

MINUTE ITEM  
This Calendar Item No. C10  
was approved as Minute Item  
No. 10 by the State Lands  
Commission by a vote of 2  
to 0 at its 11/20/86  
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

C 10

A 11

11/20/86  
W 23807 PRC 7024  
Lane

S 7

GENERAL PERMIT - PUBLIC AGENCY USE

APPLICANT: Contra Costa County Public  
Works Department  
Attn: Julia R. Bueren  
255 Glacier Drive  
Martinez, California 94553-4897

AREA, TYPE LAND AND LOCATION:  
A 0.096-acre parcel of tide and submerged land,  
located in Wildcat Creek at Richmond,  
Contra Costa County.

LAND USE: Construction and maintenance of a bridge  
crossing.

TERMS OF PROPOSED PERMIT:  
Initial period: 49 years beginning December 1,  
1986.

CONSIDERATION: The public use and benefit; with the State  
reserving the right at any time to set a  
monetary rental if the Commission finds such  
action to be in the State's best interest.

BASIS FOR CONSIDERATION:  
Pursuant to 2 Cal. Adm. Code 2003.

APPLICANT STATUS:  
Applicant is permittee of upland.

PREREQUISITE CONDITIONS, FEES AND EXPENSES:  
Filing fee and processing costs have been  
received.

(PAGES 40-40.15 ADDED 11/17/86)

-1-

CALENDAR PAGE	<u>40</u>
MINUTE PAGE	<u>3719</u>

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C 10 (CONT'D)

STATUTORY AND OTHER REFERENCES:

- A. P.R.C.: Div. 5, Parts 1 and 2; Div. 13.
- B. Cal. Adm. Code: Title 2, Div. 3; Title 14, Div. 6.

AB 884: 01/01/87.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. Bridge construction over Wildcat Creek is a phase of the North Richmond Bypass project, sponsored by the City of Richmond, that will create a more convenient and efficient route for truck traffic through Richmond.

The creek channel at the site of the bridge crossing will also be a part of a new flood control project, sponsored by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Contra Costa County Flood Control District. Because of the much larger scope of the flood control project, the major impacts would be due to creek bed improvements rather than roadway construction. To ensure coordination of mitigation measures for the two projects, Contra Costa County is constructing the bridge. Work in the waterway will be restricted to the time frames allowed by the California State Department of Fish and Game. Project plans call for construction to commence in early 1987 for the three 30-foot span bridge.

2. An EIR was prepared and adopted for this project by the City of Richmond. The State Lands Commission's staff has reviewed such document and believes that it complies with the requirements of the CEQA. Additionally, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has prepared a Final Supplemental EIS on the flood control project, which the staff has considered.
3. The annual rental value of the site is estimated to be \$345.

(ADDED 11/17/86)

-2-

CALENDAR PAGE	40.1
MINUTE PAGE	3720

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C 10 (CONT'D)

4. This activity involves lands which have NOT been identified as possessing significant environmental values pursuant to P.R.C. 6370, et seq. However, the Commission has declared that all tide and submerged lands are "significant" by nature of their public ownership (as opposed to "environmental significant"). Since such declaration of significance is not based upon the requirements and criteria of P.R.C. 6370, et seq., use classifications for such lands have not been designated. Therefore, the finding of the project's consistency with the use classification as required by 2 Cal. Adm. Code 2954 is not applicable.

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

California State Department of Fish and Game,  
and United States Army Corps of Engineers.

FURTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED:

None.

EXHIBITS:



- A. Land Description.
- B. Location Map.
- C. EIS/EIR Summary.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. FIND THAT AN EIR WAS PREPARED AND ADOPTED FOR THIS PROJECT BY THE CITY OF RICHMOND AND THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.
2. DETERMINE THAT THE PROJECT, AS APPROVED, WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
3. FIND THAT THE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES ORIGINALLY IDENTIFIED PURSUANT TO P.R.C. 6370, ET SEQ., ARE NOT WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE AND WILL NOT BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT.
4. AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE TO CONTRA COSTA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF A 49-YEAR GENERAL PERMIT - PUBLIC AGENCY USE BEGINNING DECEMBER 1, 1986; IN CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC USE AND BENEFIT, WITH THE STATE RESERVING THE RIGHT AT ANY TIME TO SET A MONETARY RENTAL IF THE COMMISSION FINDS SUCH ACTION TO BE IN THE STATE'S BEST INTEREST; FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF A BRIDGE CROSSING ON THE LAND DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.


