Association (P.E.M.A.) Northern California Chapter since its inception in 1990 and served on the board of directors for the years (1992-1994). In addition, Mr. Tom has also been a member within the State Bar of California Environmental Forum (C.E.L.F.), Chinese American Environmental Protection Association (C.A.E.P.A.) and within several commercial real estate associations including the Northern California Commercial Association of Realtors (N.C.C.A.R.), Association of Commercial Real Estate (A.C.R.E.), and Investment Marketing Forum (I.M.F.).

Experience in the environmental field, specialties, and experience working within the bounds of a wide range of federal, state, and local laws and oversights.

Before forming Basics in November 1994, Mr. Tom served for some of the top national environmental engineering consulting firms including Air Water Technologies/Metcalf & Eddy, Inc., Kleinfelder, Inc., and The MARK Group, Inc.
Through his experience with these firms, Mr. Tom has gained the knowledge in performing cost-effective, high quality Phase I & II environmental assessment reports and reviews in a clear, concise and effective way demanded by the real estate and financial industry.

Under the direction of Mr. Tom, Basics provides the environmental status of a subject property or properties that support your process in evaluating the "risks" associated with providing financing for transactions. Depending upon applicable federal and state laws, the costs of environmental cleanup could materially affect your risk of loss and/or impair the value of your security interest in the uses of the subject property. Accordingly, Basics provides all the appropriate inquiries into the previous ownership and uses of the subject property consistent with good commercial and prudent engineering practices in an effort to minimize liability, and follows, at a minimum, the protocols set forth by The American Society for Testing & Materials (ASTM) Standard E1527, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process and and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s All Appropriate Inquiry (AAI) Final Rule 40 CFR Part 312”.

Because environmental concerns differ from site to site, specific client requirements also differ. Basics consistently employs a phased approach. At the completion of a phase, Basics orally advises the client of the findings and prepares a summary report. If the data do not support a satisfactory level of confidence regarding potential environmental liability, Basics will submit a proposal for the next phase of work for the client's review and approval of the work scope and cost. The client is always in control of the level of effort we provide.

Basics is prepared to address these concerns by delivering site specific Phase I & II environmental site assessments that are always objective, systematic, and carefully documented. Basics has developed expertise in assessing the impacts of present and/or past hazardous waste practices on air, soil and water quality, evaluating the significance of this impact with respect to beneficial uses and public health, as well as assisting in complying with applicable environmental permits and regulations. Review of current and past facility operations and practices are conducted in a prompt and professional manner, and client confidentiality remains a prime concern throughout. Basics has provided the appropriate inquiry into, depending upon the facts and circumstances of the subject property, the present and historical uses and the facilities present thereon. From these inquiries Basics has identified conditions which indicated the advisability of further investigation.

Basics has a strong base of capabilities in dealing with regulatory compliance and hazardous waste management. Basics approach includes beginning each project with a thorough and complete project plan in line with the client's goals followed by proper subcontractor management and cost control, finishing with smooth running operations and client satisfaction.
Basics possess the experience, technical competence, and the objectivity to deliver the optimal solutions to each client's specific needs. Basics commitment is to deliver the solution on time and within budget.

Basics provides a solid understanding and record of experience in working with regulatory agencies at the local, state, and federal level on environmental issues related to real estate transactions. As Principal Consultant, Mr. Tom prides himself on his knowledge and application of federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations. The quality of our reports is highly regarded by the financial and real estate community. Basics reports have often been met with unqualified approvals or have been accepted without major revisions. This fact alone has saved clients valuable time and expense and has resulted in expedited project implementation.

**Supervisory experience and written materials demonstrating supervisory training and/or skills.**

Basics experience with some of the largest financial lending institutions in the country as well as the smaller community banks has provided the knowledge in performing cost-effective, high quality environmental assessment reports, clear and effective environmental communications, and winning marketing strategies required in the commercial real estate lending industry.

Besides receiving a MBA and formal training in business management, Mr. Tom regularly trains, manages, and reviews the work of Basics environmental professionals in the performance of environmental transaction screens, Phase I & II environmental site assessments, and environmental facility audits. Typically, in the case of quick turnaround projects such as Phase I environmental site assessments, project progress meetings are held every morning regarding the progress to date, scheduling problems, major technical problems, future actions required, and follow-up responsibilities.

Provisions for acceleration of work tasks to keep the project on schedule. In the event delays are experienced, the approach that will be used to accelerate work will involve the implementation of one or more of the following actions:

1) Personal commitment of working overtime (nights, weekends, or holidays whatever it takes to get the job done on schedule and within budget).
2) Extra concentration of effort on critical path tasks.
3) Addition of reserve personnel, if necessary.
4) Extra concentration of effort on critical path tasks.
Mr. Tom's ability to effectively manage a staff of environmental professionals was best illustrated in response to a fast-track acquisition of a small banking institution by Comerica Bank. While employed by his previous employer, Mr. Tom managed the performance of 34 Phase I environmental and asbestos reports for sites located throughout northern California and provided an executive report summarizing the findings of all the 34 sites all within ten business days.

Mr. Tom met this challenge by quickly mobilizing an experienced team of eight qualified environmental professionals to complete the reports on time. Site visits were conducted for the purpose of reviewing the property for the obvious presence of toxic or hazardous materials. A special checklist adhering to Comerica's requirements was used to facilitate the assessment process.

Under the direct supervision of Mr. Tom, the Phase I environmental team then reviewed pertinent records provided by the former bank as well as information obtained from a database search of available local, state and federal agency lists. This review characterized the site history and the facility’s compliance history.

Thirty four separate reports describing the results of each site visit and records evaluation were presented to the client in draft form within seven working days and the final reports were presented within the 10 business day deadline. In addition, asbestos sampling, testing and reporting was performed by a certified asbestos subcontracting firm and the results were provided in each report. Plus a fifty year chain of title guarantees were performed by title subcontractors and issued as follow up reports for ten of the sites.

This project is an example of Mr. Tom’s ability to coordinate, supervise and train multiple environmental specialists to produce numerous reports within tight deadlines to meet client needs and requirements. In addition, although the project was virtually impossible to complete within ten business days the dedication of the project team was evident in their commitment to working nights and over a holiday weekend.
Basics performs the right amount of environmental due diligence you require.

**Environmental Due Diligence**

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oversees enforcement and clean up of contaminated sites across the United States. The federal government enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) in 1980. If you own or have ever owned a property that is presently contaminated, you may be designated as a potentially responsible party (PRP) under the CERCLA regulations. Being designated as a PRP means you may be financially responsible for cleaning up environmental contamination you did not create.

The only way to avoid this liability is through the “Innocent Landowner Defense”. In order to qualify for this defense, you have to show that you made a significant effort to determine if the property was contaminated before you bought it. This effort is called Due Diligence. A properly conducted Phase I Environmental Site Assessment meets the requirements for due diligence.

Lenders as well as potential title holders of a property follow a number of steps to evaluate the fiscal risks before financing properties. An environmental assessment helps evaluate the suitability of the financed property as collateral. *(1) Will the property value decline as a result of environmental liabilities that are identified before the loan payoff? and (2) If the borrower defaults, will the bank own a property that is a liability rather than an asset?*

The potential costs for environmental site investigations and remediation are substantial. Soft costs for investigation, reporting, and regulatory response can represent a large percent of the property value. Add costs for sampling, analysis, corrective action implementation, and long-term monitoring, and the overall remediation budget can easily exceed property values. Consequently, potential losses are greater for less valuable property because eventual sale of the property will recover a smaller percentage of the remediation costs.

In view of the potential costs for site cleansups, lenders as well as potential title holders of a property utilize environmental assessments to help identify high-risk sites.
Note: The amount of due diligence a Lender may require depends upon the amount of environmental business risk the lender is willing to accept. Many lenders will require a lesser degree of due diligence that is required in a properly conducted Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (i.e., Environmental Questionnaire, Environmental Database Review, Environmental Transaction Screen, Limited Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, etc.). Currently, only a properly conducted Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will meet the requirements of the “Innocent Landowner Defense”.

Degrees of Environmental Due Diligence

**Environmental Questionnaire.** The Environmental Questionnaire is typically utilized for all potential sites as a starting point for the lender to assess environmental business risk. This scope of work typically involves a standard Environmental Questionnaire.

The borrower will typically fill out a standard questionnaire regards to current and past uses regarding the use of hazardous materials and physical characteristics of the property.

**Environmental Database Review.** The Environmental Database Review is typically utilized for residentially zoned sites which do not currently utilize hazardous materials and are not believed to have utilized hazardous materials in the past. This scope of work typically involves the following:

(1) Environmental Database Search

Basics environmental professionals will obtain and review publicly available information maintained by various federal, state, and local governmental agencies with administer environmental regulations, including records of known or potentially contaminated and/or problem sites, landfills, and other disposal sites, and underground storage tank records (for both leaking and registered USTs). FirstSearch, Inc. and Environmental Data Resources, Inc. are reliable commercial sources and will be subcontracted to generate the lists.
**ASTM Environmental Transaction Screen.** The Environmental Transaction Screen is typically utilized for commercially zoned sites which do not currently utilize hazardous materials and are not believed to have utilized hazardous materials in the past. This scope of work typically involves the following:

1. **Environmental Database Search**

2. **Historical Research.**

   Basics environmental professionals will obtain and interpret readily available historical information to provide brief research into the potential presence of an environmental condition associated with historic activities. Readily available information may include: fire insurance maps (Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps), topographic maps, local street maps/directories, aerial photographs, building department records, and fire department records. Historical research of the property and the surrounding properties typically extend far back as 1940 or first development of the property.

3. **Site Reconnaissance.**

   Basics environmental professionals will perform a visual inspection of the site noting number of buildings, approximate size of buildings' footprints, number of stories each, approximate age of buildings, occupancy status, pavement, fences, foundation/ruins, utilities, and ancillary structures in order to discover evidence of the presence or likely presence of impacts or other environmental problems on the subject property. In addition, visual inspection of adjacent sites will be made from the subject site and/or from access roads, as appropriate for the assessment of the property.

   At a minimum, Basics environmental professionals will walk the perimeter boundary of the property, each side of the drainage pathways, the boundaries of all on-site bodies of water, and a grid pattern for remaining exterior areas (including overgrown or wooded areas). For the interior of the structures on the property, environmental professionals will, at a minimum, visually inspect accessible common areas expected to be used by occupants or the public (e.g., lobbies and hallways), maintenance and repair areas (e.g., boiler rooms), and a representative sample of occupant spaces.

   The visual inspection will consider past and present use(s) of the property that may adversely impact the soil and/or ground water. The ASTM Environmental Transaction Screen Questionnaire is utilized to facilitate this process.
(4) Interviews.

Basics environmental professionals will interview easily accessible site contacts (property/site managers, environmental managers, real estate agents, local county personnel, etc.) with knowledge of the current and past uses and physical characteristics of the property. The ASTM Environmental Transaction Screen Questionnaire is utilized to facilitate this process.

(5) Summarizing Report.

This phase of the assessment concludes with a report describing the results of the historical review, site visit and database records evaluation.

**ASTM Environmental Transaction Screen + Local Regulatory Agency File Review.** The Environmental Transaction Screen + Local Regulatory Agency File Review is typically utilized for commercialy zoned sites which currently do not utilize hazardous materials, however may have utilized hazardous materials in the past. This scope of work typically involves the following:

(1) Environmental Database Search

(2) Historical Research.

(3) Site Reconnaissance.

(4) Interviews.

(5) Local Regulatory Agency File Review.

A review of local enforcing agency (Regional Water Quality Control Board, County Environmental Health, local Fire Department, etc.) personnel and files, where reasonably available and to the extent necessary, will be conducted to identify sites with "known" or "potential" contamination and "environmentally sensitive business activities" on or adjacent and/or “perceived” up gradient of the subject property. The files will be reviewed to determine: (1) if the identified known or potential properties are listed on the regulatory databases; (2) if there are any issued environmental permits; (3) if there have been any notice of violations; (4) if any corrective actions have been taken; (5) if there have been any complaints; (6) if there have been any environmental investigations; and (7) if there is any other pertinent environmental information.
(5) Summarizing Report.

This phase of the assessment concludes with a report describing the results of the historical review, site visit, database records evaluation and local regulatory agency file review.

**ASTM/AAI Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.** The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is typically utilized for *residential or commercially zoned sites which currently utilize hazardous materials or want to avoid environmental liability through the “Innocent Landowner Defense”*. This scope of work typically involves the following:

(1) Environmental Database Search

(2) Historical Research.  

In addition to the historical research performed as part of an Environmental Transaction Screen, the Basics environmental professionals will obtain and interpret at least one reasonably ascertainable historical resources within specific time frames (typically every five to ten years). Historical research of the property and the surrounding properties typically extend far back as 1940 or first development of the property.

(3) Site Reconnaissance.

(4) Interviews.

(5) Local Regulatory Agency File Review.  

In addition to the local enforcing agency files review as performed as part of an Environmental Transaction Screen + Local Regulatory Agency File Review, Basics environmental professionals will review building department records and fire department records. The files will be reviewed to determine: (1) if there are any issued environmental related permits; and (2) if there is any other pertinent environmental information.

(6) Physical Setting Evaluation.

Environmental professionals will obtain, where reasonably available, site geological information. Data may be obtained from available topographic elevation maps, soil lithology maps, surficial geological maps, bedrock geology maps, and ground-water maps.
(7) Summarizing Report.

This phase of the assessment concludes with a report describing the results of the historical review, site visit, database records evaluation and local regulatory agency file review. In addition, site topographical location maps, site layout representative maps, representative site photographs, and any other relevant information will be included.

**Conclusions and Environmental Issues**

The objective of any degree of environmental due diligence is to identify potential environmental issues associated with a property. If findings indicate hazardous materials in any quantity are being utilized or have been utilized in the past on the property, then this would constitute an environmental issue.

Environmental issues are separated into two categories: recognized environmental conditions and de minimus conditions.

(1) Recognized Environmental Condition (REC).

*Recognized environmental conditions means, "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on a property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property."

Basically, evidence was discovered that there is a significant potential that a hazardous substance has been released from its operation onto (or into) the surface and may be subject to government enforcement.

(2) De minimus condition.

*De minimus condition means, "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that did not indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on a property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property,"

Basically, no compelling evidence was discovered that there is a significant potential that a hazardous substance has been released from its operation onto (or into) the surface and are not likely to be subject to government enforcement.

Because ultimately it remains the user who accepts the liability for having entered into a chain of title, it remains important that the user recognize that the “risk tolerance” of a regulatory agency could change, as could be the case if information is later uncovered to suggest that the de minimus conditions (i.e., those that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies) are of greater significance than once thought.

Based on the de minimus condition stated above, additional scope of services, may or may not disclose information which may significantly reduce the “risk tolerance” in connection with the acquisition of a parcel of commercial real estate.

**Phase II Site Investigations**

If findings indicate recognized environmental conditions, then further investigation and documentation is warranted.

(1) Limited Phase II Environmental Site Sampling.

A Phase II site investigation is the evaluation of recognized environmental conditions (i.e. confirmation of the significant potential of a release into soil, groundwater, or structures on a property).

Basically, soil and/or ground water sampling is required to address the potential that a hazardous substance has been released from its operation onto (or into) the surface.

This phase of an environmental assessment can require multiple steps, however, typically starts out as a private investigation (i.e. Limited Phase II Environmental Site Sampling).

If results of the sampling indicates levels of hazardous materials in the soil and/or ground water above the local regulatory action levels, recommendations for further review by the federal or state and local agencies is warranted. A report of positive contamination may require the owner/operator to define or provide more specific information about the release into soil, groundwater, or structures on a property, etc. subject to government enforcement (i.e. additional Phase II Site Investigations).
(2) Baseline Environmental Sampling.

If findings indicate de minimus conditions, then further investigation and documentation is optional.

Baseline Environmental Sampling is the evaluation of de minimus conditions (i.e. confirmation of a potential release into soil, groundwater, or structures on a property).

Basically, soil and/or ground water sampling is optional (based on the environmental risk level required by the client) to address the potential that a hazardous substance has been released from its operation onto (or into) the surface.

If results of the sampling indicates levels of hazardous materials in the soil and/or ground water above the local regulatory action levels, recommendations for further review by the federal or state and local agencies is warranted.
Basics delivers the environmental due diligence you demand.

Proven Performance

Basics specializes in performing Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessments and Environmental Compliance Audits for real estate transactions on a quick turnaround basis. Throughout Mr. Tom's environmental career he has been involved with performing environmental site assessments for real estate transactions almost since the inception of Property Transfer Assessments, as they were called in the 1980's. Since that time Mr. Tom has performed thousands of environmental assessments and has seen the industry mature and reports become standardized under ASTM in 1994 and AAI in 2006.

Basics was formed by Mr. Tom to apply his in-depth knowledge of the Phase I & II industry and provide the required due diligence demanded by the financial industry and compile the data and recommendations into professionally stamped high-quality reports quickly and cost-effectively in accordance with industry standards and/or client defined protocols. Basics specializes in providing only these “basic” Phase I & II environmental reports for sites throughout Northern California and as such we believe our Phase I & II environmental site assessment reports are the best in Northern California!

As an “approved environmental consultant” with almost all of the major financial institutions as well as a U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) preferred contractor, Basics implements various Phase I environmental site assessment studies and Phase I environmental reviews for properties under consideration by public and private financial institutions for real estate transfer and financial transactions.

The various environmental site assessment studies ranged in scope from performing ASTM Environmental Transaction Screens to Full ASTM/AAI Phase I Environmental Site Assessments. In addition, expert opinion and recommendations were given on prior environmental reports performed by other environmental professionals. Sites assessed have ranged from commercial office buildings and motels to gasoline service stations and hazardous waste processing facilities.
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  Lafayette, CA  94549
  Mr. Tom Park (925) 283-2265
  Ms. Terry Guillory (925) 283-2265
  (Various Phase I Reports)

• Bay Area Development Company
  1801 Oakland Boulevard, Suite #100
  Walnut Creek, CA  94596
  Mr. Joe Lampe (925) 926-1020
  Mr. Robert Thompson (650) 472-5603
  (Various Phase I/II Reports)

• Capital Access Group
  150 California Street, Suite 250
  San Francisco, CA  94111
  Ms. Jacquelin Jordan (415) 217-7600
  Mr. Alan Jung (415) 217-7600
  (Various Phase I/II/III Reports)

• Wachovia Small Business Capital
  1690 20th Avenue
  San Francisco, CA  94122
  Mr. Mark Raffield (415) 242-0486
  (Various Phase I/II Reports)
November 30, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

I highly recommend Basics Environmental, Inc. based on my experience of utilizing the company for obtaining environmental due diligence reports over the past 10 years. Donovan Tom and his associates at Basics Environmental, Inc, provide comprehensive reports within a short period of time at fair price. My clients and Wachovia Small Business Capital have benefited greatly over the years by using this company's services.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any questions.

Mark Raffield
VP/Senior Business Development Officer
Wachovia Small Business Capital
1690 20th Avenue
San Francisco, CA  94122
Tel: 415-242-0486
Fax: 415-242-0487
Cell: 415-336-0465
Email: mark.raffield@wachoviasbc.com
August, 2000

Mr. Donovan Tom, R.E.A.
116 Giorietta Blvd.
Orinda, CA 94563

To Whom It May Concern:

US Bank, SBA Division has used Basics Environmental’s services for over four years in environmental issues that face our transactions.

Donovan Tom and Basics Environmental has been the environmental consultant for most Commercial Real Estate loans originating from the San Francisco Loan Production Office. In every project (40+), Basics has exceeded expectations in timing, so much so that Donovan has earned the respect and admiration of many of our brokers and borrowers for his sense of urgency and expertise.

Donovan's professional detail and close personal attention are displayed in every deal. In addition, his solid environmental contacts in business and regulatory agencies throughout the Bay Area have further expedited the work process. We appreciate his work ethic and value the relationship.

We openly recommend Basics to clients and colleagues alike.

Sincerely,

Ole Tustin
Vice President
SBA Business Development
US Bank SBA Division, San Francisco
June 3, 1997

Mr. Donovan G. Tom, R.E.A.
Basics Environmental
46 Circle Creek Court
Lafayette, CA 94549

To whom it may concern:

Bank of Commerce has used Donovan Tom’s services for over one year in environmental issues that face our transactions.

Donovan Tom and Basics Environmental has been the environmental consultant for most Commercial Real Estate loans originating from the San Francisco Loan Production Office. In every project, Basics has exceeded expectations in timing. Donovan’s professional detail and close personal attention are displayed in every deal. We appreciate his work ethic and value the relationship.

We openly recommend Basics to clients and colleagues alike.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeff Phillips
Vice President
SBA Business Development
San Francisco L.P.O.
7 February 1997

Donavan G. Tom, R.E.A.
Basics Environmental
46 Circle Creek Court
Lafayette, CA. 94549

Re: Recommendation of Basics Environmental

Dear Sir/Madam,

Basics Environmental has been providing environmental assessment services to The Mechanics Bank for the past several years. He has assisted me and several of my colleagues on many of our construction, mixed use, and industrial commercial loan transactions requiring Environmental Transaction Screens and Environmental Phase I Site Assessments.

Mr. Tom has demonstrated an ability to meet or exceed the standards set forth by our institution and the environmental industry. Mr. Tom is professional, provides a quality product, and has always delivered product in a timely manner.

For these reasons, we recommend the engagement of Basics Environmental for use in assessing environmental conditions of real property to other financial institutions and other users in need of environmental assessment services.

Most sincerely,

Patrick T. McHone
Vice President
Corporate Banking Department
Walnut Creek Office
Donavan G. Tom, R.E.A.
Basics Environmental
46 Circle Creek Court
Lafayette, CA 94549

To whom it may concern,

Basics Environmental (Basics) has been a valuable asset in providing environmental consulting services for our firm.

They have assisted us in many projects, including Environmental Transactions Screens and Environmental Phase I Site Assessments which have met or exceeded protocols set forth by the latest standards set forth by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E1528, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments.

In all cases we have found Basics to be very competent and professional firm that has been instrumental in assessing the commercial properties within our portfolio.

We would not hesitate to give a strong recommendation of approval for the services of Basics to anyone who has need for an environmental consultant.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Rita Chao
Grand Pacific Financing Corp.
11 March 1997

Donavan G. Tom, R.E.A.
BASICS ENVIRONMENTAL
46 Circle Creek Court
Lafayette, Ca 94549

To Whom it may concern,

Finally, we met Donavan Tom who did everything he promised! We are very happy with the way Basics Environmental handled our request for an environmental survey.

As the Business Development Officer for Alameda County, we at The Money Store Investment Corporation want to mention how we appreciated working with your company and the fine level of service you gave us. It would be our pleasure to refer anyone looking for professional environmental services to you and your fine company.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Alex Escobar
The Money Store
DATE: 1-12-01
TO: Donavan Tom/basics environmental
  cc: file
FROM: Serpico Landscaping, Inc. / Sharon Serpico Hanson
RE: Environmental Report

Thank you for the excellent report. It was well researched, well put together and understandable to someone not in your industry.

We have decided not to purchase the property due to the number of problems we have been made aware of. We are thankful for your advice and report as it helped clarify a number of questions we had.

We will absolutely contact you again if we ever need another environmental report.
Monday June 15, 1998

Donavan G. Tom, R.E.A.
BASICS ENVIRONMENTAL
46 Circle Creek Court
Lafayette, Ca  94549

To Whom it may concern,

Finally, we met Donavan Tom who did everything he promised! We are very happy with the way Basics Environmental handled our request for an environmental survey.

As the Business Development Officer for Alameda and Contra Costa counties, we at Cupertino National Bank want to mention how we appreciated working with your company and the high level of service you gave us. It would be our pleasure to refer anyone looking for professional environmental services to you and your fine company.

Sincerely,

Alex Escobar
Business Development Officer
East Bay Region
DONAVAN G. TOM, M.B.A., E.P., R.E.P.A.

EDUCATION
M.B.A., Management, Golden Gate University, San Francisco, 1988
B.S., Bio/Medical Physics, University of California, Berkeley; 1987

REGISTRATION
Registered Environmental Assessor I, 1994 - California #05598
Registered Environmental Assessor II, 1999 - California #20039
Registered Environmental Property Assessor, 2013 - NREP #213165

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY
1994 - Present  Principal Consultant, Basics Environmental, Inc. Oakland, California
1992 - 1996  Environmental/Sales Manager, MWW Global/The MARK Group, Inc.,
Pleasant Hill, California
1991 - 1992  Senior Environmental/Marketing Specialist, AECOM/Metcalf & Eddy, Inc.,
Santa Clara/Redwood City, California
1989 - 1991  Environmental/Marketing Coordinator, Kleinfelder Inc.,
Walnut Creek, California
1988 - 1989  Marketing Intern, Legal Assistance for Seniors Inc., Oakland, California
1988  Environmental Marketing Intern, Berkeley, California
1985 - 1987  Chemistry Intern, University of California, Berkeley, California

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
Professional Environmental Marketers Association - Board of Directors (92-94)
Chinese American Environmental Protection Association - Member
California State Bar Association of Environmental Law - Member
Commercial Investment Marketing Forum - Member
Northern California Commercial Association of Realtors - Member
Association of Commercial Real Estate - Member
City of Berkeley Breakfast Club - Member

SUMMARY
Mr. Tom has over twenty years of professional experience in the environmental consultancy industry. He is an expert in managing, conducting and reviewing all phases of environmental site assessments involved in real estate transactions. Mr. Tom has specifically supervised, managed and directed activities relating to the development of hazardous substance or hazardous waste site cleanup opinions using industry standards (ASTM) and preliminary endangerment assessment (PEA) and All Appropriate Inquiry (AAI) protocols and procedures. These opinions have included determining whether a significant release has occurred, whether a response action is needed, and determining the activities needed to adequately reduce environmental risk. Mr. Tom, along (along with geologists, toxicologists, chemical engineers, and other environmental professionals, as necessary) has conducted environmental assessments and investigations; directed and performed site investigation and remediation activities; evaluated site information and data and rendered opinions derived from that data; defined the work required to reduce risk from contamination; and, determined and certified that all work necessary to reduce risk from contamination has been properly conducted and that all work has been completed.

SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE
• Managed and conducted a comprehensive Phase I and II environmental assessment of a former auto dismantler facility in Oakland, California. Performed the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency records, aerial photos, and historical maps; site inspections; hydrogeologic review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites; and oversaw the drilling, sampling, and logging of soil borings and groundwater sampling for petroleum hydrocarbons, solvents, and metals. Secured all necessary
permits, prepared drawings and reports, negotiated with regulatory agencies on behalf of the client, and developed workplan for follow-up health risk assessment and remedial actions.

- Managed and conducted a comprehensive Phase I and II environmental assessment of a multi-tenant industrial facility in San Leandro, California. Performed the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency records, aerial photos, and historical maps; site inspections; hydrogeologic review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites; and oversaw the sampling, and logging of soil and groundwater sampling as part of the final closure of former underground storage tanks at the site for petroleum hydrocarbons. Secured all necessary permits, prepared drawings and reports, negotiated with regulatory agencies on behalf of the client for site closure.

- Managed and conducted a comprehensive Phase I and II environmental assessment of a multi-tenant auto maintenance facility in Walnut Creek, California. Performed the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency records, aerial photos, and historical maps; site inspections; hydrogeologic review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites; and oversaw the sampling, and logging of sediment and surface water sampling of impacted sumps for petroleum hydrocarbons, solvents, and metals. Secured all necessary permits, prepared drawings and reports, negotiated with regulatory agencies on behalf of the client, and implemented follow-up cleanup actions.

- Managed and conducted a comprehensive Phase II and III environmental site investigation and site closure of a construction maintenance yard in San Leandro, California. Managed and developed the remedial workplan for the excavation, sampling, and logging of soil impacted with petroleum hydrocarbons from former underground storage tanks. Managed the installation of ground water monitoring wells and subsequent sampling. Secured all necessary permits, prepared drawings and reports, and achieved site closure with regulatory agencies.

- Managed and conducted a comprehensive environmental assessment and facility compliance audit for two large steel processing facilities in Richmond, California. The environmental assessment was performed under Bank of America, Wells Fargo Bank and ASTM standard protocols. The facility audit included the review of all environmental documents pertaining to the general facility, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA), Storage Tanks, Emergency Planning and Community Right To Know, Polychlorinated Biphenols (PCBs), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), and Environmental Management Pollution Prevention. A summary report describing the results of the environmental assessment and facility audit was completed on a "fast-track" basis within a two week period to meet the financial deadline.

- Managed and conducted a comprehensive Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for a large former shipyard facility in Alameda, California. The facility consisted of over 50 acres with numerous structures, and had an industrial history dating back to 1912. Performed the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency records, aerial photos, and historical maps; site inspections; hydrogeologic review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites, and prepared drawings and reports. A summary report identifying areas of concern and further recommendations was completed on a "fast-track" basis within a two week period over the Christmas Holidays to meet the financial deadline.

- Managed in the preparation of an Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) for the County of Solano Office of Emergency Services. Work was performed according to Title 14, Subdivision 4 of the California Code of Regulations and with local agency coastal programs such as Marine Oil Spill Contingency and National Contingency Plans.
• Managed and performed the in-depth historical and environmental research to be used in as part of a litigation dispute between the State of California Department of Transportation and a large oil refining and marketing company. Gathered information from federal, state and local regulatory agencies, historical societies, universities and libraries, and aerial photographic libraries.

• Coordinated an environmental team of seven (7) environmental specialist for the conductance of thirty four (34) preacquisition environmental assessments for a large financial institution within the San Francisco Bay Area. Work performed included planning, budgeting, and scheduling for the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency listings, title reports, and aerial photos; site inspections; asbestos surveys; hydrogeological review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites; and summary reports describing the results of the site visits and site history evaluations. All 34 assessments were completed on a "fast-track" basis within a two week period during a holiday period.

• Conducted a comprehensive regulatory agency list of all documented underground storage tank leak and toxic spill leak sites within the entire county of Santa Clara for the JP Morgan Investment Management Group. Work included the compilation and tabulation of all Federal, State and local regulatory agency listings into one complete report referenced by city complete with several maps denoting site location and type of spill.


• Conducted numerous Phase I Property Transaction Assessments under ASTM and Financial Institution Guidelines for various financial institutions within California. Representative financial institutions include the following:
  - Federal Deposit and Insurance Corporation, Various Bay Area
  - The Mechanics Bank, Various Northern California
  - California Bank of Commerce, Various Northern California
  - River City Bank, Various Northern California
  - Fremont Bank, Various Northern California
  - First Republic Bank, Various Northern California
  - Cathay Bank, Various Northern California
  - Scott Valley Bank, Various Northern California
  - U.S. Bancorp, Various Northern California
  - Bank of the West, Various Northern California
  - Comerica Bank, Various Bay Area
  - Wells Fargo Bank, Various Bay Area
  - Bank of America, Various Bay Area
  - Bank of Alameda, Various Bay Area
  - General Bank, Various Bay Area
  - Wachovia Small Business Financial, Various Northern California
  - Capital Access Group, Various Bay Area
  - TMC Development, Various Bay Area
  - Greater Sacramento Development, Various Northern California
  - Bay Area Development, Various Northern California
  - Grand Pacific Financing Corporation, Various Bay Area
  - Union Bank, Fairfield
  - East County Bank, San Francisco
Managed and conducted numerous Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) and facility evaluations for various light and heavy industrial facilities within California. Work performed typically included the review of Federal, State and local regulatory agency records, title reports, aerial photos, and historical maps; site inspections; hydrogeologic review; personal interviews regarding previous and present hazardous material operating activities conducted at sites; and summary reports describing the results of the site visits and records evaluations. Representative projects include the following:

- Electric Batter Facility, Burlingame
- Former UPS Facility, San Mateo
- LTM Construction Facility, San Leandro
- Former Southland Gas Station, San Francisco
- Shell Gasoline Stations, Sacramento Area
- Del Monte Produce Facilities, Tracy
- NewStar Produce Facilities, Salinas
- Woodworking Warehouse, San Francisco
- Empire Computer Components, Santa Clara
- Intelmatic, Fremont
- Lairds Plastics, Santa Clara
- TCL Circuit Boards, Fremont
- Codiroli Motor Company, Livermore
- Crystal Springs Medical Facility, San Mateo
- Former Fish Farm Ponds, Gustine
- Central Dry Cleaners, South San Francisco
- Former J&R Autodismantlers, Oakland
- Former BF Goodrich Tire Facility, Oakland
- Carlisle Plastics, Brisbane
- Former Le Gas Station, Lafayette
- J&R Autodismantlers, Oakland
- Cummings Hwy Extension, Crockett
- Jay Forni Steel Pipe Facility, Concord
- St. Regis Retirement Center, Hayward
- Royal Kennels, Hayward
- J. Lohr Winery, San Jose
- Whalen Medical Facility, Oakland
- Turman Painting Facility, Livermore
- Oyster Point Culvert/Hwy 101 Interchange, South San Francisco
- River Street Automotive Center, Santa Cruz
- Dixon Convalescent Home, Dixon
- Fibreboard Wood Products Parcels, Stanislaus National Forest
- Former Chevron Station, Stockton
- Former Chevron Station, Berkeley
- Pinole Point Steel Facility, Richmond
- Colorstrip Facility, Richmond
- IC Sensors Facility, Sunnyvale, Milpitas
- Ice Chalet Ice Skating Rink, San Mateo
- Montgomery Wards Auto Center, San Mateo
- Valley Automatic Fuels, San Jose
- Auto Mechanic Center, Santa Clara
- Mann Packing Co., Salinas
- City of Santa Rosa, Hotel/Convention Center
- Byron Union School District, Byron
- Devcon Airport Business Park, Santa Rosa
- Pizzagoni Towing, Antioch
- Ace Recyclers, Oakland
- Golden Gate Lumber, San Rafael
Conducted numerous Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) and facility evaluations for various real estate developers within California. Representative projects include the following:

- Contra Costa County Real Property Division, Various Locations
- C&H Development, Various Northern California
- Lafayette Town Center, Lafayette
- Mariners Square Associates, Alameda
- Children’s World, Vacaville
- Clark Avenue Office Complex, Dublin
- Fillmore Marketplace Complex, San Francisco
- Sierra Business Center, Dublin
- Woodfield Complex, North Highlands
- Gholami Properties, Walnut Creek
- Vosti Properties, Santa Cruz
- 318 Diablo Road Office Complex, Danville
- Castlewood Properties, Pleasanton
- Valley Vista Tennis Club, Walnut Creek
- Mills Corporation, San Mateo Fashion Island Shopping Mall
- Sammis Development, Fremont, Fairfield, Sunnyvale
- Urban Frontier Development, San Francisco
- Koll Company, San Jose
- Setinel Real Estate, Benecia
- Windsor Business Park, Windsor
- Solano Avenue Partners, Napa
- Toys "R" Us, San Rafael
- AIG Partners, Vacaville
- Lincoln Properties, San Ramon
- Harbor Bay Isle Associates, Alameda
- Hayman Homes, Burlingame
- Brenn Company, Danville
- Trans Pacific Metro Center, Foster City
- Garrett Development, West Pittsburg, Antioch
- Heinz Development, Vacaville
- David Powers and Associates, San Jose
- Cushman and Wakefield, Solano Business Park, Fairfield
- Lazzerini Properties, Fairfield
- Franklin Properties, Fremont
- Oakmont Developers, Santa Rosa
- Trans Pacific Metro Center, Foster City
- Chase National Corporation Services, Pleasanton
- A M Homes, San Jose
- Housing Associates Napa Development, Napa
- Speiker Partners, Milpitas, San Jose
- Jonathan Development Group, Danville

PUBLICATIONS

THE REA II - SITE MITIGATION AUTHORITY AND EXPERTISE

The Registered Environmental Assessor II (REA II) has significant authority under existing statutes and regulations to serve an extensive role in environmental programs and site mitigation activities. The REA II is the only environmental manager and practitioner over whom a Cal/EPA office has direct authority, and whose areas of professional environmental expertise are determined by Cal/EPA.

The REA II is a qualified environmental professional who may manage and conduct site investigation, assessment and remediation work at schoolsites, Brownfields, or other potentially contaminated properties. The REA II registration differs from other registrations traditionally used in site investigation and cleanup work by being a strictly environmental registration managed and directed by a Cal/EPA office.

In the role of a “Private Site Manager,” the REA II is authorized to supervise, manage and direct activities relating to the development of hazardous substance or hazardous waste site cleanup opinions using preliminary endangerment assessment procedures. These opinions include determining whether a significant release has occurred, and whether a response action is needed.

Regulations (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 19030 et seq.) describe the activities and evaluations that an REA II may perform as a project manager. An REA II:

- Determines the activities needed to adequately characterize hazardous waste or hazardous substance release sites;
- Conducts environmental assessments and investigations;
- Directs and performs site investigation and remediation activities;
- Evaluates site information and data and render opinions derived from that data;
- Defines the work required to reduce risk from contamination; and,
- Determines and certifies that all work necessary to reduce risk from contamination has been properly conducted and that all work has been completed.

The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our Web-site at www.dtsc.ca.gov.
Regulations specify that an REA II must meet certain performance standards when conducting, developing, performing or directing the following activities:

- Preliminary Endangerment Assessments;
- Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies;
- Remedial Design;
- Remedial Action;
- Remedial Action Plans;
- Corrective Action Plans;
- Removal Action Workplans; and,
- Remedial Work.

The REA II is not permitted to claim the privileges of a Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) registrant, or the privileges of any other registration, certification or license unless the REA II holds that particular credential. Whether a particular activity requires professional registration typically can only be determined on a case-by-case basis. An REA II may obtain the assistance of registered subcontractors for the performance of any work requiring professional registration while performing environmental assessment and restoration activities, as long as the work is incidental to the business of the REA II. Any subcontractor’s work, or the work performed by others, must be properly cited in any report prepared by the REA II. The REA program can assist registrants or interested parties in evaluating whether the activities of an REA II may be in an area reserved for other licensed professionals. The REA program will also disseminate useful information pertaining to the practice of other registered professionals to all REA II’s.

In performing work activities, the REA II is charged to hold paramount the public health, safety and welfare, and to follow all applicable performance standards while conducting work activities. Regulations specify the performance standards for the work activities of an REA II. The REA program may randomly audit the work products of its registrants to ensure that all applicable performance standards are met. We will also investigate work-related complaints about registrants and will, if necessary, take disciplinary actions, or rescind the registration of an REA II whose work does not meet applicable performance standards.

For additional information about the program, its regulations, and applicable laws please review the other information on the REA program website http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/REA/index.html or contact the REA program at (916) 324-6881.
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## I. PROJECT DATA

### Table 1. Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name/Number</th>
<th>San Pablo Apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Submittal Date</td>
<td>September 7, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>10963 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Developer</td>
<td>Studio KDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase No.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type and Description</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Watershed</td>
<td>Baxter Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Site Area (acres)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area of Land Disturbed (acres)</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Impervious Surface Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area</td>
<td>13,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area</td>
<td>16,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Post-Project Impervious Surface Area</td>
<td>13,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Rule[*]</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Density</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Special Project Categories</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Complete even if all treatment is LID]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent LID and non LID treatment</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMP Compliance [†]</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*50% rule applies if:
Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area > 0.5 x Pre-Project Impervious Surface Area]*

[†HMP applies if:
(Total New Impervious Surface Area + Total Replaced Impervious Surface Area) ≥ 1 acre]
II. SETTING

II.A. Project Location and Description
The project will be made up of one parcel located at the intersection of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue across from the El Cerrito Fire Department. The project will occupy approximately 0.42 acres of what is now a one-story commercial building and parking lot.

II.B. Existing Site Features and Conditions
The existing site consists of an approximately 9,500 square foot one-story commercial building, an asphalt parking lot which takes up approximately 7,000 square feet of the site. There is landscaping surrounding the parking lot which covers approximately 1,700 square feet of the site and small areas of concrete walkways that make up the rest of the site.

The site’s bordering streets are Jefferson Avenue to the north, Alameda Avenue to the south side of the block, San Pablo Avenue to the East, and S57th Street to the far west end of the block. There is a “no build” easement on the southern edge of the property limits, approximately 140 feet long and 10 feet wide.

The site slopes from West to East and South to North. Runoff from the bordering existing paved roads is collected in five storm drain inlets (three to the North and two to the South) at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and S56th Street in Richmond City Limits which then discharges to an existing 30-inch storm drain line located in S56th Street.

A Geotechnical report has not been completed at this time to determine site soils. Typically soils in the Contra Costa County area are soil Group D, so this type has been assumed for entire site of 10963 San Pablo Avenue.

II.C. Opportunities and Constraints for Stormwater Control
Treatment of all runoff from the site will be treated by Integrated Management Practices (IMP). Since the post-project impervious surface area is less than the pre-project impervious surface area, there is no requirement to manage in-runoff peak flows and durations (hydrograph modification management, HMP).

Due to the assumed existing clayey native soils, direct infiltration into the soil is not an option, thus perforated storm drain pipes shall be placed at the bottom of bioretention area to collect treated Stormwater.

Runoff to the implemented IMPs will be collected from portions of the rooftop and roof decks of the building and routed down to one bioretention planter on the second floor roof deck and two ground floor bioretention planters. All bioretention areas will be collected in a subsurface perforated pipe, then piped through the site to sidewalk cross drains that outfall onto Jefferson Avenue. Please note that currently the existing site runoff drains onto Jefferson Avenue and into Richmond City Limits.

III. LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT DESIGN STRATEGIES

III.A. Optimization of Site Layout

III.A.1. Limitation of development envelope
One limitation of this project is that the site currently drains onto Jefferson Avenue via overland release into Richmond City Limits. Our intent is to maintain this drainage pattern and improve upon
it by draining our impervious area through bioretention planters prior to outfalling onto Jefferson Avenue.

### III.A.2. Preservation of natural drainage features

The site naturally drains onto Jefferson Avenue down to storm drain inlets at the intersection of Jefferson Avenue and S56th Street. We are proposing not to change that drainage pattern.

### III.A.3. Setbacks from creeks, wetlands, and riparian habitats

There are no creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats adjacent to this property.

### III.A.4. Minimization of imperviousness

Landscaping and four bioretention areas are incorporated into the site design.

### III.A.5. Use of drainage as a design element

The three bioretention areas are used as design elements, located on the second floor roof deck and at-grade on the north and south sides of the building.

### III.B. Use of Permeable Pavements

Due to assumed impermeable soils with little to no infiltration ability, permeable pavers are not feasible.

### III.C. Dispersal of Runoff to Pervious Areas

#### III.C.1. Permeability of Site Soils

4,725 square feet of on-site landscaping area shall serve as a self-treating surface to meet the “self-retaining” requirements.

#### III.C.2. Potential Opportunities for Harvesting and Use

Not proposing harvesting or reuse.

#### III.C.3. Harvesting and Use Feasibility Calculations

Not proposing harvesting or reuse.

*Table 2. Harvesting and Use Feasibility*

Not proposing harvesting or reuse.

### III.D. Integrated Management Practices

This project has direct runoff to the following integrated management practices: Bioretention planters.
IV. DOCUMENTATION OF DRAINAGE DESIGN

IV.A. Descriptions of each Drainage Management Area

IV.A.1. Table of Drainage Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA Name</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Area (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA 1A</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>6,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA 1B</td>
<td>Roof/Landscape</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA 1C</td>
<td>Roof/Landscape</td>
<td>4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA 1D</td>
<td>Pervious Pavement/Landscape</td>
<td>4,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.A.2. Drainage Management Area Descriptions

**DMA 1A:** Totaling 6,570 square feet, includes a portion of the roof area, the level 4 roof deck and landscape planter. The bioretention area will be sized to accommodate flow control volumes. After stormwater filters through the bioretention area, it is collected in a perforated pipe, then piped to sidewalk cross drains that outfall onto Jefferson Avenue.

**DMA 1B:** Totaling 2,115 square feet, includes a portion of the roof area. The bioretention area will be sized to accommodate flow control volumes. After stormwater filters through the bioretention area, it is collected in a perforated pipe, then piped to sidewalk cross drains that outfall onto Jefferson Avenue.

**DMA 1C:** Totaling 4,915 square feet, includes a portion of the roof area, the level 2 roof deck and landscape planter. The bioretention area will be sized to accommodate flow control volumes. After stormwater filters through the bioretention area, it is collected in a perforated pipe, then piped to sidewalk cross drains that outfall onto Jefferson Avenue.

**DMA 1D:** Totaling 4,065 square feet, includes at-grade landscaping and the pervious pavement. This area is considered self-treating.

IV.B. Tabulation and Sizing Calculations

(See Contra Costa Clean Water Program IMP Sizing Tool summary)

V. SOURCE CONTROL MEASURES

V.A. Site activities and potential sources of pollutants

V.B. Source Control Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential source of runoff pollutants</th>
<th>Permanent source control BMPs</th>
<th>Operational source control BMPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site storm drain inlets</td>
<td>All accessible on-site inlets will be marked to convey that no dumping is allowed.</td>
<td>Inlets and pipes conveying storm water to BMPs will be inspected and maintained as part of BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Parking Garages</td>
<td>Parking garage floor drains will be plumbed to the sanitary sewer.</td>
<td>Inspect and maintain drains to prevent blockages and overflow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape/outdoor pesticide use</td>
<td>Landscape plans will be designed to minimize irrigation and runoff and to minimize use of fertilizers and pesticides. Specify plantings within swales that are tolerant of the sandy loam soils and periodic inundation and will conform to the plan list recommendation by the C.3. Guidebook. Include pest-resistant plants, plantings appropriate to site soils, slopes, climate, sun, wind, rain, land use.</td>
<td>Landscape will be maintained using minimum or no pesticides. IPM information will be provided to new residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor storage of equipment or materials</td>
<td>Courtyard areas will have furniture and cooking facilities. No non-hazardous liquids or hazardous materials will be stored in this area.</td>
<td>No non-hazardous liquids or hazardous materials should ever be stored in this area. Follow permanent source controls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. STORMWATER FACILITY MAINTENANCE

#### VI.A. Ownership and Responsibility for Maintenance in Perpetuity

An operations and maintenance agreement & plan will be developed between Studio KDA and the City of El Cerrito prior to construction of this project & it will be recorded.

#### VI.B. Summary of Maintenance Requirements for Each Stormwater Facility

**Bioretention Areas**

These facilities remove pollutants primarily by filtering runoff slowly through an active layer of soil. Routine maintenance is needed to ensure that flow is unobstructed, that erosion is prevented, and that soils are held together by plant roots and are biologically active. Typical maintenance consists of the following:

- Inspect **inlets** for channels, exposure of soils, or other evidence of erosion. Clear trash and any obstructions and remove any accumulation of sediment. Examine rock or other material used as a splash pad and replenish if necessary.
- Inspect **outlets** for erosion or plugging.
- Inspect **side slopes** for evidence of instability or erosion and correct as necessary.
- Observe soil at the bottom of the swale or filter for uniform **percolation** throughout. If portions of the swale or filter do not drain within 48 hours after the end of a storm, the soil should be tilled and replanted. Remove any debris or accumulations of sediment.
- Examine the **vegetation** to ensure that it is healthy and dense enough to provide filtering and to protect soils from erosion. Replenish mulch as necessary, remove fallen leaves and debris, prune large shrubs or trees, and mow turf areas. When mowing, remove no more than 1/3 height of grasses. Confirm that irrigation is adequate and not excessive. Replace dead plants with those required by the C.3. Plan list in the 6th edition C.3. Guidebook and remove noxious and invasive vegetation.
- Abate any potential **vectors** by filling holes in the ground in and around the swale and by insuring that there are no areas where water stands longer than 48 hours following a
storm. If mosquito larvae are present and persistent, contact the Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control District for information and advice. Mosquito larvicides should be applied only when absolutely necessary and then only by a licensed individual or contractor.

VII. CONSTRUCTION PLAN C.3 CHECKLIST

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stormwater Control Plan Page #</th>
<th>BMP Description</th>
<th>See Plan Sheet #s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bioretention Areas</td>
<td>C3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. CERTIFICATIONS

The selection, sizing, and preliminary design of stormwater treatment and other control measures in this plan meet the requirements of Regional Water Quality Control Board Order R2-2009-0074 and Order R2-2011-0083.