Water Depths around the Project:  
 National Ocean Survey Datum MLLW + 00', MHHW + 5.9'

- ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS**
1. JOSEPH & BETTY CARONE
  2. JOSEPH & BETTY CARONE
  3. WEST CONTRA COSTA SANITARY DISTRICT
  4. TILLE INSURANCE & TRUST COMPANY
  5. WEST CONTRA COSTA SANITARY DISTRICT
  6. HERMAN & CATHERINE MARTIN
  7. GOLDEN STATE SANWA BANK
  8. GOLDEN STATE SANWA BANK
  9. GOLDEN STATE SANWA BANK
  10. CONTRA COSTA COUNTY




37° 57' 47" N

MHHW = 5.9'



**PROPOSED NORTH RICHMOND BYPASS BRIDGES  
 ON WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS  
 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
 APPLICATION BY CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
 PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
 SHEET 1 OF 3  
 2-28-86**



SHEET 2 OF 2

EXHIBIT "A"  
LAND DESCRIPTION

W 23907

CALENDAR PAGE	40.4
MINUTE PAGE	3723

PROPOSED NORTH RICHMOND BYPASS BRIDGES  
ON WILDCAT CREEK  
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
APPLICATION BY CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
SHEET 2 OF 3 2-28-86





EXHIBIT "B"  
W 23807



CALENDAR PAGE

40.5

MINUTE PAGE

3724

EXHIBIT "C"  
EIS/EIR SUMMARY

CHAPTER 1

SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed North Richmond Bypass, upon ultimate completion, would be an eight-mile, four-lane high-speed (45 mph) arterial connecting I-580 (existing State Route 17) at Castro Street with I-80 at a new interchange north of the Hilltop Commercial Area. The proposed project would significantly reduce truck and other through traffic on residential streets in the cities of Richmond and San Pablo. It would be constructed in six phases, with the final phase scheduled for completion by 2000.

The North Richmond Bypass would constitute the northern counterpart to the Hoffman Corridor project which involves the improvement of the seven-mile Route I-580 (17) to six-lane freeway standards between I-80 near Buchanan Street in Albany and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. This project has already been approved and is expected to be completed by the year 2000. The proposed bypass would cross Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks, and would be coordinated with their proposed flood control improvements.

The limits of this DEIS/SEIR are Phases 1 through 6 (I-580 to I-80). The environmental impacts are addressed specifically for Phases 2 and 3 (Castro Street to Parr Boulevard) because these phases are expected to be Federally funded. The environmental impacts are addressed in a more general way for the overall project.

Four alternatives are evaluated in this report:

- 1) Completion of all phases of the proposed bypass;
- 2) Completion of all phases except Phase 4;
- 3) The improvement of existing streets; and
- 4) No project.

CALENDAR PAGE	40.6
MINUTE PAGE	3725

Alternative 1 is currently considered to be the preferred alternative, however, all alternatives are under consideration and the final selection has not yet been made.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

Construction of the proposed bypass would result in a change of land use in the right-of-way from open space to transportation use. Project cost is estimated to be 43.9 million, funded with a combination of developer exactions/fees, assessment districts, and federal/state monies. These are impacts of the project which are considered neither adverse nor beneficial.

Table 1.1 summarizes the environmental impacts of bypass construction and the mitigation measures which are designed to minimize these impacts. This table refers to Alternative 1, which is currently the preferred alternative. A comparison of all four alternatives follows.