Jason White, PE, LEED AP, QSP/P  
Project Manager

9-6-2017  
Date
THE PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AT 10963 SAN PABLO AVENUE IN EL CERRITO WILL CREATE OR REPLACE MORE THAN 10,000 SQUARE FEET OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE. THEREFORE, THIS PROJECT WILL BE SUBJECT TO COVERAGE UNDER THE PROVISIONS C.3 OF THE CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD'S SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA REGIONAL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (SWMP). COMPLIANCE WILL BE ACHIEVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONTRACTION COSTS AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

### Stormwater Control General Notes

- **BOUNDARY:**
  - LPC:
  - ROOF:
  - PAV:
  - SW:
  - LID:
  - BMP:
  - TOTAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUNDARY</th>
<th>LPC</th>
<th>ROOF</th>
<th>PAV</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>LID</th>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drainage Management Area Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA</th>
<th>LPC</th>
<th>ROOF</th>
<th>PAV</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>LID</th>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,505</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abbreviations

- **BMP:** BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE
- **CONC:** CONCRETE
- **DMA:** DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA
- **GND:** GROUND
- **LID:** LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
- **LVL:** LEVEL
- **RF:** ROOF
- **SFS:** SQUARE FEET

### Stormwater Control Plan

- **PROJECT #:** KWP01
- **ISSUING:** STUDIO K D.
- **ISSUEDATE:** 09/07/2017
- **CHECKED BY:** J. WHITE
- **DRAWN BY:** M. THOMAS

---

**NOTE:**

- The proposed mixed use development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito will create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface. Therefore, this project will be subject to coverage under the provisions C.3 of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board's San Francisco Bay Area Regional Stormwater Management Program (SWMP). Compliance will be achieved in accordance with contract costs and other program requirements.
# Project Name: 10963 San Pablo Apartments
Project Type: Treatment Only
APN:
Drainage Area: 18,302
Mean Annual Precipitation: 20.0

## Self-Treating DMAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA Name</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA1D</td>
<td>4,065.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IV. Areas Draining to IMPs

### IMP Name: IMP1
IMP Type: Flow-Through Planter
Soil Group: IMP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA Name</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Post Project Surface Type</th>
<th>DMA Runoff Factor</th>
<th>DMA Area x Runoff Factor</th>
<th>IMP Sizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA1A</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>Conventional Roof</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>Imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA1A-LSP</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Imp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 6,603

### IMP Name: IMP2
IMP Type: Flow-Through Planter
Soil Group: IMP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA Name</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Post Project Surface Type</th>
<th>DMA Runoff Factor</th>
<th>DMA Area x Runoff Factor</th>
<th>IMP Sizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA1B-ROOF</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>Conventional Roof</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>Imp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 2,115

### IMP Name: IMP3
IMP Type: Flow-Through Planter
Soil Group: IMP3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMA Name</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Post Project Surface Type</th>
<th>DMA Runoff Factor</th>
<th>DMA Area x Runoff Factor</th>
<th>IMP Sizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA1C-ROOF</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>Conventional Roof</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>Imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA1C-LSP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Imp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 4,830
| Area | 0.040 | 1.000 | 193 | 195 |

Report generated on 9/6/2017 12:00:00 AM by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program IMP Sizing Tool software (version 1.3.1.0).
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1.0 Executive Summary

CSDA conducted an environmental noise survey to determine the appropriate acoustical recommendations for the project at 10963 San Pablo Avenue to meet San Pablo (City) and California (State) Code requirements. The following summarizes our findings:

- This project will require up to 42 STC windows and STC 40 doors to comply with the City and California Building Code acoustical requirements.
- Some exterior walls may require additional interior gypsum board and/or resilient clips/channels.
- Where sound rated windows and/or doors are required, fresh air ventilation must be provided.

2.0 Project Description

The 10963 San Pablo Avenue multi-family development is located in El Cerrito, at the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The project consists of a 50 unit rental apartment building with a commercial space on the first floor. The parcel is zoned RM-4 (Mixed Housing Type Residential). The main noise source is San Pablo Avenue. Additional noise sources include general city noise, occasional traffic on Jefferson Avenue, and traffic on Interstate 80.

CSDA conducted an environmental noise study to quantify the existing environmental noise levels and determine the facade components necessary to meet City and State Code interior noise requirements. This report summarizes our findings and recommendations.

3.0 Acoustical Criteria

3.1 El Cerrito General Plan

The City of El Cerrito 1999 General Plan specifies the following policies applicable to this project:

- H3.1 Noise Levels in New Residential Projects: “New residential development projects shall meet acceptable exterior noise level standards. The ‘normally acceptable’ noise standards for new land uses are established in Table 7-1, Land Use Compatibility for Community Exterior Noise Environments, which shall be modified by Policies H3.2 through H3.12” (applicable sections listed below). See Figure 1.
H3.6 New Commercial, Industrial and Office Noise Standards: “Appropriate interior noise levels in commercial, industrial, and office buildings are a function of the use of space and shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Interior noise levels in offices generally should be maintained at 45 $L_{eq}$ (hourly average) or less.”

H3.11 Commercial or Industrial Source Noise: “Noise created by commercial or industrial sources associated with new projects or developments shall be controlled so as not to exceed the noise level standards set forth in the table below (Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure for Stationary Noise Sources), as measured at any affected residential land use.” See figure 2.
3.2 El Cerrito Municipal Code

The 2017 El Cerrito Code of Ordinances\(^1\) contains the following specifications applicable to this project:

- Section 19.21.050-B3
  - All new residential developments should have an hourly average noise level of 45 dBA or less. Commercial developments may be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but generally should have an hourly average noise level [\(L_{eq}\)] of 45 dBA or less.
  - Interior noise levels in new residential units exposed to an \(L_{dn}\) of 60 dBA or greater should be limited to a maximum instantaneous noise level of 50 dBA in bedrooms. Maximum instantaneous noise levels in other rooms should not exceed 55 dBA. The typical repetitive maximum instantaneous noise level at each site would be determined by a noise meter.

3.3 El Cerrito Municipal Code Outdoor Noise Levels

The 2017 Code of Ordinances contains the following specifications applicable to this project:

- Section 19.21.050-B2: “all new development shall comply with the outdoor noise standards established in Table 19-21-A below.” See Table 1.

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Land Use Type} & \text{Exterior Noise Exposure [\(L_{dn}\), dBA]} \\
& \text{Normally Acceptable} & \text{Conditionally Acceptable} & \text{Unacceptable} \\
\hline
\text{Residential, Hotel and Motels} & 60 & 75 & >75 \\
\text{Office Buildings, Business Commercial, and Professional} & 60 & 80 & >80 \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

\(^1\) https://library.municode.com/ca/el_cerrito/codes/code_of_ordinances
19.21.050-B5: “The zoning Administrator may require a noise study to be prepared for all new uses with outdoor noise levels within the conditionally acceptable range in Table 19.21-A (Table 1), or uses that, in the Zoning Administrator’s opinion, may not meet the standards of the Noise Section of the Resources and Hazards General Plan Element.”

3.4 California Building Code

For the residential portion of the project, the California Building Code stipulates that an interior noise level attributed to exterior sources shall not exceed $L_{dn}$ 45 dBA for any habitable room in a multi-family building.\(^2\)

CALGreen stipulates noise criteria for the retail portion of the ground floor work/live unit. For sites with hourly noise levels above 65 dBA, interior noise levels must be no greater than $L_{eq}$\(^3\) 50 dBA during the noisiest hour of operation (Performance Method).\(^4\)

3.5 Criteria Summary

In order to meet City and State acoustical requirements, the following must be achieved:

- Existing environmental noise intrusion from exterior sources:
  - $L_{dn}$ 45 dBA or less inside of residences per California Building Code.
  - $L_{eq}$ 45 dBA or less inside of residences per El Cerrito Municipal Code.
  - $L_{dn}$ 45 dBA or less in the retail portion of the project per El Cerrito General Plan.
  - $L_{eq}$ 50 dBA or less in the retail space during the noisiest hour of the day per California Building Code.
  - $L_{max}$ 50 dBA or less in all bedrooms of residences per El Cerrito Municipal Code.
  - $L_{max}$ 55 dBA or less in all other rooms of residences per El Cerrito Municipal Code.

- Exterior noise levels at the property line generated per the building equipment:
  - $L_{eq}$ 45 dBA or less at night and 55 dBA or less during the day per El Cerrito General Plan.

4.0 Noise Measurements

Long-term (i.e., 48-hour) noise measurements were conducted at the project site from June 26 to 28, 2017 to quantify the existing environmental noise levels at the site. The long term measurements were taken in secured lock boxes 12 feet above the ground. Measurements commenced around midday on June 26 and ended around midday on June 28. The following summarizes the measurement conditions and results.

4.1 Weather

During the measurements, the maximum wind speed was 18 miles per hour (mph); wind speeds were high from June 27 at 7:00 PM to June 28 at 3:00. Based upon a review of the data during these times, wind noise did not affect the measurements. The temperature ranged from a low of 57°F to a high of 81°F, and averaged 69°F. The humidity level ranged from a low of 39% to a high of 84%, averaging 64%. There was no precipitation during the testing period.

---

\(^2\) 2013 California Building Code (CBC), California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Volume 1, Section 1207.4

\(^3\) $L_{eq}$: The equivalent continuous sound level which would contain the same sound energy as the time varying sound level.

\(^4\) 2013 California Green Building Standards Code, Section 5.507.
4.2 General Noise Conditions

The noise environment is dominated by traffic on San Pablo Avenue. Minor noise sources include occasional traffic on Jefferson Avenue, Interstate 80, and general city noise. During the nighttime hours, local traffic decreased lending to lower noise levels.

4.3 Noise Measurement Results

The equipment was calibrated immediately before and after the measurements with no significant drift in response. LT-1 was along the east property line and primarily measured noise generated by traffic on San Pablo Avenue. LT-2 was placed adjacent to the north property line across Jefferson Avenue. While this location is not directly on the project site, it has the same setback to Jefferson Avenue and it is still an accurate measure for noise impinging on the northern facade of the project building. Figure 3 shows the measurement locations, Table 2 summarizes the noise measurement results, and Figure 4 shows the noise measurements data graphically.

Table 2 – Noise Measurement Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L_{dn}</th>
<th>Noisiest Hour</th>
<th>Typical L_{max}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT-1 San Pablo Ave.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-2 Jefferson Ave.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LT = Long-term meter height (12')
5.0 Analysis and Recommendations

5.1 Noise and Land-Use Compatibility

Per El Cerrito General Plan, the measured noise levels at the site (measured up to $L_{dn}$ 73 dBA) warrant a detailed noise analysis. The required analysis involves calculating expected noise levels inside of the habitable rooms (i.e., Actions 1.1 and 3.1, which reference the California Building Code) and providing recommendations as necessary for the facade construction to meet the interior $L_{dn}$ 45 dBA Code requirement.

The following analysis are based upon expected future noise levels, incorporating the traffic growth projections contained in the City’s General Plan. San Pablo Avenue traffic volumes are expected to increase by 2.4% annually. There is no significant expected increase in traffic along Jefferson Avenue.

5.2 Interior Noise Levels

In order to achieve City and State Code standards, sound-rated windows and exterior doors are needed at various building facades. Please note the following:

- Calculations are based on architectural drawings dated June 27, 2017.
- A typical construction grade window achieves STC 28.
- A typical exterior entry door with gasketing and a door bottom/shoe (swing doors) achieves STC 28.
- We assume metal siding/rainscreen finish, shear plywood, and insulated stud exterior walls at the residential levels; please inform us if the assembly is different.
- The STC rating of operable fenestration corresponds to performance in the closed position, which halts natural ventilation; therefore, fresh air must be provided using an active mechanical (e.g., HVAC) or passive (e.g., stack-effect) system. The mechanical engineer should review this recommendation.
- The STC ratings below need to be refined if the design changes.

Figures 5 and 6 show the recommended window and exterior door STC ratings necessary to meet the acoustical criteria. All dwelling units are typical for floors 2-5. If you need window/door product recommendations, please contact us.

Note that exterior walls will likely require an additional layer of gypsum board at the unit interior. Please forward the exterior wall detail when it becomes available for our review and comment. At bedrooms facing east (i.e., towards San Pablo Avenue), resilient channels with clips are likely necessary. We will provide more guidance when the exterior wall details are available.

*Figure 5 – Window/Exterior Door STC Ratings for Retail Space*
This concludes our environmental noise study for 10963 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA; please contact us with questions.
APPENDIX TRA: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM AND TRAFFIC STUDY
Fehr & Peers conducted a preliminary transportation assessment for the proposed development, consisting of 50 residential units and about 2,900 square-feet of commercial space at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, California (Project). The Project is located in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP) area, which was analyzed in an environmental impact report (EIR) certified in 2014.

Based on our analysis, the Project is consistent with the SPASP EIR and would generate fewer AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips than the total trip generation assumed for the high priority opportunity sites in the EIR. Thus, no additional analysis is needed for this Project (final determination will be made by City of El Cerrito Staff). In addition, we recommend the following to help reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the Project:

1. Consider providing AC Transit passes or BART-equivalent Clipper Card Value for project residents.

The rest of this memorandum describes the Project, estimates trip generation, and reviews the site plan for adequate parking supply and safe access and circulation.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is located in the SPASP “Midtown” area, at the southwest corner of the San Pablo Avenue/Jefferson Street intersection. Playland-not-at-the-Beach (an indoor amusement park), a donut shop, a hairdresser, and a surface parking lot currently occupy the site. The Project would replace the existing uses with a mixed-use five-story multi-family residential development with 50 dwelling units and about 2,900 square-feet of ground-level commercial space.

The Project includes a parking garage with 31 double lift parking spaces, one individual space, and two ADA spaces, for a total of 34 garage parking spaces reserved for residential uses. In addition, two uncovered car-sharing spaces would be provided, available to both residents and the public. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Street. The residential parking would be unbundled from the apartment units, meaning that the spaces would be leased separately from the units.

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation is the process of estimating the number of vehicles that would likely access the Project site. Current accepted methodologies, such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation methodology, are primarily based on data collected at single-use suburban sites. These defining characteristics limit their applicability to developments located in more walkable urban settings near frequent local and regional transit service, such as the proposed Project. Fehr & Peers adjusted the ITE-based estimates using the methodology used in the SPASP EIR to account for the Project’s setting and proximity to frequent transit service. In the SPASP EIR, the ITE-based trip generation estimate was adjusted by applying an MXD (Mixed-Used Development) Tool, which accounts for the density, land use mix, roadway design, and transit characteristics of the Project area and uses these to adjust the ITE trip generation rates.

Table 1 presents the trip generation for the Project. To account for trip generation of the existing site, Fehr & Peers collected morning and evening peak hour-trip generation counts on Tuesday, July 18, 2017. The existing site’s trip generation is applied as a reduction to the trip generation estimates of the Project. Accounting for the MXD adjustments used in the SPASP and existing land
uses, it is estimated that the proposed mixed-use development would generate about seven morning and 18 evening net-new peak-hour trips.

**TABLE 1: PROJECT TRIP GENERATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size¹</th>
<th>A.M. Peak</th>
<th>P.M. Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments (#223)²</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Shopping Center (#820)³</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Site Trip Generation</strong>⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playland-not-at-the-Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donut Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Existing Site Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net-New Project Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 square feet
2. ITE *Trip Generation (9th Edition)* land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology.
   - AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.28 trips per DU (31% in, 69% out)
   - PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.44 trips per DU (58% in, 42% out)
3. ITE *Trip Generation (9th Edition)* land use category 820 (shopping center), adjusted based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology.
   - AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.85 trips per KSF (62% in, 38% out)
   - PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 3.27 trips per KSF (48% in, 52% out)
4. Existing trip generation based on counts collected on Tuesday, July 18, 2017.
The SPASP EIR assumed developments at planned/entitled and high priority opportunity sites as part of the traffic analysis for the EIR. Although the proposed Project is within the SPASP area, it was not included as a planned/entitled project or priority opportunity site as part of the EIR traffic analysis. However, this analysis compares the Project to the high priority opportunity sites analyzed in the EIR to ensure the Project does not exceed the total assumptions made for the SPASP area. Since the certification of the SPASP EIR, four developments, including this Project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the City’s approval process at this time. Table 2 summarizes the trip generation for these four developments. The four developments combined would generate about 26 morning and 47 evening net-new peak hour trips. The combined trip generation is less than the total trip generation estimated for all the opportunity sites in the SPASP EIR. Since the uses proposed by the Project are consistent with the assumptions in the SPASP EIR and the proposed Project would generate fewer automobile trips than assumed in SPASP EIR, the proposed Project would not result in additional impacts on traffic operations at the intersections analyzed in the SPASP EIR.
TABLE 2: TRIP GENERATION FOR PROPOSED OPPORTUNITY SITES IN THE SPASP AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10963 San Pablo Avenue (Proposed Project)²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10192 San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10290 San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10300 San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Projects Trips</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPASP EIR Trip Generation for High Priority Opportunity Sites²</strong></td>
<td>284</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Complete</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. See Table 1 for details on the proposed Project’s trip generation rate.
2. Total trips include only high priority opportunity site projects analyzed in the SPASP EIR (Appendix D)


CONSISTENCY WITH SPASP

The SPASP classifies each roadway within the SPASP area and specifies improvements on roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements based on those classifications. The City of El Cerrito is currently in the process of refining the multimodal improvements identified in the SPASP and developing a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to determine fair share payment by the development projects facilitated by the Specific Plan for these improvements.

Within the vicinity of the Project, Jefferson Street is classified as a neighborhood street. The SPASP calls out the following improvements for neighborhood streets:

- Add bulb-outs as possible at all intersections and mid-block crossings; consider bulb-outs along parking lane where appropriate
Within the vicinity of the Project, San Pablo Avenue is classified as a community street in the mid-town area. The SPASP calls out the following improvements for San Pablo Avenue within the vicinity of the Project:

- Add landscaped bulb-outs with two standard curb ramps at all intersections.
- Consider consolidating and moving to far-side-of-intersection bus stops with bus platforms in the parking lane to increase transit efficiency and enhance rider experience.
- Provide cycle tracks

Specific to the Project area, the SPASP specifies the following improvement:

- Provide midblock connection/crosswalk just north of Jefferson Street across San Pablo Avenue.

The Project would make a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal improvements identified by the SPASP. One option is payment of the City of El Cerrito Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), currently under development.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW**

This section evaluates access and circulation of all travel modes within the proposed site, based on the site plan dated August 30, 2017. The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan includes a Form Based Code to ensure the goals of the SPASP are met. The Form Based Code is the primary regulating document for the Project site.

**Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation**

Residents would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Street, about 130 feet west of San Pablo Avenue. The driveway would provide access to a secured parking garage and two uncovered parking spaces reserved for car-sharing services. Section 2.04.02.02 of the SPASP Form Based Code requires two-way driveways for buildings located on corner lots of community streets to be no wider than 20 feet and located along the adjacent side street. San Pablo Avenue within the vicinity of the Project site is classified as a community street, requiring the two-way Project driveway to be no wider than 20 feet. The proposed driveway has a width of 22-feet, not
meeting the Form Based Code requirements. However, it is recommended that the Project maintain the additional width to allow for maneuvering into and out of the carsharing spaces.

**Project Driveway Sight Distance**

The driveway on Jefferson Street would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Vehicles parked on Jefferson Street on both sides of the driveway may block sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on Jefferson Street. Trees planted on both sides of the driveway may also affect visibility of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than six feet from the ground. Based on the site plan, dated August 30, 2017, the Project would provide 10 feet of red curb on both sides of the driveway to ensure adequate sight distance.

**Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation**

Table 3 outlines bicycle parking requirements for the Project site. The Project would consist of 50 dwelling units and about 2,900 square-feet of commercial space, requiring 76 long-term spaces and five short-term spaces. The Project would provide 76 long-term spaces and six short-term spaces, meeting the requirements for long-term spaces as defined in the Form Based Code.

The Project would provide long-term bicycle parking in secured corrals located in both the southwest corner of the garage and along the south elevation of the building in the southwest corner. Pedestrians and cyclists would access the long-term bike parking along the exterior of the building through side gates located on Jefferson Street and San Pablo Avenue and the bike storage located in the garage would be accessible through the lobby or the garage entrance. Short-term parking would be located along the building frontage on both Jefferson Street and San Pablo Avenue.


**TABLE 3: BICYCLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Long-Term</th>
<th></th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces per Unit</td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>Spaces per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>1:5:DU</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1:20 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>1:10 KSF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Min. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required Bicycle Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicycle Parking Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Requirements</td>
<td>Meets Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. DU = Dwelling Units; KSF = 1,000 square-feet
2. Based on Form Based Code Table 29: Number of Parking Spaces Required
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017

**Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation**

Pedestrian access to the residential component of the Project would be provided through a staircase and elevator in the building lobby and a staircase in the garage. The building lobby would be accessible through the main entrance on Jefferson Street, through the Project garage, and through the walkway on the south side of the Project site. The commercial component of the Project would be accessible through an entrance along San Pablo Avenue.

The Form Based Code requires a minimum of 14 feet of sidewalk space along community streets, including eight feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and six feet of amenity space, which includes landscaping. For neighborhood streets, the Form Based Code requires a minimum of 10 feet of sidewalk space, including five feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and five feet of amenity space.

The proposed Project site plan shows 14-feet sidewalk widths along San Pablo Avenue, a community street, and 10-feet sidewalk widths along Jefferson Street, a neighborhood street, which would meet code requirements for total sidewalk width. The site plan also delineates eight feet and
five feet of pedestrian right-of-way along San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Street respectively, meeting code requirements.

**Transit Access**

AC Transit provides nearby transit service to the Project site with a bus stop on southbound San Pablo Avenue, at the near-side of the San Pablo Avenue/Jefferson Street intersection (just north of Jefferson Street). The bus stop provides a bench but does not include a bus shelter.

**Parking Requirements**

The Project would provide a secured parking garage with a two-way drive aisle and a total of 34 spaces, including 31 double lift parking spaces, one surface space, and two ADA spaces. Two additional uncovered parking spaces would be provided for car-sharing services, located outside the garage door and accessible via the Project driveway. The surface parking space dimensions are approximately nine feet in width and 18 feet in length, meeting Form Based Code requirements for perpendicular parking spaces.

The SPASP Form Based Code requirements for the TOMIMU zoning district apply to the Project site. TOMIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) requires a maximum of 1.5 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic TDM plan. There is no required parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square-feet. For projects proposing a residential parking ratio between zero and one space per unit, additional TDM measures and a parking study may be required.

**Table 4** summarizes the required and proposed parking for the Project. The Form Based Code would limit parking to a maximum of 75 off-street residential parking spaces for the Project. Based on the site plan dated August 30, 2017, the Project would provide 36 spaces (corresponding to 0.72 spaces per unit), meeting Code requirements.

Section 2.05.07.07 of the Form Based Code requires that at least 10-percent of the total number of parking spaces provided for a multifamily residential project be pre-wired to allow for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging, with at least one space being an accessible parking space. The site plan designates three parking spaces as pre-wired to accommodate EV charging, one of which is an
accessible space, meeting code requirements. An additional parking space is designated as a run conduit for future EV station.

### TABLE 4: REQUIRED MAXIMUM AND PROPOSED PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size¹</th>
<th>Required Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The Project is not required to provide commercial parking spaces, as the proposed commercial space is less than 3,000 square-feet
2. Source: SPASP Form Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 – TOMIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential; Max 1.5 spaces per DU
3. DU = Dwelling Units; KSF = 1,000 square feet

Date: March 30, 2018
To: Buddy Williams, Studio KDA
From: Huma Husain and Sam Tabibnia, Fehr & Peers
Subject: 10963 San Pablo Avenue – Transportation Demand Management Plan

The proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project is required to prepare a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan based on the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP) Form-Based Code guidelines and direction provided by the City of El Cerrito, because it would provide less than one off-street parking space per unit. This memorandum describes the Project, the proposed parking supply, and lists the mandatory TDM strategies that the Project shall implement to achieve a reduction in vehicle ownership associated with the Project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is located in the SPASP “Midtown” area, at the southwest corner of the San Pablo Avenue/Jefferson Street intersection in El Cerrito. Playland-not-at-the-Beach (an indoor amusement park), a donut shop, a hairdresser, and a surface parking lot currently occupy the site. The Project would replace the existing uses with a mixed-use five-story multi-family residential development consisting of 50 dwelling units and about 2,900 square-feet of ground-level commercial space.

The Project includes a parking garage with 31 double lift parking spaces, one individual space, and two ADA spaces, for a total of 34 garage parking spaces reserved for residential uses. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Street. The residential parking would be unbundled from the apartment units, meaning that the spaces would be leased separately from the units.
PARKING SUPPLY

The Project would provide a secured parking garage with a two-way drive aisle and a total of 34 spaces, which corresponds to about 0.68 spaces per unit. Table 1 summarizes the required and proposed parking for the Project.

The SPASP Form-Based Code requirements for the TOMIMU zoning district apply to the Project site. TOMIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) requires a maximum of 1.5 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit and a basic TDM plan. For projects proposing a residential parking ratio between zero and one space per unit, the Form-Based Code states that additional TDM measures may be required. There is no required parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square-feet.

Although the proposed parking supply is within the required parking ratio, the Project is required to implement a TDM plan to account for the difference between the proposed parking supply ratio of 0.68 spaces per unit and the recommended minimum ratio of one space per unit. Therefore, the goal of the TDM Plan is to discuss how the parking deficiency of 0.32 spaces per unit will be addressed by the Project.

**TABLE 1: REQUIRED MAXIMUM AND PROPOSED PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size1</th>
<th>Required Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Supply Ratio (spaces/unit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The Project is not required to provide commercial parking spaces, as the proposed commercial space is less than 3,000 square-feet.
2. Source: SPASP Form Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 – TOMIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential; Max 1.5 spaces per DU
3. DU = Dwelling Units; KSF = 1,000 square feet

TDM STRATEGIES TO REDUCE PARKING DEMAND

Project Context

An appropriate TDM plan will depend on the context of the Project within the surrounding neighborhood. The Project is located along a commercial corridor, near Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and adjacent to frequent bus service. The nearest BART station is the El Cerrito del Norte station, approximately one-half mile north of the Project. AC Transit is the primary bus service provider with frequent service (approximately 15 minute headways) along San Pablo Avenue; the nearest bus stop is just north of the Project site.

The Project’s proximity to both regional and local transit, as well as to commercial uses, is likely to result in relatively high rates of non-automobile use by residents and visitors. This is evidenced in part by the travel patterns of the area’s existing residents. Based on US Census data, Table 2 summarizes the transportation mode split for employed residents’ journey to work, which shows that a large proportion of employed residents, approximately 34 percent, use public transportation to travel to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Mode</th>
<th>Percent of Employed Residents in Surrounding Census Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Census Tract 3860
TDM Strategies

The Project could address their less-than-one parking ratio for residents by implementing the following required and additional TDM strategies.

Required Strategies

The following TDM strategies are required as part of the SPASP Form Based Code. These strategies are incorporated into the parking space reduction calculations because they are not accounted for in the base parking demand of 1.07 spaces per unit estimated for the Project.

- **Unbundled Parking** - Unbundled parking means that parking is rented or sold separately than the residential unit, rather than automatically included in the rent or cost. The process of unbundling and itemizing parking costs helps potential residents understand the cost of parking. Not including the price of parking in the housing cost would attract residents that do not own a car. Research indicates that a reduction in automobile ownership can be expected from separately pricing residential parking. The research indicates a reduction of four to 19 percent in automobile ownership if parking is unbundled and charged separately.\(^1\) This corresponds to a reduction in parking demand of approximately two to ten spaces for the proposed Project.

- **Bicycle Parking** – The Project would provide 76 long-term spaces and six short-term bicycle parking spaces. The effectiveness of providing bicycle parking on automobile ownership is not known at this time. However, providing bicycle parking beyond the City Code requirements would make the development more attractive to car-free households. Although, Bicycle parking is required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan but it is still a strategy to reduce parking demand.

Additional Strategies

The following additional TDM strategies are recommended in order to address the Project’s parking deficiency of 0.32 spaces per unit.

- **Transit Fare Subsidies** – Providing free or subsidized transit (such as funding Clipper Cards for residents) would further incentivize project residents to use transit and not own a car. The effectiveness of providing transit subsidies on automobile ownership is estimated based on research compiled in Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), August 2010). This report is a resource for local agencies

---

\(^1\) Todd Litman (2014), *Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability*, Victoria Transport Policy Institute (www.vtpi.org)
to quantify the benefit, in terms of reduced travel demand, of implementing various TDM strategies. The focus of the CAPCOA document is reductions to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle trip reductions. For the purposes of this analysis the vehicle ownership reduction is assumed to be half of the VMT reduction. Subsidizing transit costs for project residents would make the development more attractive to car-free households. Providing transit subsidies corresponds to a parking demand reduction of two to six spaces for the proposed Project. The Project Developer will provide a $3.00 per day subsidy per residential unit for the first year of occupancy. The subsidy would be in the form of a Clipper Card, with a monthly or annual deposit. This potential subsidy totals an estimated $54,750 ($3 x 50 units x 365 days).

- **TDM Coordinator** – Building management shall designate a “Building TDM coordinator” to coordinate, monitor and publicize TDM activities. The effectiveness of providing a TDM Coordinator on automobile ownership is not known at this time. The developer will instruct the building management company to designate their on site manager as the TDM coordinator.

- **TDM Marketing and Tenant Education** - Building management shall provide employed tenants information about various transportation options in the Project area and the TDM strategies provided by the building. This information would also be posted at central location(s) and be provided to each building tenant. The information shall be updated as necessary. Marketing strategies can promote alternative trips by making commuters aware of the options and incentives of using non-automobile transportation. Implementing commute trip reduction strategies with a complementary marketing strategy can increase the overall effectiveness of the program. A TDM Marketing program corresponds to a reduction in parking demand of about zero to three spaces. The developer will install a transit screen in the lobby with some information on transit routes, fare discounts, rideshare, and walking and biking events, which will be administered by the building management company’s on site manager. This information will include:
  
  - **Transit Routes** – Promote the use of transit by providing user-focused maps. These maps provide residents with wayfinding to nearby transit stops and transit-accessible destinations, and are particularly useful for those without access to portable mapping applications. The Project will install TransitScreen real-time transit information in a visible location in the building lobby to provide residents with up-to-date transit arrival and departure times.
  
  - **Transit Fare Discounts** – Provide information about local discounted fare options offered by BART and AC Transit, including discounts for youth, elderly, persons with disabilities, and Medicare cardholders.
  
  - **Car Sharing** – Promote accessible car sharing programs, such as Zipcar, and Getaround by informing residents and employees of on-site and nearby car sharing locations and applicable membership information.
  
  - **Ridesharing** – Provide residents and employees with phone numbers and contact information for ride sharing options including Uber, Lyft, and El Cerrito taxi cab services.
- **Carpooling** – Provide residents and employees with phone numbers and contact information for carpool matching services such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 511 RideMatching.

- **Walking and Biking Events** – Provide information about local biking and walking events as events are planned.

**Table 3** summarizes the effectiveness of the strategies discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to Reduce Parking Demand</th>
<th>Parking Space Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbundled Parking (4-19%)</td>
<td>-2 to -10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fare Subsidy (3-10%)</td>
<td>-2 to -6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM Coordinator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Education (0-5%)</td>
<td>0 to -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reduction</strong></td>
<td>-4 to -19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Recommended Parking Supply** 50
- **Proposed Parking Supply** 34
- **Total Parking Demand with TDM Strategies** 31 to 46
- **Parking Surplus/Deficit** +3 to -12

1. This range represents a $1.00 - $6.00 per day per resident subsidy.
2. Based on SPASP recommended parking minimum of 1.0 spaces per residential unit.


Since the effectiveness of some of the strategies (bicycle parking and TDM coordinator) cannot be quantified at this time, it is conservatively estimated that those strategies would have a parking
space reduction of zero. With this assumption, the strategies combined would reduce parking demand for project residents by between 4 and 19 spaces if all strategies are implemented.

It is estimated that with the implementation of the strategies described above, the peak parking demand generated by Project residents would be reduced to between 31 and 46 parking spaces. Considering the 34 on-site parking spaces, it is estimated that Project would result in between a parking deficit of 12 spaces and a surplus of three spaces after implementation of the required and additional parking demand reduction strategies.

**ON-STREET PARKING DEMAND**

Fehr & Peers assessed on-street parking availability in the Project area on Thursday March 22, 2018 at 9:00 PM and Tuesday March 27, 2018 at 12:00 PM along San Pablo Avenue (between Madison and Bay View Avenues), Jefferson Avenue (between San Pablo Avenue and 57th Street), 57th Street (between Jefferson and Alameda Avenues), and Alameda Avenue (between San Pablo Avenue and 57th Street) within one block of the Project site. The total parking supply in the study area is estimated at about 157 spaces and is generally unrestricted along the residential streets in Richmond, restricted to two-hours during business hours for the residential segments of Jefferson and Alameda Avenues in El Cerrito, and restricted to one or two hours during business hours along San Pablo Avenue. See Attachment A for a summary of the parking supply, demand, and restrictions.

The average on-street parking occupancy for each street in the study area is summarized in Table 5. As shown in the table, the overall parking occupancy in the area is about 52 percent at 12:00 PM and about 59 percent at 9:00 PM. At both 12:00 PM and 9:00 PM, parking demand is highest along Alameda Avenue, with an occupancy of 84 percent and 90 percent respectively. The average on-street parking occupancy on Jefferson Avenue, where Project residents will mostly likely park, is approximately 47 percent at 12:00 PM and 57 percent at 9:00 PM. Jefferson Avenue, with an estimated 26 available spaces at 12:00 PM and 21 available spaces at 9:00 PM, can accommodate the Project’s potential parking deficit. Assuming that up to 12 additional vehicles would park on Jefferson Avenue, the parking occupancy would increase along Jefferson Avenue to 71 percent at 12:00 PM and 82 percent at 9:00 PM.
### TABLE 5: ON-STREET PARKING DEMAND SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>12:00 PM</th>
<th></th>
<th>9:00 PM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Avenue</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Avenue</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th Street</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Please contact us with questions or comments.

Attachment A – On-Street Parking Demand
### On-Street Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>3/27/18 12:00 PM</th>
<th>3/22/18 9:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Madison Ave to Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave to Alameda Ave</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Alameda Ave to Bayview Ave</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Madison Ave to Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave to Alameda Ave</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Ave</td>
<td>Alameda Ave to Bayview Ave</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Pablo Ave Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>San Pablo to S 57th St</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>San Pablo to S 57th St</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jefferson Ave Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Ave</td>
<td>San Pablo to S 57th St</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Ave</td>
<td>San Pablo to S 57th St</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda Ave Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 57th St</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave to Alameda Ave</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 57th St</td>
<td>Jefferson Ave to Alameda Ave</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S 57th Street Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Notes
Parking on San Pablo Avenue limited to 2 hr, 9am-6pm ("except by permit" on the east side)
Parking on Jefferson and Alameda Avenues in El Cerrito limited to 1 hr, 9am-6pm
Memorandum

Date: May 1, 2018

To: Interested Parties

From: Margaret Kavanaugh-Lynch, Zoning Administrator

Subject: Interpretation of San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Section of 2.05.02.02.06, Front and Upper Floor Setback along Neighborhood Street and Abutting Residential Districts.

And

Additional Direction Regarding All Development Sites Abutting Residential Districts in terms of Daylight Plane Establishing Setback Requirements for the Upper Floors of Buildings on Project Sites That Abut Residential Zoning Districts

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a Zoning Administrator interpretation of the development standard called out in Section of 2.05.02.02.06 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The heading of this section shall now read, “Upper Floor Setbacks for Buildings on Project Sites That Abut Residential Zoning Districts”. The text of the section shall read, “On a project site that abuts a residential zoning district, any side of a building that faces an abutting residential zoning district shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined inward starting from a height of 35 feet above existing grade at the setback line.”

Height in this setting shall mean the top of the roof plate. Items such as parapets and other miscellaneous roof elements are not included in the height of a building for the purpose of implementing the daylight plane regulation.
Under the rule, as interpreted, if a project site abuts a residential zoning district on any side, then the proposed building shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined inward starting from a height of 35 feet above existing grade at the setback line on any side of the building that faces an abutting residential zoning district.

Figure FBC 49, which is intended to illustrate this section of the Plan, should be disregarded until the City prepares a replacement figure.

BACKGROUND

The Title of Section of 2.05.02.02.06 states, “Front and Upper Floor Setback along Neighborhood Street and Abutting Residential Districts”. This language has been interpreted to mean that, if a development project is abutting a residential district and a Neighborhood Street (meaning both conditions are true), then the new building shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined inward starting from a height of 35 feet above existing grade at the setback line.

However, the text of the section also states, “Buildings along neighborhood streets and buildings abutting residential districts shall not intercept a 45-degree daylight plane inclined inward starting from a height of 3 feet above existing grade at the setback line.” That text suggests that the daylight plane regulation would apply if either condition were true.

This internal contradiction has caused confusion regarding the meaning of the daylight plane section of the Specific Plan. Further, staff has identified instances where a residential district abuts a development project site on the site’s south or west side, and the Specific Plan is silent on this type of condition.

INTERPRETATION

Section of 2.05.02.02.06 is located in the Supplemental General Development Standards (2.05). The purpose of this chapter states, “These standards are intended to ensure development that employs context-sensitive design that strengthens a sense of place, ensures return on investment, encourages practical and market friendly development, enhances and humanizes the public realm, and positions the Avenue as an environmental and ecological destination of the Bay Area.”

The intent of the Shadow Standards (2.05.02.02) reads in part, “To minimize impacts of shadows on public right-of-ways and open space and adjacent residential lot through leveraging creative design solutions, establishing context sensitive setbacks and height guidelines.” The Plan increased the overall allowable height of buildings in the Plan area from 35 feet to 55/65 feet to facilitate the addition of housing within the Plan area. However, staff noted that there are places where these heights may not be context sensitive without some consideration of surrounding uses and districts already in place.

The Zoning Administrator concludes that the goal of the section in question is to offer guidance as to the proposed building and site layout related to the massing and height of new buildings based on their context. A significant part of their context is
their interaction with neighboring uses and zoning districts. It contains guidance by setting limits in both the casting of shadows and daylight plane implementation.

The first four of the sections address shadow impacts on:

- Existing neighboring residential uses,
- The Ohlone Greenway,
- Property past the curb line on sidewalks on the opposite side of Commercial streets to the north and east; and
- On commercial or mixed uses across Neighborhood streets.

The final section addresses limits to the daylight plane. The primary reason for focusing on the daylight plane is to address the massing of the new development in the Plan area as it relates to an existing residential zoning district immediately abutting it. When the Plan was drafted, staff felt that existing homes in a residential zoning district should reasonably expect that abutting buildings in adjacent districts will not extend up more than three stories before they step back at a 45% angle. One the main reasons for that expectation is that the zoning in effect before the Plan held that same development standard. The purpose for bringing this standard forward was to strike a contextual balance between existing residential districts and the new, taller height standards afforded in the Plan. Simply stated, the daylight plane allows for light and air to infiltrate to the existing residence located in a residential district.

It was not the intent of this section to extend that design detail to residences across streets that can be approximately 60 feet wide or greater. With these types of buffer distances, the massing itself becomes a much smaller concern, as light and air is easily able to enter into such an area. Once a street is located between a new development and a residence, shadow is a much more useful consideration for the existing resident. That is why both daylight plane and shadows are discussed separately in this chapter.

Finally, while researching this issue, it became apparent to the Zoning Administrator that the Plan was silent on the issue of residential zoning districts to the south and west of development projects. Therefore, this interpretation clarifies that this context sensitive design element is intended to serve residential zoning districts on all sides of a development project, in either El Cerrito or the City of Richmond.
10963 San Pablo

Design Review comments

City of Richmond, Design Review Chair.

Comment One:

Thank you!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! We need this! Nice design overall, just a few comments. This is another great example of a FBC document that works. I wish Richmond’s was up and running.

OK, some less flowerly comments

1. Landscaping on Jefferson .....It is a nice idealistic vision to have provided a bocce court for the public on Jefferson, however this idea is most likely going to be a future nuisance and look like a run-down weed trap in the years to come. The side walk is very wide here and there is no commercial use adjacent to this wide sidewalk. I would suggest using the par-course recreation station, the bocce court as landscape space to soften the towering mass above Jefferson. I would also suggest that the sidewalk be limited to 6 feet of travel and the rest dedicated to landscaping. Again, way too much hardscape in relation to the vertical mass. Remember the design must transition to the grain and scale of Single Family low density on Jefferson....

2. Worried about the harsh stucco wall adjacent to the two story apartment building to the West. This is an unbroken unarticulated mass of concrete with no vines intended to grow to soften this after-thought of the building design. Suggest pulling the building away from the PL 6” and then adding a vine espalier to this west face...plants will thrive in the warm afternoon sun there and soften the harsh wall of concrete that the residents of the apartment house get to look at.
3. I would not be opposed to seeing a change of roof height on the back section of this design. Use the artful roof overhang of the San Pablo Ave façade and use it to help shade and reduce the bulk on the North, West and South sections of this design. The box like forms do not relate to the needed shade functions. Too boxy and unarticulated

4. The art / entry structure needs to be a warmer, more organic and of human scale design. Steel and polycarbonate is cold and unwelcoming. Try using the IPE wood that is shown on the balconies in lieu of the proposed very urban but interesting entry.... This may work in Emeryville, but not so much on Jefferson.

5. West façade – needs help...needs warmth

6. All LED lighting needs to be 2500-3000K max! all lighting on the face of the building shall be indirect – either up or down lights.

Cheers

Jonathan
February 5, 2018

Melanie Mintz, Community Development Director
El Cerrito Planning Department
10890 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

RE 10963 San Pablo Ave, southwest corner of Jefferson Ave. (Playland-Not-at-the-Beach and Donut Shop); proposed 50-unit high density mixed-use development; 65 off-street parking spaces; 57’ to top of parapet
10819 San Pablo Ave, southwest corner of Alameda Ave. (Marty’s Motors and Conners Overhead Door Co.); proposed 85-unit high density mixed-use development; 42 off-street parking spaces; 57’ to top of parapet:

Dear Ms. Mintz:

The Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council is in review of the above-titled building projects. Listed below are some of our recommendations:

1. For a thorough and comprehensive plan review, please include the following items for these two building projects, which is common practice of other cities reviewing large scale projects:

Site Plan
- Show the property lines and indicate the lot dimensions on the plans.
- Show dimensioned setbacks, including front setback, side yard setbacks on both sides, and most importantly the rear yard setback and the side setbacks of the abutting residential rear building/s and indicate the number/s on the plans.
- Show any portions of neighboring buildings within 100 feet of subject property, including the rear properties.
- Show driveways and parking spaces with dimensions.

Building Elevations
- Show the profiles of adjacent buildings that show the full outline of abutting homes and/or apartment buildings within 100 feet of subject property and indicate their elevations on the plans.
- Side elevations should show full profile of the adjacent building and window openings that face the project.

Parking Survey
- Parking evaluation for projects requesting a waiver of any parking required under the ZO.

Photo Simulations for Large Scale Development Projects
- Photo simulations for large scale development projects. Show site before and after project, from at least 4 angles that demonstrate maximum impact on views from surrounding properties; also show adjacent properties that surround the development project, including the rear single-family and/or apartment buildings within 100 feet.

Traffic Impact Analysis
- For projects creating 1) for more dwelling units, 5,000 SQF or more of gross floor area, or 25 peak hour or more vehicle trips (based on ITE generation rates)
2. Stepbacks

We recommend stepbacks, as shown below in the Berkeley example on San Pablo Avenue at the corner of Delaware Street.

Delaware Street Elevation. "Delaware Court is a four-story, 51 unit, mixed-use project in Berkeley, California. In addition to the 51 units above the podium, this .46 acre (20,037.6 square feet) site incorporates 8,500 square feet of retail and parking for 50 cars on three tier parking lifts. Delaware Court is to be the first new building on San Pablo Avenue in what will be the revitalization of the West Berkeley/San Pablo Avenue corridor. Delaware Court makes the transition from a commercial street to a residential neighborhood by borrowing materials and details from the Bungalow style architecture of the adjacent homes and incorporating them into the elevations of the building. Significant stepping of the elevations and setbacks along Delaware add to the transition from commercial to the single family homes," as described in HDO Architects/Planners' portfolio. Delaware Court was developed by Said Adeli.

These stepbacks were achieved, based on West Berkeley's Physical Form Policy 4.2: The physical form should 'use tools such as increased building setbacks or upper story stepbacks to reduce the impacts of differences in scale, style and site plan.'

The El Cerrito daylight plane is not favored and does not kick in until after the building is 35 feet.

Under the Albany 2035 General Plan, adopted April 18, 2016, their daylight plane provision is a lot better and their building height limit for San Pablo Avenue is reasonable. A 38-foot height limit applies, although a height bonus may be considered. Zoning overlays may apply within their area to particular General Plan objectives, such as reducing impacts on nearby residential uses and creating "nodes" at key locations. For parcels on San Pablo Avenue in Albany,
the regulation means that the 38 foot height limit can only be achieved on a portion of each property, since that limit becomes gradually lower toward the rear of the lot. The maximum height at a distance of 15 feet from the rear property line is 20 feet. Their zoning regulations include additional information on how daylight plane is calculated, and what the regulations are in different zones.

**RANC Recommendations:** We recommend stepbacks to break up the building forms from the rear of the proposed buildings, where Richmond Annex low-density residential neighborhoods exist. Lower the building height from 57' to 42'. We believe the height at the roof ridgeline of the Village at Town Center Apartments, 10810 San Pablo Avenue at Schmidt Lane would be more appropriate for this particular location. (On page 4 of 4, please see the Building Height Perspectives, showing the Village at Town Center Apts.)

### 3. Parking

The building project at 180C San Pablo Avenue at the corner of Delaware Street in Berkeley did not dramatically reduce the required number of parking spaces, due to the fact that the building abuts a low density residentially-zoned district. The Delaware units provided at least one parking space per unit.

**RANC Recommendations:**

- In this case, the Alameca and Jefferson Building Projects abut a residentially-zoned district in Richmond Annex. Therefore, the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council recommends that the Alameda Building Project provide at least one parking space per unit. If not provided, a project of this magnitude (85-units) will assuredly create parking spill over into adjacent neighborhoods and create severe parking conflicts on Alameda Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.

- Carefully distinguish the difference between an intensive business use with higher parking demands and a low-volume use. Ensure there is adequate off-street parking for intensive retail business (employees and customers) to prevent parking conflicts in Richmond Annex residential neighborhoods.

- In our experience, guest parking is key in making this type of project successful. At least 1 space per every 10-units would be appropriate. Friends and relatives will be visiting the tenants all the time, especially during the evenings and on the weekends.

In summation, the proposed projects would be **overbuilt for the lots** and show a major disregard of our neighborhoods. We would like to ensure that the new building projects are designed to minimize sharp contrasts in height. As proposed now, the dramatic height in relationship to our low-density residential neighborhood would make us feel enclosed—i.e. visually blocked off like inside a fort. Furthermore, our residential neighborhood would be used as a parking lot, due to the dramatic reduction in off-street parking. If the two projects were redesigned with our recommended modifications, we believe it would lead to a quality development which would be a **better fit** and more harmonious with the Richmond Annex side of San Pablo Avenue.

We would like to work with you to effect a compatible design. Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Selva,
President
510-375-7769

Cc: El Cerrito Design Review Board members

Attachment: Building Height Perspectives
Building Height Perspectives
As verified with city records; building heights as measured from grade to roof ridgeline.

The Village at Town Center (mixed-use building)
10810 San Pablo at Schmidt Lane, El Cerrito
Building height: 42 ft., as verified with City records.

The Vital Building (formerly E.C. Mill & Lumber Building)
10837 San Pablo at Orchard Ave., Richmond Annex
Building height: 25 ft., as verified with City records.

Del Norte Place (mixed-use building)
11720 San Pablo at Knott Ave., El Cerrito
Building height: 45 ft., as verified with City records.

Eskaton Hazel Shirley Mancr (senior housing)
11025 San Pablo at Madison Ave., El Cerrito
Building height: 40 ft., as verified with City records.

1885 University at MLK, Berkeley (Trader Joe's mixed-use building) Building height: 50 ft. for main building; 54 feet to top of penthouses, as verified with City records.
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DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
C/O PLANNING DIVISION
CITY OF EL CERRITO

WRITTEN COMMENTS FOR APRIL 4TH MEETING OF BOARD

Blair Akey
March 13, 2017

Concerns Regarding the Construction of San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA.

1. Property lines: My understanding is that the property line between lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. and lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. extends southward to within three inches from the south wall of the existing building which is to be demolished. The west boundary line of lot 10945 San Pablo Ave., which runs north to south will extend to and intersect the south property line between lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. & lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. which runs east to west.

2. Fencing: Your plans indicate a six foot wood fence partially along the south boundary line as described in paragraph 1. [*See enclosed letter*]

   It is requested that a prefabricated masonry or concrete block fence, seven feet in height minimum, be constructed along the entire length of the property line as described in paragraph 1.

   The requested fence will provide better security and sound control between the two properties. An access gate set back from San Pablo Ave. along your south property line will provide a living space between the two properties for street people who frequent San Pablo Ave.

3. Trees planted along the south property as described in paragraph 1 could prove to be a maintenance problem depending upon the type of tree selected and how they are planted. If the trees are deciduous or have surface feeding root systems removal of leaves in the fall and heaving of concrete will have to be addressed. One cubic yard of waste removal per week by East Bay Sanitary cost about $78.00. I would request that Italian Cypress trees be planted with root retainers if necessary.

4. Security: Security by means of fencing and possibly Security Patrol will have to be maintained during the construction process. Removal of the structure on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. will obviate the present security for lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. Building a permanent fence as soon as practical along southern boundary line as described in paragraph 1 is requested. During the construction of the El Cerrito Village Apartments there was intrusion of street people at night and theft of property even though there was temporary fencing of the entire property.