TABLE 1.1

#### SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation
<u>Geology and Seismicity</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased soil erosion and sedimentation during the construction phase.</li><li>• Potential destabilization of landslide deposits in Phases 5 and 6 during construction.</li><li>• Seismically induced subsidence, lurching, liquefaction, and differential settlement of uncompacted sediments.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construction shall be timed to avoid exposing excavation and dirt stockpiling during the rainy season.</li><li>• A detailed geotechnical and engineering study shall be conducted to locate landslide and other potentially hazardous areas.</li><li>• Roadbeds or embankments shall be surcharged and/or lime treated to ensure minimum settlement over time and materials and/or pile footing shall be excavated to more dense sediments.</li></ul>

CALENDAR PAGE	40.7
MINUTE PAGE	3726



TABLE 1.1 - Continued

Impact	Mitigation
<u>Geology and Seismicity - continued</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seismically induced landslides in previously stable, metastable and unstable deposits in Phases 5 and 6.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A structural engineer specializing in earthquake-resistant design shall be consulted to ensure maximum earthquake resistance for the bypass.</li> </ul>
<u>Soils</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High shrink-swell potential and soil corrosivity could damage road, foundations, and utilities. Surface soils in Phases 2 and 3 are plastic and are poor quality subgrade materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first 6 inches of soils high in vegetation and surface organic matter shall be removed and exposed soils leveled and limed and/or surcharged.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differential settlement may occur where the approaching bypass joins creek crossing structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planned crossing structures for the two creeks shall be supported from the stiff older deeper marsh deposits. Periodic road maintenance might be needed more frequently due to settlement.</li> </ul>
<u>Hydrology and Floodplains</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raised roadbeds may have a barrier effect on runoff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culverts shall be installed where necessary to maintain east to west drainage.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater infiltration into excavations may contain hazardous wastes in certain areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater infiltration shall be analyzed before it is dewatered if there is reason to suspect that it is contaminated.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain parts of the bypass route are currently below the 100-year flood level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roadbed grade shall be above the 100-year flood level in areas with a flooding potential. This would not be necessary in areas where flood control project is implemented.</li> </ul>

CALENDAR PAGE	40.3
MINUTE PAGE	3727

TABLE 1.1 - Continued

Impact	Mitigation
--------	------------

Hydrology and Floodplains - continued

- Additional runoff and erosion may be expected as a result of an increased area of impervious surface.
- Construction shall take place during the dry season to minimize erosion and sedimentation. Sedimentation basins shall be constructed where appropriate to limit downstream sediment load during construction.

Biotic Resources

- Construction at creek crossings has a potential for the disruption of riparian habitats.
- Riparian areas shall be revegetated after construction of bridges except where incompatible with flood control improvements at Wildcat and San Pablo creeks.
- The small seasonal wetland area in Phase 4 may be disrupted if the route passes through it.
- Phase 4 shall be realigned to avoid passing through the wetland area.

Noise

- Although FHWA noise standards would not be exceeded, the residential areas to the west of Filbert/3rd Street in Phases 2 and 3, and to the north of Stanton Avenue in Phase 5 would be subject to increased noise levels during both construction and operation of the bypass.
- A noise barrier could be constructed in Phases 2 and 3. The Phase 5 section requires further study in order to develop an adequate mitigation.

Air Quality

- Fugitive dust would be the major source of emissions during construction.
- Regular watering and the paving of construction roads shall be used to control excess airborne dust.

CALENDAR PAGE	40.9
MINUTE PAGE	3728

TABLE 1.1 - Continued

Impact	Mitigation
<u>Water Quality</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and operation of the proposed bypass would generate a certain amount of additional pollution to San Pablo Bay and its creeks in the form of petroleum products from the roadway, settlement of air-borne particulates, the effects of acid precipitation, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runoff carried pollution of surface water shall be minimized by erosion control during construction.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased runoff during construction and bypass operation in the Wildcat Garden area of Phase 3 and other nurseries in the area could result in pesticide contamination of Wildcat Creek.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Public Health and Safety section for mitigation measures for possible hazardous waste contamination.</li> </ul>
<u>Visual Resources</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long stretches of the proposed bypass route would involve the conversion of open fields and hills to roadway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sides of the bypass shall be landscaped with drought-tolerant tree species to partially screen it from the view of nearby residents.</li> </ul>
<u>Public Services</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police and fire department response times could be increased during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detour routes shall be clearly marked and authorities notified of their location.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bypass may affect a Reserved Future Elementary School site located near Phase 5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final alignment of Phase 5 shall be designed to include a buffer zone between the roadway and school site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewer lines might be disrupted during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sanitation District requires notification before any disturbance of lines. Construction plans shall be coordinated with the District before commencement of work. Temporary connections may have to be provided.</li> </ul>