5. Drainage: The Grant Deed for lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. provides for permanent drainage of surface water from said lot onto the lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. There are presently two out falls for surface water. This right will have to be addressed.

6. Parking: Present parking in and around existing apartments in the area is impacted by sheer demand and limited space. A reduction in parking spaces required per apartment for new construction by the City of El Cerrito has made a bad problem even worse. The City does not consistently enforce its parking regulations and commercial businesses on San Pablo Ave. who need available street parking to attract and retain a customer base are unfavorably impacted. Additional off street parking at a minimum of one parking space per unit of rental is requested.

7. Noise and Dust Control: Demolition and construction on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. will by its very nature generate dust and noise in close proximity to existing living structures consisting of 2 apartments
of 28 units and 2 homes. Please provide a specific plan of action and control measures which will be 
taken and monitored during the entire construction process to ensure that people residing in adjacent 
buildings will not in any manner be harmed or exposed to elements that will cause any type of physical 
injury to people or personal property.

8. Hours of Construction: Hours of construction consistent with present laws and regulations are 
requested to be strictly observed and monitored for compliance during the entire time that construction 
is undertaken on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave.

Copy to:
Wang Brothers Investments, LLC Representative

Blair Akey 3/15/18
March 15, 2017

Blair Akey
P.O. Box 11
Alamo, CA 94507

Design Review Board
c/o Planning Division
City of El Cerrito
10890 San Pablo Ave.
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Reference Application: PL17-0084

Dear Sir:

Enclosed are a letter and a list of concerns which I discussed with Mr. Kevin Wang, developer of the proposed San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave.

I am the owner of the property, El Cerrito Village Apartments, 10945 San Pablo Ave., directly south of lot 10963 San Pablo Ave.

It is requested that a copy of the enclosures be given to each member of the Design Review Board in preparation for the Board’s scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 4, 2018.

Although Mr. Wang & I have discussed the concerns and I have sent the letter requesting the fencing, there has been no written agreement on anything.

It is requested that the enclosures become part of the official record of the Board’s meeting on April 4, 2018.

I plan to attend the April 4th meeting.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Blair Akey

Cc: Concerns Regarding the Construction of San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave. March 13, 2018
Letter dated March 15, 2019 requesting fencing for San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave.
March 15, 2018

Blair Akey
P.O. Box 11
Alamo, CA 94507

Mr. Kevin Wang:
Wang Brothers Investments, LLC
1 Bates Blvd.
Suite # 400
Orinda, CA, 94563

Dear Mr. Wang:

Thank you for the recent meeting we had last Tuesday concerning the development of your property located at 10963 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA.

After giving the proposed fencing for lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. some thought I am requesting that the fence to be constructed be entirely on your property, that it be a minimum of 7 feet in height and be made of materials identical to that which is specified for the fencing for your development at 10919 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA, The Alameda Apartments.

Having the requested fencing would greatly enhance the appearance of the San Pablo Apartments, and provide for better security and sound control.

By having the fence constructed entirely on your property it establishes clear ownership of the fence and the exact property line between the two lots, 10945 & 10963 San Pablo Ave.

Your previous proposal of utilizing the existing fence allows for a small portion of land belonging to lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. on the north side of the existing fence.

I am most desirous that there be no impediment to the future sale of my property created by my land being on the north side of the existing fence which in itself overtime may dispute as to who in fact legally owns the land.

I can appreciate your desire to utilize the existing fencing but given the above reasons long term the requested fencing should prove to be mutually beneficial and in both parties best interest.

Yours truly,

Blair Akey

cc: City of El Cerrito, Design Review Board
BUILDINGS ALONG NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS (JEFFERSON AVE) WITH MIXED USES SHALL NOT CAST SHADOWS BEYOND THE CURB LINE ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF A STREET NORTH OF THE SITE AT 4 PM ON THE WINTER SOLSTICE (DEC 21).

BUILDINGS ALONG MAJOR COMMERCIAL STREETS (SAN PABLO AVE) SHALL NOT CAST SHADOWS BEYOND THE CURB LINE ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF A STREET EAST OF THE SITE AT 1:30 PM ON THE WINTER SOLSTICE (DEC 21).
1. All measurements are to face of curb unless otherwise noted on plans.
2. The utility shown on this plan set are derived from records data and/or surface observation. The presence of any additional utility lines not shown on this plan shall be verified in the field prior to construction.
3. Prior to digging, call 811 at least 48 hours in advance to have existing underground utilities marked.
4. Unless otherwise noted contractor shall protect all existing improvements.
5. Limit of sidewalk removal shall be to the nearest score joint.
6. All surface improvements (asphalt, concrete, shrubs, trees, etc.) within the limit of deviation are to be removed (less setbacks) prior to
7. Landscaper removal
8. Tree removal
9. Approximately limit of deviation
10. Fenced removal

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY AND BOUNDARY
The existing conditions and boundary data shown on these plans is compiled from data available and/or records data and is not responsible for the accuracy of the surveyed data and is not responsible for any errors or omissions.

ABBREVIATIONS

BASIS OF ELEVATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DEMOLITION PLAN

C1.0

STUDIOS KDA
1810 SIXTH STREET, BERKELEY, CA 94710
PH: 510.841.3555 FAX: 510.841.1225
STUDIOKDA.COM

SAN PABLO
APARTMENTS
10963 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA

ISSUEDATE:
02/27/2018

CHECKEDBY:
J.WHITE

DRAWNBY:
M.THOMAS
The proposed mixed-use development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito will create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface. Therefore, this project will be subject to coverage under the provisions of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region. The project will be designed in accordance with the California Urban Stormwater Management Program (CUSMP) and the Stormwater Management Plan (SMAP).

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NOTES:**
- Storm drain routing of BMP 2 on second floor to be determined by MEP. See plumbing plans for details.
- Pipe routing of all roof drainage management areas to BMPs to be determined by MEP. See plumbing plans for details.

**PROPERTY LINE**

**STORMWATER CONTROL PLAN**

**DRAWN BY:** M. Thomas

**CHECKED BY:** J. White

**ISSUEDATE:** 02/27/2018

**PROJECT #:** KWP01

**ENTITLEMENTS / DESIGN REVIEW**

**PLAYLAND APARTMENTS**

**10963 SAN PABLO AVE**

**EL CERRITO, CA**

**1810 Sixth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710**

**Ph: 510.841.3555 Fax: 510.841.1225**

**studiokda.com**

**DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SURFACE</th>
<th>DRAINAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMP1</td>
<td>160 SF</td>
<td>160 SF</td>
<td>160 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP2</td>
<td>295 SF</td>
<td>295 SF</td>
<td>295 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP3</td>
<td>185 SF</td>
<td>185 SF</td>
<td>185 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>570 SF</td>
<td>570 SF</td>
<td>570 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- **FLOOD THROUGH PLANTER**
- **LANDSCAPE AREA**
- **IMPERVIOUS SURFACE**
- **SUB DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA**
- **PROPERTY LINE**

**ABBREVIATIONS**

- **BMP:** Best Management Practice
- **CONC:** Concrete
- **CMA:** Concrete Management Area
- **CIP:** Cast-In-Place
- **LID:** Low Impact Development
- **LOWER:** Lower Level
- **RF:** Roof
- **SF:** Square Feet

**GENERAL NOTES**

- All proposed BMPs to be designed by MEP. See plumbing plans for details.
- All proposed drainage management areas to BMPs to be designed by MEP. See plumbing plans for details.
1. TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL DEVICES Shown on Construction Plan Sheet C4.0 and Approved by the Inspector shall be used on all grading operations until all permanent erosion control measures are installed.

2. Except as otherwise directed by the Inspector, all devices shown on the Erosion Control Plan shall be used on all grading operations.

3. All temporary erosion control devices shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the 'Design Review' section of the Public Works Department Design Specifications. All temporary erosion control devices shall be completed at the end of each working day, except those installed in accordance with the 'Design Review' section of the Public Works Department Design Specifications.

4. All temporary erosion control devices shall be installed prior to backfilling.

5. All temporary erosion control devices shall be removed when the adjacent area is no longer subject to erosion.

6. CRITICAL AREAS shall be protected with appropriate erosion control measures. Critical areas shall be determined by the Inspector, based on the contour, soil type, and location of the critical area.

7. All grading operations shall be conducted in accordance with the 'Design Review' section of the Public Works Department Design Specifications. All grading operations shall be conducted in accordance with the 'Design Review' section of the Public Works Department Design Specifications.

8. IFTHEPROJECTREQUIRESASTORMWATERPOLLUTIONPREVENTIONPLAN(SWPPP),PROVIDETHEFOLLOWING:

9. STORMWATERPollutionPreventionPlan(SWPPP)shallbeimplementedonacontinuingbasis.

10. AFTEROCTOBER1,ALLEROSIONCONTROLMEASURESWILLBEINSPECTEDDAILYANDAFTEREACHSTORM.

11. OCTOBER1THROUGHAPRIL15,AUSUALEROSIONCONTROLPLANSHALLBEIMPLEMENTEDSIXTIMES PERWORKINGDAYANDATLEASTONESEQUENTIALSTORMWATERPOLLUTIONPREVENTIONPLAN(SWPPP)shallbeimplemented.

12. ALLSTORMDRAININLETSTRUCTURESGREATERTHANFOURFEETINDEPTHSHALLHAVESTEPSINSTALLEDPERTHEOUTLETONTHELOTANDTHESTREET.

13. ALLGRADEDAREAS,INCLUDING,BUTNOTLIMITEDTO,CUTANDFILLSLOPES,STREETS,PARKINGAREAS, ANDBUILDINGPADSAREBEINGINSTALLED.

14. ALLEROSIONANDSEDIMENTCONTROLMEASURESSHALLBECLEAREDANDMAINTAINEDDURINGTHE RAINYSEASON.

15. TOMINIMIZEEROSIONOFGRADEDBANKS,ALLGRADEDBANKSSTEEPERTHAN2%ANDHIGHERTHAN3FEET,SHALLBE HYDROSEEDED,LANDSCAPED,ORSEALED.

16. ALLEXCavationsopposedortowardsacriticalarea,includingcriticalareasshallbeprotectedwithappropriate erosioncontrolmeasures.

17. ALLEROSIONANDSEDIMENTCONTROLMEASURESSHALLBEBUILTINTOCONSTRUCTIONPLANSASSTORMWATERPOLLUTIONPREVENTIONPLAN(SWPPP).

18. ALLEROSIONANDSEDIMENTCONTROLMEASURESSHALLBEBUILTINTOCONSTRUCTIONPLANSASSTORMWATERPOLLUTIONPREVENTIONPLAN(SWPPP).

19. SANDBAGS,STRAWTATTLESAND/ORSTRAWBALESSHALLBESTOCKPILEDONSITEANDPLACEDATINTERVALSSHOWN ONTHEDETAILONTHISSHEET.ITISTHECONTRACTOR'SRESPONSIBILITYTOCLEANTHEDESILTINGBASINSANDTHE PADS SHALL BE HYDROSEEDED PER CITY'S REQUIREMENT.

20. SANDBAGSOROTHEREROSIONRESISTANTMATERIALSAPPROVEDBYTHEINSPECTOR,ANDSHALLEXTEND COMPLETELYACROSSTHESTREETORCHANNELATRIGHTANGLESTOTHECENTERLINE. EARTH DIKES MAY NOT BE USED AS VELOCITY CHECK DAMS.

21. WHENDIRECTEDBYPARTY,AFIELDSHAPERMAINSHELLOMAINTAINEDALONGTHETOPOFTHESLOPEOFTHESITE.

22. WHENDIRECTEDBYPARTY,AFIELDSHAPERMAINSHELLOMAINTAINEDALONGTHETOPOFTHESLOPEOFTHESITE.

23. PROVIDEVERSITY CHECK DAMS IN ALL SURFACES OF THE TRENCHES AT THE INTERVALS OF 50 FEET OR LESS THAN ALL OTHER INTERSECTIONS. THE TRENCHES SHALL BE BLOCKED AT THE INTERVALS OF 50 FEET OR LESS THAN ALL OTHER INTERSECTIONS.

24. PROVIDEVERSITY CHECK DAMS IN ALL SURFACES OF THE TRENCHES AT THE INTERVALS OF 50 FEET OR LESS THAN ALL OTHER INTERSECTIONS. THE TRENCHES SHALL BE BLOCKED AT THE INTERVALS OF 50 FEET OR LESS THAN ALL OTHER INTERSECTIONS.
CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE

NOT TO SCALE

INLET PROTECTION

NOT TO SCALE

FIBER ROLL

NOT TO SCALE

STORM AND SEWER CLEANSOUT

NOT TO SCALE

STORMDRAIN OVERFLOW STRUCTURE

NOT TO SCALE

UNDERDRAINS

NOT TO SCALE

FLOW THROUGH PLANTER CLEANSOUT

NOT TO SCALE

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

C5.0

SAN PABLO APARTMENTS
10963 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA

DESIGN FIRM ELEVATION

- STREAMS CONNECT (see note #1)
- SMOOTH DRAINAGE (see note #2)
- SOIL TIGHT AT BREEZE

DESIGN PONDING ELEVATION

- SEE PONDING DETAIL FOR PONDING REQUIREMENTS
- SEE PONDING DETAIL FOR DESIGN INFORMATION

GENERAL NOTES

1. CLEANOUT PIPE SHALL BE SAME SIZE AND MATERIAL AS UNDERDRAINPIPE.
2. LOCKING MECHANISM SHALL BE TAMPER RESISTANT AND PLUMB OR LEVELLED IN ALL.
3. CLEANOUT TABLE SHALL BE INSTALLED TO ALLOW FOR MAINTENANCE ACCESS TO ALL PIPES.
4. ALL FITTINGS SHALL BE SOIL TIGHT.
5. MAINTENANCE TERMS CODES GRIZZLIE SHALL BE LARGER THAN MAX DRAINS OPENING.
LEGEND

SYM | DESCRIPTION
--- | ---
FLOW THROUGH PLANTER | SEE CIVIL DWGS
COLORED CONCRETE TYPE 1 TO BE:
DAVIS "SUBTLE" COLOR
AND FINISH TBD
WWW.DAVISCOLORS.COM
800-358-4848

COLORED CONCRETE TYPE 2 TO BE:
DAVIS "PREMIUM" COLOR
AND FINISH TBD
WWW.DAVISCOLORS.COM
800-358-4848

PERMEABLE PAVING TO BE:
ACKERSTONE 4X12 PERMEABLE' RUNNING BOND
COLOR AND FINISH TBD
WWW.ACKERSTONE.COM
(951)-674-0047

RESTORATION HARDWARE
Makena Natural Gas Fire Table Owner's
Manual Square Style # 42100136
WWW.RESTORATION-HARDWARE.COM
800-654-1704

NATURAL GAS FIRE TABLE TO BE:
RESTORATION HARDWARE "MAKENA #42100136"
WWW.RESTORATION-HARDWARE.COM
800-654-1704

FIRE TABLE SPECIFICATION
NO SCALE
GROUND LEVEL PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>GINNIGO JUGLIS &quot;AUTUMN KOLYO&quot;</td>
<td>MAPLE</td>
<td>TREC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5&quot; BOX</td>
<td>30&quot; X 30&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>ACTINOTRICHIA AMMOPHYLLA</td>
<td>BASSWOOD</td>
<td>TREC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3&quot; BOX</td>
<td>90&quot; X 90&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>PODOCOPUS GRACILIS</td>
<td>PINE</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>24&quot; X 24&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>PHYMARTIA &quot;BLACK SEEDED&quot;</td>
<td>TANSY</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>3&quot; X 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>BILBERRY PRUDENT &quot;DWARF&quot;</td>
<td>BILBERRY</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>2&quot; X 2&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJO</td>
<td>CLAVERIA BURNABY</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>2&quot; X 2&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>LACANORA &quot;SSS&quot;</td>
<td>RASPBERRY</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>3&quot; X 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>P. T. AMBROSISS TRIVIALIS</td>
<td>BOSTON FERN</td>
<td>VINE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* STREET TILE CAUTER TO BE A MINIMUM 2.5" DBH AND EXHIBIT TRUE TAPER.

SECOND FLOOR FLOW-THROUGH PLANTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>ST. GILGA CALIF. &quot;MOUND SAV BRONZE&quot;</td>
<td>COTONESTRA</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>NAUHIBIRI &quot;SUNS&quot;</td>
<td>BERMUDA GRASS</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>S. NIGRA &quot;BLACK BEAUTY&quot;</td>
<td>BLACKBERRY</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>30&quot; X 30&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AJUGA REPENS &quot;TERRA COTTA&quot;</td>
<td>BASKETWEAVE</td>
<td>PERENNIAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
<td>3&quot; X 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROOF DECK PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>MANZANITA MULTIFLEX &quot;GOLDEN GODDESS&quot;</td>
<td>MANZANITA</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>6&quot; X 6&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MML</td>
<td>MG. &quot;MORNING LIGHT&quot;</td>
<td>MG.</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>6&quot; X 6&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUND LEVEL FLOW-THROUGH PLANTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PHALAENOPSIS &quot;ALABAMA&quot;</td>
<td>CATTLEYA</td>
<td>SLIPPER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>UJURUS &quot;SABRETOOTH&quot;</td>
<td>BERCÓLLY</td>
<td>SLIPPER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>30&quot; X 30&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>V. M. &quot;LIGATA&quot;</td>
<td>BAZAAR</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>30&quot; X 30&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>V. M. &quot;GREAT GREEN&quot;</td>
<td>BERMUDA</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>S. NIGRA &quot;BLACK BEAUTY&quot;</td>
<td>BLACKBERRY</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>30&quot; X 30&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>A. N. &quot;TERRA COTTA&quot;</td>
<td>BASKETWEAVE</td>
<td>PERENNIAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
<td>2&quot; X 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUND LEVEL PLANTING

GB - GINKGO
PG - Podocarpus
CD - Carex Divulsa
PT - Parthenocissus
PB - Phormium 'Black Adder'
BF - Bulbine 'Orange'
LB - Lomandra 'Breeze'
AR - Acer 'Armstrong'

FLOW-THROUGH PLANTERS

MM - Mahonia 'Charity'
CD - Carex Divulsa
FC - Frangula
AM - Achillea
MR - Muhlenbergia rige
SN - Sambucus

ROOF DECKS

BM - Bamboo
MM - Miscanthus
IRRIGATION PLAN
GROUND FLOOR

IRRIGATION DEMAND: 8 GPM AT 60 PSI. VERIFY EXACT PRESSURE IN FIELD PRIOR TO START OF WORK.

COORDINATION LEGEND

NOTE:
REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.

COORDINATION LEGEND

SYMBOL DESCRIPTION

- Copper Pipe Penetration. All Copper Pipe in structure shall be routed, supplied, and installed by the plumbing contractor. See all noted on plans.

- Electrical Conduit Penetration. All conduit in structure shall be routed, supplied, and installed by the electrical contractor. See all noted on plans.

- Electrical Conduit from Controller to Remote Penetration

- Structure Penetration

- Electrical Conduit from Controller to Remote Penetration

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.
COORDINATION LEGEND

**SYMBOL** | **DESCRIPTION**
--- | ---
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION. ALL COPPER PIPE IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, INSTALLED, AND CONNECTED PER THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
- | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, INSTALLED, AND CONNECTED PER THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
- | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, INSTALLED, AND CONNECTED PER THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM CONTROLLER TO REMOTE PENETRATION.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM CONTROLLER TO SECOND FLOOR.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM SECOND FLOOR TO FOURTH FLOOR.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR TO SECOND FLOOR.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR TO FOURTH FLOOR.
- | ELECTRICAL PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR TO FOURTH FLOOR.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM IRRIGATION ROOM TO SECOND FLOOR.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM IRRIGATION ROOM TO SECOND FLOOR.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM IRRIGATION ROOM TO FOURTH FLOOR.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM IRRIGATION ROOM TO FOURTH FLOOR.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.
- | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION FROM GROUND FLOOR IRRIGATION ROOM TO UPPER FLOORS.

**NOTE:** REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.
NOTE: REFER TO SHEET L303 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>COPPER PIPE PENETRATION. ALL COPPER PIPE IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONDUIT FROM CONTROLLER TO REMOTE PENETRATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONDUIT FROM CONTROLLER TO FLOOR PENETRATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: IN-STRUCTURE MAINLINE AND ELECTRICAL CONDUIT LINES SHALL BE ROUTED AND SUPPLIED BY THE PLUMBING OR ELECTRICAL ENGINEER. MINIMUM SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
MINIMUM 12" APART. SHORT SIDE OF VALVE BOXES SHALL BE PARALLEL TO WALK, SHALL BE AN EQUAL DISTANCE FROM THE WALK, CURB, ETC. AND EACH BOX SHALL BE BUILDING OR LANDSCAPE FEATURE. AT MULTIPLE VALVE BOX GROUPS, EACH BOX INSTALL VALVE BOXES MINIMUM 12" FROM AND PERPENDICULAR TO WALK, CURB, 16.

VALVE LOCATIONS SHOWN ARE DIAGRAMMATIC. INSTALL IN GROUND EACH OF ALL OPERATING AND SERVICING KEYS AND WRENCHES REQUIRED FOR AT COMPLETION OF MAINTENANCE PERIOD, PROVIDE OWNER WITH THREE (3) WIRES. LOOP 36" EXCESS WIRE INTO EACH SINGLE VALVE BOX AND INTO ONE VALVE (ONE WITH A WHITE STRIPE) AND OF A DIFFERENT COLOR THAN OTHER CONTROL INSTALL ONE (1) SPARE CONTROL WIRE FOR EVERY 6 (SIX) STATIONS ON THE EQUIPMENT WITH LOCAL MANUFACTURER'S REPRESENTATIVES. NOTED.

INDEX SHEET WITH CONTRACTOR'S CONTACT INFORMATION AND LIST OF 13.

LEAVE A 36" COIL OF EXCESS WIRE AT EACH SPLICE AND 100 FEET ON CENTER ALONG 33.

CONTROL WIRE AT THE CONTROLLER AND ATTACH AN ID TAG AT EACH REMOTE 32.

SHOWN ON PLANS. RUN WIRE FROM EACH RCV TO THE CONTROLLER. SPLICING WIRES 7:00 AM.

OPERATE IRRIGATION CONTROLLER(S) BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 10:00 PM AND 14.

IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO BE TURNED OFF DURING RAIN. DRAIN EXCESS WATER BACK TO MAIN SYSTEM OR NEAREST CATCH BUNKER TO MINIMIZE WASTAGE AND MAINTAIN WATER LEVEL IN TRENCHES. 15.

IRRIGATION SYSTEM TESTED UNDER PRESSURE OF 125 PSI. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TESTING ORGANIZATION AND MATERIALS. REPORTING THE RESULTS IN A WRITTEN REPORT TO THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE. IN THE EVENT THAT THIS NOTIFICATION IS NOT PERFORMED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESTORE SURFACES, EXISTING UNDERGROUND INSTALLATIONS, ETC., DAMAGED OR CUT AS A RESULT OF EXCAVATIONS, TO ORIGINAL CONDITIONS IN A MANNER APPROVED BY THE OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE.

PVC SOLVENT WELD FITTINGS. 12" COVER.

PVC SOLVENT WELD PIPE WITH SCHEDULE 40 DISTRIBUTION TUBING: TORO EHD0437-010 MICRO HOSE.

**Backflow Preventer to be Installed by**

**Plumbing Contractor**

**Notes:**
1. Valve Box shall be 12" pipe diameter or larger.
2. Backflow installation shall conform to all applicable building and plumbing codes.
3. Reduced pressure backflow assembly.

**Master Remote Control Valve - Wall Mounted**

**Flow Sensor Detail - Wall Mounted**

**Inside Wall Mount Controller**

**Valve Box Installation Detail**

**Pipe and Wire Trenching**

**Wire Connection Detail**

**Quick Coupler in Box Detail**

**Irritrol Climate Logic Weather Sensor**

**Tree Bubbler Detail**
SAN PABLO APARTMENTS
10963 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA

EXISTING SOLID WALL AT PROPERTY LINE EXC. CLAIMS

#1

#2

#3

#4

#5

#6

#7

#8

EXISTING TREE
TO BE REMOVED

PROPOSED TREE
SEE SHEET L201

EXISTING TREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE ID</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SIZE (DBH)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>REASON FOR REMOVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CARYA VULGARIS</td>
<td>CHINESE HICKORRY</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>SIDEWALK (JEFFERSON ST) (100')</td>
<td>TO BE REMOVED</td>
<td>PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LIGUSTRUM</td>
<td>SWEET LAUREL</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>SIDEWALK (JEFFERSON ST) (100')</td>
<td>TO BE REMOVED</td>
<td>PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CARYA VULGARIS</td>
<td>CHINESE HICKORRY</td>
<td>13&quot;</td>
<td>SIDEWALK (PAZO AVE) (100')</td>
<td>TO BE REMOVED</td>
<td>PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PIRUS CALLIPIRUM</td>
<td>ORNAMENTAL PEAR</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>NORTH PROPERTY LINE</td>
<td>TO BE REMOVED</td>
<td>INTERFERS WITH NEW SITEWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PIRUS CALLIPIRUM</td>
<td>ORNAMENTAL PEAR</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>SOUTH PROPERTY LINE</td>
<td>TO REMAIN</td>
<td>INTERFERS WITH NEW SITEWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PIRUS CALLIPIRUM</td>
<td>ORNAMENTAL PEAR</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>SOUTH PROPERTY LINE</td>
<td>TO REMAIN</td>
<td>INTERFERS WITH NEW SITEWORK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.05.02.20.06 - Front and Upper Floor Setback along Neighborhood Street and Abutting Residential Districts:
(35' max. height, then a 45 deg. angle inward)

Roof canopy above 5th floor deck is stepped down to be within the setback envelope
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DETAILS

Application Number: PL17-0006

Applicant: Charles Oewel

Location: 10167 San Pablo Avenue

APN: 501-034-003

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier II Design Review project, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board. This review includes authority over the following elements only:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

The project proposes a new 6-story building containing 62 residential units. Thirty-one (31) on-site auto parking spaces are proposed. 93 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 8 short-term bicycle parking spaces are proposed.

The building features a mixture of traditional and contemporary design elements. The ground floor entry for the residential lobby is proposed along San Pablo Avenue. This gate for the parking garage entry integrates public art facing San Pablo Avenue. As exterior materials, the building will utilize dark brown cement fiber siding, and smooth stucco painted brown and rust color. The project will feature aluminum windows throughout.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is approximately 0.26 acre (11,144 square-feet) and is located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, north of Central Avenue. The project consists of one parcel. The project sits on a mid-block site, with the existing Burger King restaurant to the south and a vacant site to the north which is the site of a proposed development project under a separate application. The project site is generally flat.

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) in the City’s General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The overall site features street frontage on San Pablo Avenue only. The existing San Pablo Avenue frontage is improved with street trees, which are noted on the project plans, and African Iris in the landscape strip adjacent to the curb. San Pablo Avenue features an existing AC Transit bus stop (Lines 72 and 72M).

Existing/Previous Land Use

The project site comprises the southern portion of a former automotive sales business run by McNevin Cadillac. The former automotive sales business sat on three adjoining parcels. The site for the subject project is the southern most of the three parcels. The site has been vacant for several years. The northern two parcels of the former automotive sales business are the site of a development project proposed by a separate applicant under a separate application.
Adjacent Land Uses

**North:** A vacant site with a submitted application for a project containing 72 dwelling units and 4,435 square feet of retail space.

**East:** Across San Pablo Avenue sit various commercial uses including a dry-cleaning business, a restaurant and medical/dental offices.

**South:** Fast food restaurant.

**West:** One single family home and one property which appears to contain two residential units.

Analysis

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to construct a new six-story building, consisting of a total of 62 new housing units. The building would feature a residential lobby and building entrance from San Pablo Avenue. A leasing office would also be located on the building frontage. The lobby would contain an elevator, mailboxes and a room for packages. The lobby would lead to a single corridor from which the first floor units would be accessed. The proposed building would feature a below-grade level which would contain 31 auto parking spaces and 93 long term bicycle parking spaces. This parking would be accessed by vehicles via a ramp from San Pablo Avenue and would be accessible to pedestrians via the building elevator. Floors 4-6 of the building would contain common open space in the form of outdoor terraces and a 2,456 square-foot outdoor deck would also be located on the roof.
Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:

- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which includes private, common and public open spaces.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:

- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed.

This project is located in the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOHIMU) Transect and meets all of the relevant development standards specified for its location in the Plan Area.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards and the compliance of the project with those standards. The section of San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site is designated a Community Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation by Street Type: SPA Commercial Street</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>7 ft. 10 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: Up to 10 ft. for non-residential uses; up to 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
<td>5 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>10 ft. (No applicable shadow standard at rear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Street facing ground floor units and spaces to have individual</td>
<td>Residential lobby entry serving all units on San Pablo Avenue;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
entries along front or side streets. Upper floor units and spaces to be accessed by common entry along the front or side streets.

**Vehicular Access**

| Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways, minimum 100 feet apart. Side access on corner lots. | 17 ft. driveway on San Pablo Avenue |

**Building Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Floor Setbacks</th>
<th>See Shadows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</th>
<th>14 ft. min clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Transparency</td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Transparency</td>
<td>30% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Length</td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 ft. along street frontage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Length</td>
<td>65 ft. along street frontage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ground Floor Transparency | 80% for Shop Front |
| Upper Floor Transparency | 65% |
| Front Encroachments | 4 ft. max |
| Rear Encroachments | 4 ft. max |
| Allowed Frontage Types | Min: 50% Flex |
| Max: 50% Forecourt (NE side). Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade (NE side SPA) or Ecofront |
| Allowed Frontage Types | Shop Front (100%) |

**Open Space Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Common Open Space</td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min 62x80=4,960 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings &gt;25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 1,214.08 sq. ft. required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Parking</strong></td>
<td>Up to 1.0 spaces/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
<td>0.5 space per unit (total of 31 garage spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>Min 1 short-term space/10 units 62/10=6.2 (6) spaces</td>
<td>8 short-term spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit 62x1.5=93 spaces</td>
<td>93 long-term spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Height</strong></td>
<td>65 ft. max</td>
<td>64 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Height</strong></td>
<td>3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial</td>
<td>6 residential stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Review Process

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.B of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, Tier II Design Review is the entitlement process for new projects that have been designed in full-compliance with the design standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The Design Review Board is the body of decision for Tier II Design Review. The discretionary scope of Tier II Design Review includes the following components:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

### Architectural Design

The building’s architecture incorporates a contemporary aesthetic. The building will feature a traditional-looking ground floor and street presence, with increased glazing on the ground floor street frontage. Upper floors of the building will feature projections in key locations near the midpoint of the building and near the top. These projections are proposed to be clad with dark brown cement fiber siding with a horizontal v-groove. The recessed portions of the building would be finished with smooth stucco, painted brown, while the elevator tower would feature smooth stucco painted rust color, with large windows proposed for the stairway adjacent to the elevator tower. The stucco on the elevator tower and the adjacent windows at the stairwell, provide a prominent vertical element on the front façade. Dark bronze aluminum windows are proposed throughout the building.

The side elevations will feature recessed balconies. Dark brown cement fiber siding is proposed in most locations, with brown smooth stucco utilized on the vertically oriented elements of the elevations.
Landscape Design

The project will feature landscaping at the roof deck level, on the outdoor patio areas, and within the setbacks on the ground level.

On the roof, the project will have a perimeter green roof planter that will provide area for stormwater filtration. Within this perimeter the project will have a mixture of landscape and hardscape. Amenities proposed for the roof deck include a fire pit, petanque (bocce) court, seating, a barbeque, a pergola, and dining tables.

The landscaping features a mixture of native and other drought tolerant plants, including Manzanita (*arctostaphylos 'Dr Hurd'*), Flax (*phormium 'Platt’s Black*), and spider plant (*chlorophytum saundersiae*).

City staff engaged a consultant to aid with review of the proposed landscape plans. The consultant’s comments are as follows:

- *Epilobium canum* may be too fragile to survive in streetscape planting areas. Verify streetscape species preferences with city arborist.
- *Garrya elliptica* is listed for ground level planters. Since space is tight and planters are close to the building, suggest smaller cultivar ‘Evie’ to reduce future pruning needs. The mature size of the straight species is larger although it will be smaller in a contained planting area.
- *Chondropetalum tectorum* is shown in green roof mix area. Ensure green roof area soil depth is sufficient to install 1 gallon plants and support their root system over time.
Art in Public Places

The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50, Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The applicant will be constructing a sculptural metal gate at the entrance to the parking garage on San Pablo Avenue.

Required Monetary Contributions to the Community

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that the applicant is required to pay related to this project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These fees are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to the Complete Streets component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.

1. An in-lieu fee of $123,835.65 to meet the required public open space that is not being provided by the project. While this is a development standard, since it is being paid as an in-lieu fee, the money will be given to the Public Works Department to further enhance existing and proposed public open space.

2. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross habitable square footage of the project. (48,563 sq. ft. x 5.02= $243,786.26) This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

3. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (62 du x $1,648= $102,176). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $469,797.91.

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

Complete Streets Plan

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. These improvements will be made as funds become available. For San Pablo Avenue, which is a Community Street, the improvements include installing landscaped pedestrian bulb-outs, creating a crosswalk which decreases the crossing distances for pedestrians, and providing a new bicycle lane.
Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site and posted at the site on April 11, 2018.

Staff received a voicemail comment from one anonymous citizen. The caller expressed concern about the height of the project being inconsistent with surrounding buildings, the shadows cast by the proposed building, and solar blockage to adjacent properties.

Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of height, and shadow standards.

Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 3). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensures that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

Intent of the Specific Plan

The project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

*The project addresses San Pablo Avenue with a building entry onto the street and landscaping improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will continue to enhance the San Pablo Avenue corridor, as a place, by bringing more residential units to this location of El Cerrito.*

**Strategy A.4:** Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.
The project site fronts onto San Pablo Avenue, a Community Street. The project creates a relationship to the street by providing direct pedestrian access from the street to the building.

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

The project will provide 62 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will provide a pleasant pedestrian environment along San Pablo Avenue.

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project will develop a vacant, underutilized site. The proposed project will provide 62 new residential units in close proximity to public transit along San Pablo Avenue, and in the downtown district.

**Strategy B.3:** Build on recent and planned private and public investments.

The applicant proposes to add 62 new residential units to a vacant parcel. The project will include public art in the form of a sculptural metal gate at the garage entrance. Private and common open space is proposed with balconies, upper-floor terraces, and a roof deck. The project includes improvements to the streetscape and will contribute toward the complete streets improvements in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 62 new residential units by developing a vacant site into a new building in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**General Plan Compliance**

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

The project will provide 62 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses. The project includes ground floor residential units.

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.
**LU4.1: Mixture of Uses.** Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

_The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue, by adding additional residential units to the corridor and by developing a vacant site. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, and public transit._

**LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives.** To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

_The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The location also provides convenient walking access to local businesses._

**CD1.9: Building Design.** A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

_The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and is compatible with the existing residential uses to the south, east and north of the site._

**CD2.1: Street Frontages.** Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

_The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue and features pedestrian access to the building lobby from the street. Residential units face San Pablo Avenue above the ground floor and allow surveillance of the street from the units within the project._

**CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements.** Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

_The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements. The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan._

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

_The project will contain a roof deck and several outdoor terraces as common open space for the residents of the project. The roof deck will feature amenities which are functional and desirable, such as a petanque court, for the residents. Many upper-floor units will contain balconies._

**CD3.12: Landscape Species.** Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.
The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerance plants such as Manzanita, Cape Rush, Dune Sedge, Spider Plant, Flax, and California Gray Rush.

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

*The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building features projections in key locations along the street-facing elevation. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with pedestrian building entry along San Pablo Avenue.*

**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

*The proposed project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**T2.1: Land Use Patterns.** Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.
2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.
3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.
4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.
5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

*The project will provide 62 new residences in close proximity to public transportation and local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.*

**T2.2: Project Design.** Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.

*The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue and features pedestrian access onto the streets with a main building entrance on San Pablo Avenue, which is served with frequent public transportation.*

**H2.2:** Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San
Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides higher-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

H2.3: Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public transit. The project complies fully with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings
Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for a Tier IV application, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable Specific Plan design standards;

As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

As discussed in this report, the proposed project will implement the following goals of the El Cerrito General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.12, Landscape species, CD4.2 Building Articulation; CD5.1, Design Review Process, T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, Policies H2.2, and H2.3.

Staff Recommendation
Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL17-0006, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion
Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB18-04 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL17-0006, a project that includes a 6-story residential building containing 62 dwelling units located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period
Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.
Attachments

1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Plans, dated April 19, 2018
3. Initial Study Checklist and CEQA Appendices (see page 116)
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER II DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 62 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10167 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on a Community Street;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 501-034-003;

WHEREAS, on January 17, 2016, the Applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2018, the application was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on May 2, 2018, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL17-0006, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Division:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated April 19, 2018. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If the Applicant constructs the building or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and the Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The Applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Prior to the issuance of building permit, the Applicant shall pay a fee ($123,835.65) in-lieu of the provision of the public open space on the project site.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of market rate residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

10. A construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees. This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit to allow this use.
Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:

11. Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2): The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.

12. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1): Implement the following Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

*Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:*

a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.
b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
c. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
d. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
f. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.
g. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
h. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.
i. Post a publically visible sign(s) 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.

*Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:*

j. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
k. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete
trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to
the construction site.

l. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for
independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
m. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

13. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2): Prior to issuance of building permit the Applicant shall require
project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning
Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to
identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures
to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:
a. Construction equipment selection.
b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.
c. Modified construction schedule; and
d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for
control of fugitive dust.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall implement a program, for review and
approval of the Zoning Administrator, that includes the following elements:
a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

15. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between
February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the
satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior
to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days
following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a
survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads,
and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared
or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within
150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two
weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest
is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

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

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

16. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural
resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be
stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures
described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact
Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special
rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)
shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area
reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been
notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

17. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The Applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   a. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
   c. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

18. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the Applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

19. Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.1): Future development would be exposed to outdoor noise levels exceeding acceptable levels as defined in the El Cerrito and Richmond General Plans. Noise levels inside residential structures proposed in such noise environments would exceed 45 dBA Ldn, the local established land use compatibility threshold. In areas where residential developments would be exposed to an Ldn of greater than 60 dBA, El Cerrito General Plan Policy H3.9 requires the evaluation of mitigation measures for specific projects. In Richmond General Plan Action SN4.A, new noise-sensitive uses that are located in an area with day-night average sound levels (Ldn) of 55 or greater require a noise study report; the report shall identify noise mitigation measures that limit noise to an acceptable level compared to existing conditions.

   a. Utilize site planning to minimize noise in residential outdoor activity areas (shared outdoor space in multi-family developments) by locating the areas behind noise barriers, the buildings, in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible. The goal is a maximum noise level of 60 dBA Ldn from roadway traffic and 70 dBA Ldn from BART noise.
   b. The City of El Cerrito requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or lower, and the adopted instantaneous noise levels in residential units exposed to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn should not exceed 50 dBA Lmax in bedrooms and
55 dBA Lmax in other rooms. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA Ldn so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn. These treatments include, but are not limited to, sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted to the City, along with the building plans, which shall be revised as necessary or approved prior to issuance of a building permit. Feasible construction techniques such as these would adequately reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or lower and meet instantaneous noise limits.

c. Similar to above, noise insulation features shall be considered on a case-by-case basis for noise-sensitive offices and commercial uses proposed where noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn, in order to meet adopted noise standards.

d. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

20. Noise (Mitigation 13.2): New commercial development proposed in the same building as or adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards.

a. Noise levels at residential property lines from commercial development shall be maintained not in excess of the General Plan and municipal code limits for the Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. The approval of the commercial development shall require a noise study demonstrating how the business—including loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems—would meet these requirements and would be consistent with the respective City’s noise standards.

b. Ensure that noise-generating activities, such as maintenance and loading and unloading, are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM.

21. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:

a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.

i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.
j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

22. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:
   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.
   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures that may include the following:
      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.
      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.
      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.
      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
      5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
      6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

23. The project design shall implement the following measures to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less, in compliance with City noise standards:

   Interior Noise Control Measures
   • Exterior finishes shall have a minimum STC rating of 46
   • Residential doors and windows along the eastern façade shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30
   • Residential doors and windows along the northern façade within 150 feet of San Pablo Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
   • All residential doors and windows along the southern façade shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
• Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residential units on the project site so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise and achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less.

As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the Applicant may provide a detailed acoustical analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer and shall outline the specific measures required to meet the City’s 45 dB Ldn and 50-55 dBA Lmax interior noise level standards.

24. Mechanical equipment shall be selected and designed to reduce impacts on surrounding uses to meet the City’s 60 dBA Leq daytime and 56 dBA Leq nighttime noise level requirements at the property line of nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further noise reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, selection of equipment that emits low noise levels and/installation of noise barriers, such as enclosures and parapet walls, to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the nearest receptors. Alternate measures may include locating equipment in less noise-sensitive areas, such as the rooftop of the building away from the building’s edge nearest the noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible.

25. The Applicant shall ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the adjacent crosswalk by installing mirrors on both sides of the driveway to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and install flashing lights to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway.

26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and the Applicant shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to implement: 1) distribution of BikeLink cards with $20.00 value to each resident of the project; 2) provision and operation of a fleet of four shared cars located in the parking garage for the project and free membership to the car share service for all residents of the project.

Public Works Department:

27. Earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the Applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

28. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated April 24, 2018 comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit. Applicant shall use the updated version of the storm water control report as the last submittal was using the old template. See the following links for reference: [http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/](http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/).

29. Prior to issuance of building permit, Applicant shall provide a drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage is encouraged to stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10 ft. from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

30. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

31. Bike racks to be installed shall meet the current standards and details to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.
32. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

33. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed off-site improvements plan.

34. All sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development's public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards and provide continuous, gradual sidewalk width transition from abutting properties to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

35. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

36. Prior to issuance of a building permit and before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, Applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

37. New street trees must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before issuance of the building permit. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

Building Division:

38. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.

Fire Department:

39. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Provide code analysis and show on plans how “Emergency Vehicle Access” requirements are met to get within 150 feet of all portions of exterior walls of the first story.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.

c. Fire Riser Locations
   1. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between the two buildings.

d. Gates
   1. All gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   2. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas at all gates and doors.

e. Premises Identification
   1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.

g. Emergency Egress
1. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4.
2. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
1. Standpipes shall be wet.
2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.
2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120 v Powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
40. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant shall submit a plan for construction site security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
41. Applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program. Applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
42. Construction of the new trash room shall be as illustrated on the plans.
I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a regular meeting held on May 2, 2018, upon motion of Commissioner _____, second by Commissioner ______: 

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Senior Planner
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CONTEXTUAL MAP

FORM-BASED CODE COMPLIANCE DATA

ZONING

TRANSECT ZONE

DOWNTOWN DISTRICT

TDM (M): Transit Oriented Mixed-Use

LAND USE

Proposed use: Multiple Unit - Residential, P (permitted), as all right-of-way require no discretionary review if in compliance with all standards.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

BUILDINGS HEIGHT:

Maximum: 50' O.F. or 60' O.D. if project consistent as an affordable housing project, as defined by state law.

Minimum: 3 stories for residential use.

Proposed: 8 stories, 95' O.D.

STREET TYPE

SAN PABLO AVENUE

COMMUNITY STREET

Central Avenue

CARLSON BLVD

AVILA STREET

Building Form

Upper Floor setback

Ground Floor Ceiling Height

Building Length

Ground Floor Transparency - Residential

Allowed Percentage Type - Plans

SHADOWS

Existing residential uses to the west are not impacted by shadow requirement.

Existing building is less than 90' to the west which does not comply with SBC 5.05.06.02.06

Uses shadow study.

Setback:

Ground Floor Front Yard

Yard setback

West setback

Front Yard

Back Yard

VIEWS

Project property is not large enough to include view corridors.

BUILDING ARTICULATION

Wall Offset at Street Front

Wall Offset

Colors, Materials, and Textures

FRONTAGE

Roof Pitch, Material, Awnings, Balcony, in Provision

SHOP FRONT PROPOSED

Hinge

Patio

Glazing

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

All exterior lighting will be Dark Sky certified.

Building will comply with California Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

ART

Access gate to underground parking garage will be custom designed and fabricated by a recognized metal sculpture artist.

The use of the artwork will be 1% of the construction cost or $1,000, whichever is less.

OPEN SPACE

Grass building area

Number of units

Public Open Space

Private Common Open Space

PARKING REQUIREMENT

Residential

Bike Minimum

Proposed:

Proposed long-term spaces in garage storage area, stacked.

This drawing is the property of the architect and may not be used without the permission of the architect.
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Revision Date

Issue Date

5.3.16

2.12.17

APPLICTION

1/16/17

JDeS Project Number:

6816
FACADE ARTICULATION CALCULATIONS

OVERALL SURFACE AREA = 4718.5 SF
EXTRUDED AND RECESSED PLANE AREA = 2,399 SF
PERCENTAGE OF FACADE MOVEMENT = 50.8%

GROUND FLOOR TRANSPARENCY CALCULATIONS

OVERALL SURFACE AREA = 938 SF
TRANSPARENT AREAS = 607 SF
PERCENTAGE OF TRANSPARENCY = 64.7%
NOTE:

SITE PLAN TAKEN FROM SURVEY BY
BAY AREA LAND SURVEYING DATED
JANUARY 12, 2017.

SHADOW STUDY - DECEMBER 21ST @ 1:30 P.M.
SLOPE PLANE DIAGRAM

35'-0"

45 DEGREES
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VIEW FROM BART EL CERRITO PLAZA BART STATION PLATFORM - NORTHERN END

VIEW FROM BART EL CERRITO PLAZA BART STATION PLATFORM - SOUTHERN END
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A. INTEGRAL COLOR SMOOTH FINISH STUCCO

B. FIBER CEMENT V-GROOVE SIDING

C. ALUMINUM DOORS AND WINDOWS - DARK BRONZE

D. ARTIST DESIGNED FENCE AND GATE

E. PAINTED STEEL GUARDRAILS
STORMWATER CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBUTARY</th>
<th>AREA SQ FT</th>
<th>STORMWATER COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>STORMWATER NEEDS SQ FT</th>
<th>STORMWATER PLANTER BOX SQ FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STORMWATER CALCULATIONS**

**STORMWATER COLLECTOR**

**TRIBUTARY AREA CALCULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBUTARY</th>
<th>AREA SQ FT</th>
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## Avenue Lofts - 10167 San Pablo Avenue

### CEQA Environmental Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Avenue Lofts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead agency name and address:</strong></td>
<td>City of El Cerrito Planning Division 10890 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact person and phone number</strong></td>
<td>Sean Moss (510) 215-4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Location:</strong></td>
<td>10167 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, CA 94530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>File Number:</strong></td>
<td>PL17-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project sponsor’s name and address:</strong></td>
<td>Charlie Oewel, Developer 1606 Juanita Lane, Suite A Tiburon, CA 94920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Owner:</strong></td>
<td>10167 SPA, LLC 175 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Suite 201 Annapolis, MD 21401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan Designation:</strong></td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of project:</strong></td>
<td>The project would include demolition of the one existing structure on site and construction of a new 48,641 square foot, six story, 64-foot tall multi-family residential building with a total of 62 dwelling units and 31 parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding land uses and setting briefly describe the project’s surroundings:</strong></td>
<td>Located immediately adjacent and north of the project site is a parking lot which is the site of a proposed 6-story project that would contain 73 residential units and over 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. Commercial properties, including a dry-cleaner, restaurant, and dental office, are located east of the project site across San Pablo Avenue. The project site is bounded to the west by two-story, multi-family housing. To the south, the project site is bordered by a gas station and drive-through fast food restaurant with parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):</strong></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

This checklist and attached supporting documentation have been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Avenue Lofts development (project) in relationship to the prior environmental review conducted for the project site in the City of El Cerrito’s San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (Specific Plan EIR). This analysis considers whether the environmental impacts of the project have already been analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code (PRC), Section 21000, et seq.).

This document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of El Cerrito (City). According to Section 15168(c)(2) of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR can be used to address the effects of a subsequent activity so long as the activity is within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, no new effects are found, and no new mitigation measures would be required. As supported by the analysis in this document, the Avenue Lofts Project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than what was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR.

1.1 Project Background and Prior CEQA Documentation

In 2007, the City began the process to prepare a Specific Plan for San Pablo Avenue. The major goals of the Specific Plan were to articulate a vision for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that could be applied along its length and to adjacent areas.

In 2014, the City certified the Specific Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse #2014042025) and adopted the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The Specific Plan includes (1) a Form-Based Code (FBC) to provide clear signals to developers as to the type, location, and shape of desired development; (2) multimodal transportation goals and policies including streetscape design improvements, and design standards as part of the Complete Streets Plan; and (3) infrastructure improvements to support new development.

1.2 CEQA Requirements

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. This checklist confirms the 10167 San Pablo Avenue Project would be within the planning area of the Specific Plan EIR and would have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the Specific Plan EIR. As such, the City finds that impacts resulting from implementation of the Avenue Lofts Project would be within the scope of the Specific Plan EIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10167 San Pablo Avenue Project does not require any further review under CEQA.
2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location and Setting

The project site is at 10167 San Pablo Avenue (APN 510-034-003-2) in the southwestern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California, as shown in Figure 1. The project site is located near the northwestern corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue intersection. The project site is largely flat, with a slight elevation gain of approximately 2 feet at the northeast side.\(^1\) The site contains an existing vacant outbuilding constructed in 1968, asphalt paving, and perimeter landscaping.

Located immediately adjacent and north of the project site is a parking lot which is the site of a separate, proposed 6-story project that would contain 73 residential units and over 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. Commercial properties, including a dry-cleaner, restaurant, and dental office, are located east of the project site across San Pablo Avenue. The project site is bordered to the west by two-story multi-family housing. To the south, the project site is bordered by a gas station and drive-through fast food restaurant with parking lot. Surrounding land uses are depicted in Figure 2.

The project site is located within the Specific Plan area and has a land use designation of Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) as shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. The zoning for the project site is also TOHIMU. The Specific Plan designates the portion of San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site as a Community Street and Central Avenue as a Gateway Street. Multi-family residential land use is permitted for TOHIMU per Section 2.03.03 of the Specific Plan. There have been no substantial changes in environmental circumstances at or around the project site since certification of the Specific Plan EIR; the existing environment remains much as described in the Specific Plan EIR.

2.2 Specific Plan Development Capacity

The Specific Plan provides the framework for future development along San Pablo Avenue. The Specific Plan EIR analyzed a maximum development capacity of 1,706 new residential units and 243,112 square feet of new commercial space, as shown in Table 1. Since approval of the Specific Plan, 917 residential units and 30,662 square feet of commercial space are under construction, have been proposed, or are in some stage of the City’s approval process.

---

\(^1\) Joe DeCredico Studio, project plans, 2017.
Table 1  San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area Development Capacity 2013-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Commercial (Square Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Existing Conditions (2013)</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2,016,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Development – Net New (2040)</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>243,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Future– Existing (2013) + Net New (2040)</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>2,259,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Capacity Remaining (2018)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>212,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 Project Characteristics

The project would include demolition of the one existing structure on site and construction of a new 48,641 square-foot, six-story, 64-foot tall2 multi-family residential building with a total of 62 dwelling units, as shown on Figure 5. The proposed residential units would include a combination of studios, 1-bedroom, and 2-bedroom units. Construction of the project is expected to be completed in one phase and last approximately 18 months.

The project would be accessible by automobiles, public transit, bicycles, and walking. A bus stop is located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue, and the El Cerrito Plaza Bart station is approximately 0.25 miles east of the project site. The project would enhance pedestrian and bicycle access by updating the sidewalk along the project perimeter on San Pablo Avenue and installing 93 long-term bicycle storage spaces in an underground garage. Seven short-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided for the project along San Pablo Avenue. Auto access to the project would be provided via a 20-foot wide driveway along San Pablo Avenue, connecting to a surface parking lot with 3 parking spaces and a subsurface parking garage with 31 parking spaces, including 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. The 31 parking spaces would provide a parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit, which would be consistent with TOHIMU regulations in the Specific Plan, which set forth a parking maximum of 1 space per unit.

The building would be set back a minimum of 15 feet, 10 inches from the curb line of San Pablo Avenue on the ground floor. Starting at the fourth floor, the project would be stepped back at the rear of the building at a 45-degree angle, as shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Landscaping would be provided along San Pablo Avenue, along the perimeters of the project site, and a 2,639 square foot rooftop deck available for residents’ use, as shown in Figure 8.

---

2 Measured from the finished grade to bottom of parapet along San Pablo Avenue.
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3 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

The following discussion addresses the potential level of impact relating to each aspect of the environment.

3.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to: trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion

As noted in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code and Complete Streets design guidelines and development standards. These guidelines and standards support and maintain a strong sense of place and visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are included in Chapter 2, Form Based Code and Chapter 3, Complete Streets of the Specific Plan.

The City’s location between the I-80 freeway and the East Bay Hills affords views of the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, and Mt. Tamalpais. The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the Specific Plan EIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way, and areas of lower elevation such as hillside homes in El Cerrito.

---

and Richmond (Impact 4-1).\textsuperscript{4} This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, the Specific Plan EIR requires individual development projects to complete further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan addresses views from the public right-of-way of streets that run east and west, as well as BART platforms. The project plans modeled the views from the platform of the El Cerrito Plaza BART station, with the addition of the project, as shown in Figure 9. These images show that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mount Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the San Francisco skyline). The El Cerrito Zoning Administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required from public rights-of-way of east-west streets for the following reasons:

- The project site is located within the southwestern portion of the City, which has a lower elevation.
- Streets that run east and west with potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Central Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and Avila Street. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site from Central Avenue and Eureka Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Avila Street may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the public right-of-way of Avila Street.
- The Specific Plan limits building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The project would be less than 200 feet in length.

The Specific Plan EIR also determined potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but concluded implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of non-reflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less-than-significant level. With adherence to this mitigation measure, the project would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, is within the allowable height limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

Figure 9 Visual Simulations
3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or with a Williamson Act contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR determined there are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. There is no land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within Specific Plan area or the City. In addition, the City does not contain woodland, forestland cover, or land zoned for timberland production. The project is within the Specific Plan area and therefore is not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract or any other type of agricultural or forestry land. Given this, no new impacts would occur.

---

### 3.3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling. Therefore, a project-specific Air Quality Analysis report was prepared for the project and is included as Appendix A. The results of this analysis are provided below.

**Clean Air Plan Consistency**

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines were referenced to determine if the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan, which for the Specific Plan EIR was the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP). The Specific Plan EIR found that since the Specific Plan would not cause significant increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared to service population growth, and would not interfere with CAP control measures, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to consistency with the applicable clean air plan.
BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 CAP, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. The 2017 CAP provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. To protect public health, the plan describes how BAAQMD will continue progress toward attaining all State and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities caused by air pollution among Bay Area communities. To protect the climate, the plan defines a vision for transitioning the Bay Area to a post-carbon economy and provides a regional climate protection strategy that will put the Bay Area on a pathway to achieve ambitious greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets for 2030 and 2050.

The 2017 CAP includes a wide range of control measures designed to decrease emissions of the air pollutants that are most harmful to Bay Area residents. Such pollutants include particulate matter, ozone, and toxic air contaminants (TACs). Additionally, the 2017 CAP includes measures to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by reducing fossil fuel combustion, as well as methane and other “super-GHGs” that have a larger greenhouse gas effect than carbon dioxide in the near-term.

Consistency with the CAP is determined by whether or not a proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., excessive parking or preclude extension of transit lane or bicycle path).

Implementation of the project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services, all of which would individually and collectively encourage residents to reduce their VMT. In addition, dwelling units constructed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR.

As discussed above, implementation of the project would not increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT above what was anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Trip generation anticipated under the project is discussed in detail in Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the CAP and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the CAP designed to bring the Bay Area into attainment. Consistent with the Specific Plan EIR, this impact would remain less than significant.

Construction-Related Impacts

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction from implementation of the Specific Plan would result in short-term emissions. Such activities would include site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction, fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials and can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 which would require BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1 would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Development of the project would result in similar construction-related, short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1 would be required. With adherence to the mitigation measure, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.
**Ambient Air Quality Impacts**

As described in the Specific Plan EIR, monitoring data from all ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Bay Area indicate existing carbon monoxide (CO) levels currently meet State and national ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the Bay Area has been designated as an attainment area for CO emissions. At the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified, the highest measured CO levels at the closest monitoring station to the Specific Plan area over the previous three years were 1.3 parts per million (ppm) for eight-hour averaging periods, compared with State and Federal criteria of 9.0 ppm. Monitored CO levels have decreased substantially since 1990 as newer vehicles with greatly improved exhaust emission control systems have replaced older vehicles.

Even though CO levels in the Bay Area are well below ambient air quality standards, elevated levels of CO still warrant analysis. CO hotspots (occurrences of localized high CO concentrations) can occur near busy, congested intersections. Recognizing the relatively low CO concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less than significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the Specific Plan EIR, peak hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the Specific Plan would be far below this threshold. The project would not generate vehicles trips beyond what was considered and analyzed in the Specific Plan. Given this, impacts related to CO hotspots would remain less than significant. Further discussion of project trip generation is provided in Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic.

**Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants**

Sensitive receptors are defined as residential uses, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical centers. The Specific Plan EIR determined construction activities could result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known TAC. Individuals particularly vulnerable to DPM are children, whose lung tissue is still developing, and the elderly, who may have serious health problems that can be aggravated by exposure to diesel particulate matter. Exposure from diesel exhaust associated with construction activity contributes to both cancer and chronic non-cancer health risks.

The length of time sensitive receptors are exposed to TACs and the concentration of TACs during exposure are the primary factors used to determine health risk. Health risk is quantitatively evaluated by determining the potential for exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards. Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer. The calculation of cancer risk associated with exposure to TACs is typically based on a 70-year period of exposure. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment, however, would be temporary and episodic and would occur over a relatively large area.

Sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. Construction of the project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement the best management practices (BMPs) during construction, as required by Mitigation Measure 5-1. With implementation of BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction, Mitigation Measure 5-1 would ensure that project construction emissions would fall below BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as described in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant
concentrations during project construction. The project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short-term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, and further analysis is not required.

Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the placement of new sensitive receptors in the Specific Plana area, as well as new non-residential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. The roadway screening analysis tables from the Specific Plan EIR indicate health risk from high-volume surface streets such as San Pablo Avenue, Central Avenue, Carlson Boulevard, and Potrero Avenue would be less than significant at average daily traffic volumes (ADT) of 40,000 vehicles or less at a distance of 10 feet. The Specific Plan EIR determined that if individual projects are constructed under the Specific Plan in close proximity to surface streets with daily traffic volumes higher than 40,000 ADT, a potentially significant impact would occur. Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires completion of a site-specific health risk assessment for projects within close proximity to these roadways.

The project site is located within 15 feet of San Pablo Avenue and 100 feet of Central Avenue. Therefore, to comply with Mitigation Measure 5-3, a project-specific health risk assessment was prepared in December 2017 (Appendix A).

According to BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Individually expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million,
- Increase non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or
- Cause an annual average ambient particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (μg/m$^3$).

A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project, in combination with other projects located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site, would expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 10.0 on the hazard index (chronic), or an ambient PM$_{2.5}$ increase greater than 0.8 μg/m$^3$ on an annual average basis. Impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations are discussed below.

The air quality assessment calculated TACs within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site. TAC emissions from traffic on nearby roadways including San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue, and TACs from stationary sources were calculated. Permitted stationary sources of air pollution near the project site were identified using BAAQMD’s Stationary Source Risk and Hazard Analysis Tool. This mapping tool identified the location of two stationary sources and their estimated risk and hazard impacts. Only one of these sources produces TAC emissions: a “76” gas station, located at 3160 Carlson Boulevard, approximately 130 feet southwest of the closest proposed residences under the project.

The combined community risk levels at the project site from all sources (roadways and stationary sources) are summarized in Table 2. Combined health risks for all measured TACs are below BAAQMD thresholds.
Table 2  Community Risk Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (per million)*</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Concentration (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Acute and Chronic Hazard (HI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadways – San Pablo Avenue at 25 feet; 20,580 Average Daily Trips</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadways – Central Avenue at 170 feet; 9,100 Average Daily Trips</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Gas Station at 130 feet</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>&lt;0.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BAAQMD Thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cancer Risk</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Concentration</th>
<th>Acute and Chronic Hazard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Source (Maximum)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Cumulative) Sources</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Significant? | No | No | No |


*Cancer risk adjusted for 2015 OEHHA methods

The project would not result in new or more severe impacts related to long term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, further analysis is not required.

**Odors**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded the Specific Plan area includes potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. However, most of these major existing sources are already buffered by existing uses. Responses to odors are subjective, and vary by individual and type of use. Sensitive land uses that include outdoor uses, such as residences and possibly daycare facilities, are likely to be affected most by existing odors. According to the Specific Plan, several land use types within the City are known to produce objectionable odors. The project site is not located within 1.0 miles of such odor-generating properties or land-use types. Given this, the project site would not be subject to potential odor complaints or associated impacts. Similarly, the project would entail residential development and would not create a new sources of objectionable odors.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5-1 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. Mitigation Measures 5-2 and 5-3 have been fulfilled through preparation of the project air quality health risk assessment. No new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse impact on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to: marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR found that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources, because the Specific Plan area is almost entirely urbanized with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. The Specific Plan EIR concluded the Plan area does not contain any plant or animal 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 or US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

In addition, the Specific Plan area does not contain any federally protected wetlands. The only identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community within the Specific Plan area is riparian habitat adjacent to Cerrito Creek (near the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center parking lot and Ohlone Greenway) and Baxter Creek. Cerrito Creek is located approximately 0.3 miles south of the project site. The creek is separated from the project site by dense residential and commercial land uses and several local arterial roadways including Carlson Boulevard, San Pablo Avenue, and Central Avenue, which all have at least four travel lanes.

Baxter Creek at Gateway Park is located approximately 2.0 miles northwest of the project site, and is also separated from the project site by dense residential, commercial, and industrial land uses as well as several highly trafficked roadways. As it is unlikely for species to traverse the urban, built-up land uses between Cerrito Creek, Baxter Creek, and the project site, implementation of the project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to these habitats or the species that my occur within these natural communities. The project site is covered in paved surfaces with no surface vegetation beyond street trees along the project perimeter. As such, the project site does not provide any valuable habitat beyond the street trees.

The Specific Plan EIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the Specific Plan. Removal of existing trees containing nest or eggs of migratory birds, raptors or bird species during the nesting season would be considered an “unlawful take” under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. As the project would require removal of 2 trees, adherence to Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be mandatory. Mitigation Measure 6-1 avoids the removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation during the bird nesting season spanning February 1 through August 31. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be required to adequately minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less-than-significant levels.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion
The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with Mitigation Measure 6-1. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic features?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion

**Historic Resources**

The Specific Plan EIR identified properties or features within the Specific Plan area that may be eligible for listing in a local, State, or Federal register of historic resources. The Specific Plan EIR identified **Mitigation Measure 7-1** to be applied to any individual discretionary project within the Specific Plan area that the City determines may involve a property that contains a potentially significant historic resource.\(^6\) Per **Mitigation Measure 7-1**, such a resource shall be evaluated by City staff, and if warranted, shall be assessed by a qualified professional on the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) list of consultants who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to determine whether or not the property is a significant historic resource and whether or not the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the historic resource.

The project site contains one remnant outbuilding constructed in 1963 that is proposed for demolition. Buildings older than 45 years in age are routinely considered as potential historic resources pending evaluation by a qualified professional. To evaluate this building, a Historical Resource Assessment, including research and a field visit, was prepared in November 2017. The Historical Resource

---

\(^6\) A potentially significant historic resource is defined as a property that is unrecorded and thus, has not been listed in or formally determined eligible or ineligible for listing in any local, state or federal register. Properties containing unrecorded buildings or structures over 45 years old are conservatively considered potentially significant and historic.
Assessment is included as Appendix B. As documented in the assessment, the structure located on the project site does not meet any of the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, and is thus not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.\(^7\)

**Archeological and Paleontological Resources**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded potential impacts on cultural resources from development within the Specific Plan area, including archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Discovery and disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and excavation at individual project sites. The Specific Plan EIR concluded Mitigation Measure 7-2 and Mitigation Measure 7-3 would reduce potential impacts on unknown cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

In accordance with Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 7-2, a non-confidential CHRIS records search was undertaken at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University for the project site and vicinity (Included in Appendix B).\(^8\) The records search confirmed there are no recorded cultural resources on the project site or in the project vicinity. However, the records search determined there is a high potential of identifying Native American archaeological resources and a high potential of identifying historic-period archaeological resources within the project site and vicinity.

Implementation of Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, which specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains during construction activities, would be required. These measures ensure that if archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. These mitigation measures would minimize any potentially significant impacts associated with accidental archaeological discoveries to a less-than-significant level.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 and Mitigation Measure 7-3 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. Mitigation Measure 7-1 has been fulfilled through preparation of the project Historic Resources Assessment and CHRIS search. No new mitigation measures would be required.

---

\(^7\) JRP, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Historical Resource Assessment for the Property at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California.

\(^8\) 10167 San Pablo Avenue CHRIS Request, 2017.
Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. Ground disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2 and Mitigation Measure 7-3. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.6 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   iv) Landslides?

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in table 18-1b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that geologic and soil impacts would be primarily related to potential ground shaking during seismic events and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the Specific Plan area is not located within an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. The Specific Plan EIR determined slope instability hazards are minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the Specific Plan area.

The Specific Plan area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward Fault or one of the other active faults in the region. The Hayward Fault is the nearest active fault to the Specific Plan area, approximately 1 mile to the east. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded grading and construction activities within the Specific Plan area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. The project site is entirely covered in paved surfaces, and would be excavated to construct an underground parking garage. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques would mitigate the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of the Specific Plan would have potentially significant impacts related to earthquake-induced on-site liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, and subsidence, and associated damage to project buildings and other improvements within the Specific Plan area. However, potential impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires preparation and implementation of the recommended measures of a site-specific design-level geotechnical study for individual development projects.

Expansive soil or soil with shrink-swell potential and low strength with variations in moisture content is a common cause of foundation distress. As indicated by the Foundation Investigation and Recommendation report completed for the project site in April 2017 (included in this document as Appendix C), the project site is largely underlain by soils known to be highly expansive. However, damage to surface improvements from expansive soils may be avoided by proper engineering of the foundations and flatwork and with installation and continued maintenance of landscaping and proper drainage. Per Mitigation Measure 8-1, the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical study will be implemented, reducing this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon where soils are subject to a loss of strength because of pressure from earthquakes. Soils found at the project site are a type generally not susceptible to liquefaction. Lateral spreading is a failure within a nearly horizontal soil layer that could occur due to liquefaction. Effects of lateral spreading from ground shaking would be reduced or avoided by designing structures to resist lateral forces in accordance with the 2016 California Building Code.

---

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project design plans are consistent with development standards analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code, City-required erosion control techniques, and Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 8-1. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

---

**Discussion**

As identified in the Specific Plan EIR, BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. BAAQMD suggests applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 metric tons (MT) per year per capita. Specific plans with emissions above the threshold would be considered to have an impact that, cumulatively, would be significant.

To calculate GHG emissions, Specific Plan land use types, total square footage of anticipated development, and trip generation rates were input to CalEEMod. CalEEMod predicts emissions of GHGs in the form of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions (CO$_2$e). Specific Plan GHG emissions were computed using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for two traffic scenarios, Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift. Both scenarios were calculated using projected operational emissions in 2040.

CalEEMod results showed that in the cumulative scenario year (2040), development under the Specific Plan would have per capita emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MT of CO$_2$e per year under Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively. The modeled per capita emissions for the Specific Plan would not exceed BAAQMD specific plan-level threshold of 4.6 MT of CO$_2$e /year. Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than significant.

BAAQMD does not have adopted thresholds of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. Instead, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of BMPs to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable, including, but not limited to: using local building materials of at least 10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. The 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requires a diversion rate of at least 65 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.
As documented in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the State and local level regarding GHG emissions. The Specific Plan is also subject to local and General Plan policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions, including policies in the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Given this, the Specific Plan is consistent with and conforms with applicable GHG emission reduction plans.

The project would be required to adhere to the building guidelines in the Specific Plan, would be consistent with the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, and would promote reductions in GHG emissions through mixed-use development in close proximity to transit. The project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and further analysis is not required.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for greenhouse gas impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would occur. The Specific Plan EIR did identify the potential for development to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during project construction due to the large number of auto-related businesses that previously operated in the Specific Plan area, including the project site. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined that compliance with all applicable jurisdictional City-, regional- and State-mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure potential impacts are less than significant.

The Specific Plan EIR determined residential, commercial, and open space uses proposed as part of the Specific Plan would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the Specific Plan area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substances such as fuel, paint, and solvents. These operations would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The Specific Plan EIR determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure potential impacts would be less than significant.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project site in December 2016 and is included as Appendix D. According to the Phase I ESA, sites of concern within the project vicinity include two dry-cleaners, Huey’s Laundry and Dry Cleaners (10160 San Pablo Avenue) and Sunrise Tailors and Cleaners (10160 San Pablo Avenue). In addition, numerous historic and current used car lots, auto wrecking yards, gasoline service stations and auto repair businesses have existed on and in the vicinity of the project site.

The Phase I ESA recommended collection of groundwater and shallow soil samples to investigate potential impacts by these automobile-related facilities. Accordingly, a subsequent Phase II Subsurface Investigation was conducted in January 2017 (included as Appendix D). The Phase II Subsurface Investigation report determined there is a low potential that on-site or up-gradient leaks or spills of gasoline, diesel, or motor oil have environmentally impacted soil or groundwater beneath the project site. The investigation also determined there is a low potential that dry-cleaning solvents potentially originating from two nearby up-gradient dry-cleaners have impacted groundwater beneath the project site.

The nearest school to the project site is Fairmont Elementary School located approximately 0.3 miles north of the project site. As the project site is located further than 0.25 miles from the school, no impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school would occur. The project site is located approximately 11 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. As the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no airport safety hazards

---


would occur. According to the Specific Plan EIR, no private airstrips are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the Specific Plan area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

Applicable Mitigation

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for hazards or hazardous material impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the development standards regarding hazards and hazardous materials analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. The project would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground disturbing activities. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

---

## 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Scenarios</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR determined long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan could result in stormwater runoff contamination from petroleum and other motor vehicle contaminants. However, compliance with Water Board and jurisdictional City-required post-construction, non-point source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the Specific Plan EIR determined compliance with applicable Water Board and City of El Cerrito water quality protection requirements and conditions of approval would ensure any potential construction-period and post-construction water quality impacts are less-than-significant.

Construction projects are required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of BMPs to control stormwater peak flows and pollutant levels. This requirement is stipulated in Provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). El Cerrito Municipal Code section 8.40.050 states that every application for a development project is required to submit a Stormwater Control Plan that meets the criteria in the most recent version of the Contra Costa Clean Water Program Stormwater C.3 Guidebook. Consistent with Provision C.3 requirements, the project applicant has already submitted a Stormwater Control Plan as part of the project application materials. If the project is approved, the City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and State requirements as part of the development review process.

The project would increase the amount of pervious surfaces on the site by 2,344 square feet. The increase in pervious surfaces would allow for more stormwater to be absorbed through the pervious surfaces and would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff. Further, the City’s General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include specifications for BMPs that would be implemented during project construction to control contamination of surface water flows and the potential discharge of pollutants. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure that pollutant levels in stormwater runoff would be less than significant.
The Specific Plan EIR identified that portions of the plan area (in the City of Richmond, along Central Avenue) are located within a 100-year flood zone.\textsuperscript{13} However, the project site is not located within this zone and would therefore not place people or structures in a 100-year flood zone. The Specific Plan EIR determined the Specific Plan area is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the Specific Plan along Central Avenue in the City of Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the project site is not within this area.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for hydrology or water quality impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be consistent with the development standards required in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

3.10 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?  
   - No   - No   - No   - Yes

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?  
   - No   - No   - No   - Yes

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  
   - No   - No   - No   - Yes

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded implementation of the Specific Plan would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use development in the Plan area at densities and heights greater than currently permitted. The Specific Plan EIR determined implementation of the Specific Plan would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor. The Specific Plan facilitates development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, infrastructure, and public transportation centers.

The Specific Plan would not include construction of any new roadway systems or physical barriers, and would promote connectivity along the San Pablo Avenue corridor by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing. Accordingly, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in the division of an established community.

As previously discussed, the project site is designated TOHIMU in the City’s General Plan and Specific Plan.\(^{14}\) In addition, the site is also zoned as TOHIMU. The intent of the TOHIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher density area within a half mile of Bay Area Rapid Transit

(BART) that allows a for variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the Downtown and Uptown areas.\textsuperscript{15} The TOHIMU designation allows for a 65-foot height limit (85 feet is permissible for projects subject to the State affordable housing bonus program) and requires a minimum height of three stories for residential uses.

The project would construct a 64-foot tall residential building, which is within the 65-foot height limit. The City’s Design Review Board will consider the project site plan and make findings related to any project design elements, as contemplated by the form based code guidelines articulated in the Specific Plan. The project would comply with the standards of the TOHIMU designation and would develop the site with high density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the Specific Plan EIR. The El Cerrito Plaza BART station is located approximately 0.25 miles east of the project site, and a bus stop is located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan would result in beneficial land use and planning effects. The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for land use and planning impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be consistent with the development standards envisioned in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

3.11 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

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?

Discussion

As stated in the Specific Plan EIR, the El Cerrito General Plan determined that there are no mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Accordingly, there are no identified resources in proximity to the project site. Given this, implementation of the project would have no impact on mineral resources.

---

### 3.12 Noise and Vibration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in 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 the other agencies?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

This section compares construction and operational noise impacts from the project with impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. While the Specific Plan EIR addressed noise and vibration impacts more generally, a Noise Impact Study was completed for the project in December 2017.

Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would be generated by the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by the residential land use such as exterior mechanical equipment (air conditioning systems, fans, etc.). Given the nature of the project, proposed dwelling
units are not anticipated to introduce long-term operational vibration impacts to the surrounding area. In turn, existing sources of vibration in the project vicinity would not result in adverse impacts to residents.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses. The closest sensitive receptors include residential buildings to the west of the project site.

*Exterior Noise Environment*

The Specific Plan EIR determined new residential land uses developed under the Specific Plan would be exposed to exterior noise levels of 70 dBA Ldn or greater, which exceed El Cerrito’s noise and land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified *Mitigation Measure 13-1*, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

A Noise Impact Study was conducted for the project in December 2017 to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per Specific Plan EIR *Mitigation Measure 13-1*. Future noise levels were estimated based on noise measurement data gathered at the project site in November 2017 and cumulative (2040) traffic increases calculated in the Specific Plan EIR. Noise measurement details are provided in *Appendix E*.

Under existing conditions, the exterior noise environment ranges from 57 to 70 dBA during the day and 51 to 68 dBA at night. This is based on noise measurements taken at the project site in November 2017. In the future, after full buildout of the Specific Plan, the exterior noise environment is anticipated to increase up to 1 dBA Ldn, resulting in future noise levels ranging from 70 to 71 dBA Ldn at a distance of 50 feet from San Pablo Avenue.

The proposed fifth- and sixth-floor roof decks would be partially shielded from traffic noise by the design of the building and the building height. The setback of the easternmost edge of the roof deck would be approximately 65 feet or more from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. At this distance, the roof deck would have future exterior noise levels below 60 dBA Ldn. At the northern and southern edges of the roof decks, future noise levels would be up to 61 dBA Ldn. However, since the majority of the activity areas would be located towards the center of the outdoor spaces and away from the edges of the roof decks, the building height and design would provide adequate shielding to reduce future exterior noise levels to 60 dBA Ldn or less.

The ground level open space at the rear (western) side of the building would be shielded from traffic noise by the building, and would be 180 feet or more from San Pablo Avenue. At this distance, future exterior noise levels would be 60 dBA Ldn or less.

Therefore, outdoor use areas associated with the project would not be exposed to noise levels that would exceed the City’s exterior noise level limits. The future noise environment would be compatible with the City’s General Plan threshold and would not result in new or greater impacts than those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.
**Interior Noise Environment**

Interior noise environment is dependent on both the exterior noise environment (noise coming in from outside) and the noise attenuation capabilities of the selected building materials. Exterior noise levels on all sides of the project would range from 60 to 71 dBA Ldn, as described below.

The proposed residential units along the building’s eastern side would be set back 50 to 55 feet from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. These residential units would be exposed to traffic noise with little noise shielding. At a distance of 50 to 55 feet, dwelling units on the eastern side of the building would be exposed to future exterior noise levels ranging from 70 to 71 dBA Ldn.

The northern and southern façades would be exposed to largely unobstructed noise from San Pablo Avenue at a distance of 50 to 190 feet. The southern façade would also be exposed to traffic noise from Central Avenue at a distance of 200 to 230 feet. At these distances, units along the northern façade would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 64 to 71 dBA Ldn, and units along the southern façade would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 66 to 71 dBA Ldn.

Due to the angle of the proposed building and the location of existing surrounding buildings, the western façade would be mostly shielded from traffic noise and would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 60 to 66 dBA Ldn.

Standard construction for residential buildings under the California Building Code (STC-24 to STC-28) would provide more than 25 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows closed and 15 dBA with windows open. When windows in the future dwelling units along the north, east, and south sides of the building are open, interior noise levels would not meet the City’s normally acceptable residential interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn (i.e., 71 dBA – 15 dBA = 56 dBA).

Therefore, an alternate form of ventilation, such as an air-conditioning system, would be required to ensure that windows can remain closed for prolonged time periods. Implementation of the following noise reduction measure, consistent with the requirements of Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 13-1, would be required to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less:

1. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** The project design shall implement the following measures to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less, in compliance with City noise standards:
   - **Interior Noise Control Measures**
     - Exterior finishes shall have a minimum STC rating of 46
     - Residential doors and windows along the eastern façade shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30
     - Residential doors and windows along the northern façade within 150 feet of San Pablo Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
     - All residential doors and windows along the southern façade shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
   - Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residential units on the project site so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise and achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less
• As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the applicant may provide a detailed acoustical analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer and shall outline the specific measures required to meet the City’s 45 dB Ldn and 50-55 dBA Lmax interior noise level standards.

Construction Noise

Construction is permitted by the City between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sundays or holidays. The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during other construction activities. Large pieces of earth-moving equipment such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 65 to 88 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods. These noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the noise source and receptor. Intervening structures or terrain attenuate the noise, resulting in lower noise levels.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that while construction noise would be temporary and localized to individual project sites, existing businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout Specific Plan implementation. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dBA or higher. Such a large increase in noise levels, although short-term in duration, was determined to be a potentially significant impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, which provides mitigation for temporary construction noise at residential and commercial land uses. However, construction noise impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Project construction is expected to take 18 months to complete. The project-specific Noise Impact Study assumed a typical maximum construction noise level of 70 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet during the noisiest construction activities. Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on adjacent uses; the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short term construction noise reaching 90 dBA.

Therefore, noise levels would at times exceed 60 dBA Leq at nearby residential land uses and would at times exceed 70 dBA Leq at nearby commercial land uses. Further, ambient noise levels at the surrounding uses would potentially be increased by 5 dBA Leq or more at various times throughout construction. Mitigation Measure 13-3 would be required.

While project construction could elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dBA, this impact is consistent with construction noise impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than those anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Implementation of the project would be required to comply with the Municipal Code and General Plan, and would require implementation of Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 13-3.
Construction-Related Vibration

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction under the Specific Plan would in some cases be located directly adjacent to existing weakened structures. Depending on the proximity of existing structures to the construction site, the structural soundness of the surrounding existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, construction may cause vibration levels high enough to damage existing structures.

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction-related vibration impacts would be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4, which requires projects to avoid pile driving, vibratory rolling, and tampers wherever feasible, and requires site-specific vibration studies in areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities. Since avoiding all use of vibration-generating construction equipment may not be feasible, even with mitigation, this impact was found to be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4 would be required for the project. No historic buildings or buildings that are documented to be structurally weakened are adjacent to or adjoin the project site. Construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams) are used. Construction activities would include site preparation work, foundation work, and new building framing and finishing. Construction of the project would also involve demolition of one small concrete structure and excavation for an underground parking structure. Pile driving, which can cause excessive vibration, is not anticipated to be required or used during project construction.

The nearest existing residential structures are located 25 feet from the western property line. At this distance, construction vibration levels would be up to 0.21 inches/second Peak Particle Velocity (in/sec PPV), which is below the 0.3 in/sec PPV threshold. Residential structures are also located approximately 40 feet to the north of the site. At this distance buildings would be exposed to vibration levels at or below 0.13 in/sec PPV. Additionally, a commercial building approximately 50 feet south of the site and would be exposed to vibration levels at or below 0.10 in/sec PPV. Opposite San Pablo Avenue, to the east of the project site, commercial and residential structures would be exposed to vibration levels up to 0.04 in/sec PPV.

Therefore, vibration levels due to the use of construction equipment would not exceed the 0.3 in/sec PPV vibration threshold. The project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period vibration impacts than were described in the Specific Plan EIR.

Permanent Stationary Source Noise Impacts

The Specific Plan EIR determined that new permanent mechanical equipment installed as a part of Specific Plan commercial development would generate noise, further increase the ambient noise environment and result in a potentially significant noise impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-2, which requires site-specific analysis for proposed commercial uses to reduce long-term noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project would not introduce new commercial uses; therefore, this mitigation measure would not apply.
Multi-family residential buildings typically require various mechanical equipment including air conditioners, exhaust fans, and air handling equipment for ventilation of the buildings. A mechanical equipment room would be located in the basement level garage of the project building, and mechanical equipment would also be located on the rooftop.

According to the City’s General Plan, mechanical equipment noise must be maintained at or below 55 dBA Leq during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and at or below 45 dBA Leq during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at sensitive receptors. Residences located to the west of the project site experience an average daytime ambient noise environment of 60 dBA Leq and nighttime average ambient noise environment of 56 dBA Leq.

As described in the General Plan, if ambient noise levels exceed acceptable levels, the threshold for impacts to the noise environment shall be an increase in the ambient noise environment. Therefore, operation of the project must maintain an ambient noise level of 60 dBA Leq during daytime hours and at or below 56 dBA Leq during nighttime hours at the adjacent residences to meet the City’s stationary noise requirements.

Given the close proximity of noise-sensitive receptors and the unknown type of mechanical equipment to be selected, it is conservatively assumed that mechanical equipment noise could result in an increase in the ambient noise environment at these receptors. Implementation of the following noise reduction measure would be required:

2. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Mechanical equipment shall be selected and designed to reduce impacts on surrounding uses to meet the City’s 60 dBA Leq daytime and 56 dBA Leq nighttime noise level requirements at the property line of nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further noise reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, selection of equipment that emits low noise levels and/installation of noise barriers, such as enclosures and parapet walls, to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the nearest receptors. Alternate measures may include locating equipment in less noise-sensitive areas, such as the rooftop of the building away from the building’s edge nearest the noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible.

**Mobile Source Noise Impacts**

Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity, and implementation of the project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. The Specific Plan EIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the Specific Plan, would not increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area.

According to the City’s General Plan, a substantial increase would occur if a project would result in a 3 dBA Ldn increase over existing conditions or if any increase would result in noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn. Since existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity exceed 60 dBA Ldn, a significant impact would occur if traffic from the project would permanently increase ambient levels by 3 dBA Ldn.
For reference, a 3 dBA Ldn noise increase would be expected if the project would double existing traffic volumes along a roadway. During the peak AM hour, the project would generate 18 trips. During the peak PM hour, the project would generate 28 trips. Compared to the existing traffic volumes along San Pablo Avenue, this would be an increase in peak hour traffic volumes of less than 2 percent. This would result in a traffic noise increase of less than 1 dBA Ldn. Therefore, the project would not result in a permanent noise increase of 3 dBA Ldn or more.

Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial, and the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**Aircraft Noise**

The Specific Plan EIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts because the Specific Plan area is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Oakland International Airport is the closest airport and is located approximately 11 miles southeast of the project site. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site; however, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours of any public airport, and no portion of the project site is within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, consistent with the Specific Plan EIR, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels form aircraft noise sources.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of *Mitigation Measure 13-3, Mitigation Measure 13-4*, and the project-specific condition of approval would be required. *Mitigation Measure 13-1* has been fulfilled through preparation of the project Noise Impact Study (*Appendix E*). No new mitigation would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed the Specific Plan EIR and consistent with development standards required in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.13 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts from a maximum buildout of approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. Such growth is consistent with local and regional plans, as detailed below.

The General Plan identifies the San Pablo Avenue corridor as the focus of new housing and population growth in the City, due its proximity to existing services, including public transportation infrastructure, and the opportunities for increased land use intensity afforded by underutilized land and surface parking lots.

Further, the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission have collaboratively adopted Plan Bay Area: Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area 2012-2040 (Plan Bay Area). The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area is identified as a "Priority Development Area" in Plan Bay Area, where “infill development and intensification is envisioned.” Plan Bay Area forecasted an increase of 2,350 housing units in the Specific Plan area by 2040. While projections included in Plan Bay Area are not mandates, the 1,706 housing units proposed under the project would be consistent with local and regional plans for housing and population growth.
The Specific Plan EIR concluded population growth associated with the Specific Plan will not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the Specific Plan boundaries. Rather, Specific Plan implementation will facilitate residential and commercial growth within a transit-rich, mixed use area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts. Therefore, the Specific Plan’s direct and indirect impact on population growth was determined to be less than significant.

As discussed in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan will not require or induce the displacement of housing. Over time, existing residential units may be voluntarily replaced by property owners in accordance with Specific Plan provisions and allowable land uses. However, the residential and mixed-use focus of the Specific Plan provides for the addition of approximately 1,706 net new residential units in the Specific Plan area, offsetting any loss of housing. Accordingly, impacts associated with displacement from the Specific Plan were found to be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would introduce 62 new housing units, which is consistent with development anticipated in the Specific Plan. For these reasons, implementation of the project would not result in any impacts related to population and housing beyond those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for population and housing impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in regional planning documents and the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.14 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

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? □ □ □ X

ii) Police protection? □ □ □ X

iii) Schools? □ □ □ X

iv) Parks? □ □ □ X

v) Other public facilities? □ □ □ X

Discussion

Schools

The Specific Plan area is located within the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). According to the Specific Plan EIR, WCCUSD student yield factors for multi-family units indicate the addition of 1,706 new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in the District schools over the approximately 25-year horizon of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan EIR concluded new students would be accommodated in existing WCCUSD schools, and Specific Plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. As the population and housing units proposed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the Specific Plan EIR (Table 1), the number of new students generated by the project would be within the assumptions of the Specific Plan EIR. As such, existing school facilities could accommodate the project.
Fire

The Specific Plan EIR concluded additional demand associated with buildout of the Specific Plan could be accommodated by the existing El Cerrito Fire Department fire protection facilities and personnel. Specifically, the Specific Plan EIR determined any demand for additional fire protection personnel or equipment resulting from Specific Plan buildout would be funded by the annual budget review and allocation in El Cerrito. Given this, impacts to fire protection services were determined to be less than significant. As the number of dwelling units proposed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the Specific Plan EIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

Police

The Specific Plan EIR determined increased demand for police services associated with buildout of the Specific Plan would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Specific Plan EIR reasoned that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in more “eyes-on-the-street” through creation of a more pedestrian-friendly corridor, which would in turn provide a safer public environment. The Specific Plan EIR identified police department approvals that would be required on a project-by-project basis to ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. The project would add 62 new dwelling units, which is consistent with the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new impacts to police services.

Parks and Other Public Facilities

The Specific Plan EIR determined implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a need for new or physically altered government facilities. Further discussion of parks and recreation resources is provided in Section 3.15, Parks and Recreation.

Applicable Mitigation

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for impacts to public services, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

Development of the project would be within the development assumptions evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.15 Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increase the use of existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood and regional parks or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other recreational facilities such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that substantial physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deterioration of the facility would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or require the construction or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion of recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which might have an adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical effect on the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion

Buildout of the Specific Plan would generate 1,706 new residences and increase the local population by 3,840 people. The increased local population would create an increased demand on parks and recreational facilities. The City’s General Plan establishes a ratio of 5 acres of parks and recreational facilities per 1,000 residents as the level of service standard. In 2010, the City had a ratio of 6.67 acres per 1,000 residents. With full buildout of the Specific Plan, which includes plans for open spaces, the ratio within the City would be 5.85 acres of parks and recreational facilities per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the ratio of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents would be above the adopted level of service standard. The Specific Plan EIR concluded the combination of existing and proposed parks and greenways within the Specific Plan area and its vicinity would meet the City’s requirements for parks and open space.

The project would add 62 new residential units to the site, which is consistent with the anticipated population increase analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in additional demand for parks and recreational facilities beyond what was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR.

#### Applicable Mitigation

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for impacts to parks and recreation resources, and no new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion

Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.16 Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts that would result from implementation of the project with impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. A Preliminary Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was completed for the project in November 2017 and is included as Appendix F.

The Specific Plan EIR determined buildout of the Specific Plan would cause the intersection at San Pablo Avenue/Cutting Boulevard to fall from LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E when considered cumulatively with existing conditions all other planned and reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative scenario year 2040. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 16-1, which required adoption and implementation of the San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Plan to reduce vehicle trips and change the City’s standard for acceptable LOS from D to E. However, because the projected mode shift associated with the Complete Streets Plan could not be assured, the impact was concluded to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

The Specific Plan assumed several roadway improvements would occur as part of the Specific Plan buildout. In the vicinity of the project, several roadway modifications along San Pablo Avenue in the downtown area were included to improve circulation for all modes. The City of El Cerrito is currently in the process of refining the multimodal improvements identified in the Specific Plan. The City is also developing a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to determine fair-share payment for individual development projects to finance the implementation of these improvements. The TIA determined that the additional traffic associated with the project would require fair-share mitigation fee payment, to be determined by the City. This requirement would be applied to the project as a condition of approval:

1. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

Trip Generation

Using the same trip generation methodology used in the Specific Plan EIR, the transportation analysis estimated the project would generate 18 AM peak-hour and 28 PM peak-hour trips (See Table 3). Specific Plan EIR trip generation for the project site was projected as a part of a larger combined area called the McNevin Site. This area consisted of three parcels including the project site and two parcels to the north. A separate development is now proposed on the two parcels to the north and has been evaluated in a separate CEQA analysis. The TIA compared trip generation anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR against what is currently proposed on the McNevin Site.
The project, when considered with the separately proposed project at 10135 San Pablo Avenue, would generate 54 percent more trips in the AM peak hour and 12 percent more trips in the PM peak hour than assumed in the Specific Plan EIR for the entire McNevin site.

The Specific Plan EIR analyzed the San Pablo Avenue/Central Avenue intersection within the project vicinity, and reported LOS D or better for the intersection under Existing and Cumulative conditions during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the additional 15 AM peak hour trips and eight PM peak hour trips generated by project and the separately proposed project at 10135 San Pablo Avenue would likely not result in significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

Since the certification of the Specific Plan EIR, 20 developments, including this project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the City’s approval process. Table 4 summarizes the total land uses for these developments, which includes 917 residential units and 30,662 square feet of commercial uses. Compared to the Specific Plan EIR, the combined land uses for all planned, approved, and under construction projects, including this project, are less than the planned land uses assumed in the Specific Plan EIR. Thus, the project cumulatively combined with all planned, approved, and under construction projects in the Specific Plan area would not result in significant traffic impacts beyond those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

Table 4  Land Use Comparison: Planned, Approved, Constructed Projects in the Specific Plan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (DU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Planned, Approved, Constructed Projects</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Projects Assumed in Specific Plan EIR</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Built out</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017
Vehicle Access

The TIA concluded residents and visitors of the project would access the project site via a right-in/right-out driveway on San Pablo Avenue and that the driveway and the underground garage, including the drive aisle, would provide adequate circulation for vehicles entering and exiting the garage.

The project would provide 31 private residential parking spaces (0.5 per unit), including four car-share spaces and two Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant spaces. Three of the parking spaces (including the two ADA spaces) would be standard spaces, while the remaining 28 spaces would utilize parking lifts.

Project Driveway Site Distance

The TIA provided project design recommendations to improve project driveway site distance. The project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Adequate sight distance is defined as a clear line-of-sight between a motorist ten feet back from the sidewalk and a pedestrian 10 feet away on each side of the driveway. Sight distance would be adequate between vehicles exiting the garage driveway and vehicles traveling southbound on San Pablo Avenue. The transportation analysis recommendation would be applied to the project as a condition of approval to ensure adequate sight distance for vehicles to avoid impacts with pedestrians.

2. Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Applicant shall ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the adjacent crosswalk by installing mirrors on both sides of the driveway to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and install flashing lights to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway.

Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation

Section 2.05.07.04 of the Specific Plan Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses. Based on the proposed number of units, 93 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces would be required. The Project would provide 93 covered long-term bicycle parking spaces, located in the underground parking garage, and 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces that would be located along San Pablo Avenue, meeting Specific Plan requirements.

Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation

Pedestrians would access the building via a lobby entrance along San Pablo Avenue. The lobby entrance would provide direct access to units on the first floor, as well as stair and elevator access to the upper floor units. Pedestrian access between the parking garage and the building would be provided via stairs and elevator to the lobby entrance in the front of the building.

The Specific Plan Form-Based Code (Section 2.04.02) requires a minimum clear space for pedestrians of 8 feet on all sidewalks in commercial zones and 6 feet clear space in neighborhood zones. The project would provide 8 feet of clear sidewalk space for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue, meeting Specific Plan requirements.
Parking and TDM Requirements

The Specific Plan Form-Based Code requirements for the TOHIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOHIMU zoning requires a maximum of 1.0 automobile parking space per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan.

The project would provide a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit; 31 parking spaces in the underground parking garage for a total of 62 dwelling units. This would be consistent with Specific Plan parking standards.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of *Mitigation Measure 16-1* would be required along with implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type, density, and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.17 Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

   - [ ]

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

   - [ ]

**Discussion**

As confirmed in the CHRIS records search, there are no recorded cultural resources on or near the project site. As previously discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 would be required; this mitigation measure will protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

**AB 52**

Subsequent to certification of the Specific Plan EIR, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 states that prior to the release of an EIR or
negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. Formal consultation under AB 52 is not required for this project per Section 15162, which exempts project CEQA documents that do not require public review.\textsuperscript{17}

**Native American Sacred Lands File Search**

A Sacred Lands File search for the project site was submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on November 11, 2017 (included as Appendix G).\textsuperscript{18} The results of the NAHC Sacred Lands File Search showed tribal cultural resources exist at the project site or its vicinity. Tribes have been notified of the project as recommended by the NAHC. As previously discussed, the project will implement Mitigation Measure 7-2, thus, protecting previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated the potential impacts to prehistoric and archeological. Project-specific research and Native American contact for the project has confirmed the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated the potential tribal cultural resource impacts that would occur with implementation of the project. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

\textsuperscript{17} As the Specific Plan EIR was certified prior to July, 2015, and as this Program EIR Checklist supports the findings that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, there are no new or substantially more severe significant effects and mitigation required, the project is within scope and is not subject to AB 52.

\textsuperscript{18} 10167 San Pablo Avenue Sacred Lands File Search, 2017.
### 3.18 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The Specific Plan EIR determined water demand would increase as a result of buildout of the Specific Plan. Average daily demand was projected to be 882,720 gallons per day (gpd), which represents approximately 0.38 percent of the water demand forecasted in the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for the year 2040.
The Specific Plan EIR also noted development within the Specific Plan area would incorporate the City’s requirements for providing adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards, application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process, coordination of development review with East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) including consistency with the UWMP, and the requirement that new development pay a fair share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities as required by the City’s conditions of approval.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that since development facilitated by the Specific Plan would require about 0.38 percent of EBMUD’s forecasted planning level water demand for its service area by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply would be less than significant.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded development associated with the Specific Plan would result in less-than significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined wastewater and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, in order to accommodate new development facilitated by the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan EIR provided recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements.

The Stege Sanitary District provides wastewater service to properties along San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. This project applicant will participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

3. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** Applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

The Specific Plan EIR determined that significant, unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impacts would result from construction of the identified infrastructure improvements required to meet the Specific Plan buildout capacity.

Dwelling units constructed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. As such, the project would not increase demand on the wastewater infrastructure beyond that analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Given this, the project would not result in any impacts from expanded utility infrastructure beyond what was identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the Specific Plan would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated within the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan EIR concluded the increase in solid waste generation would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulation. Solid waste generated by the occupation and operation of Specific Plan development would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient long-term capacities to accommodate residential and commercial development of the Specific Plan development, including the project. Solid
waste in El Cerrito is collected by the East Bay Sanitary Company and processed at the Golden Bear Transfer Station in Richmond. After processing, landfill materials are transferred to the Keller Canyon Landfill in Contra Costa County. As such, solid waste impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Pacific Gas & Electricity would provide gas and electric services to the project site and EBMUD would provide water services.\(^{19,20}\)

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for utility impacts. Implementation of the project-specific condition of approval would be required, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, would be required. The project would not result in new significant or more severe impacts related to utilities. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the project and no new impacts related to utilities would result.

---


4 Reference Documents


Technical Appendices

The following resources were prepared in order to further identify project specific parameters. Copies of these technical documents are incorporated herein by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the City of El Cerrito.

B. JRP, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Historical Resource Assessment for the Property at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California and CHRIIS search results.