CALENDAR PAGE	4010
MINUTE PAGE	3729

TABLE 1.1 - Continued

Impact	Mitigation
<u>Public Services - continued</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water mains would be crossed throughout the length of the the bypass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction plans shall be coordinated with East Bay Municipal Utility District before commencement of work. The District shall be notified of any potential disruption to water mains.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed regional trail from the Point Pinole Regional Shoreline to the Hilltop area would have to go over or under the bypass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed regional trail shall be incorporated into the bypass plans.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG&amp;E transmission and distributionlines could be disrupted during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some lines may have to be re-routed. Construction plans shall be coordinated with PG&amp;E before commencement of work. PG&amp;E shall be notified of any alteration plans.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An unknown number of telephone lines would be crossed by the proposed bypass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction plans shall be coordinated with Pacific Bell and other phone companies before commencement of work. The phone companies shall be notified of all specific plans to disrupt telephone lines.</li> </ul>
<u>Public Health and Safety</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two potential hazardous waste areas would be crossed by the proposed bypass, and several others would be passed nearby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any suspicious soils or groundwater shall be analyzed to determine its danger to construction workers and what kind of disposal facilities are necessary. This shall be coordinated with the Department of Health Services and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</li> </ul>

TABLE 1.1 - Continued

Impact	Mitigation
<u>Historic and Archaeological Resources</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One prehistoric site is located within the right of way of Phase 2. Another is located in the vicinity of Phase 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care shall be taken not to disturb the Phase 2 site. Phase 4 shall be designed to avoid crossing the site there.</li> </ul>

Implementation of the proposed project would have a number of beneficial impacts which are listed below:

- The bypass would remove trucks and other traffic from residential streets in North Richmond and San Pablo.
- Completion of the proposed bypass would improve access for businesses currently operating near the route, as well as making available industrial parcels more attractive for investment. Neighborhood traffic circulation problems would also be significantly reduced.
- After bypass completion, police response time and fire protection is anticipated to improve due to improved access.
- The bypass would provide easier access to parks. The number of people using these parks would be expected to increase.
- Without the bypass, air quality impacts along I-80 could conceivably violate the 1-hour and/or 8-hour CO standards, especially under congested traffic conditions. Construction of the bypass would relieve congestion on I-80 and could prevent violation of air quality standards there.
- Construction of all phases would result in a lower annual net energy use than the other evaluated alternatives.
- Completion of all phases of the North Richmond Bypass would provide the direct employment generation of approximately 1,100

person-years during construction, and indirect and induced employment generation of approximately 2,800 person-years. It would also result in a reduced level of congestion in Central Richmond and City of San Pablo commercial areas.

Table 1.2 provides a comparison of the impacts associated with all alternatives under consideration.

#### COSTS

Table 1.3 presents costs for each of the four alternatives.

#### AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

A public meeting was held on 14 November 1984 at the Richmond City Hall as an early consultation to gather potential areas of controversy associated with the proposed North Richmond Bypass Project. Some of the issues raised involved the location of on and off ramps to traffic volumes on local streets, coordination of the project with the Wildcat-San Pablo Creek Improvement Projects and the proposed waste-to-energy plant, flooding problems in the Phase 4 reach and the displacement of businesses and residents. Questions about noise and air pollution were also raised as were questions about emergency vehicle access to and from the bypass.

This report attempts to address these questions and others as a means of assessing the net benefits of full completion of the proposed project.

Final evaluation of some issues must necessarily await more detailed specifications and plans. Final bypass alignments and rights-of-way have yet to be made for some phases. Funding arrangements for some phases are not finalized. Some of these issues should be settled before the publication of the Final EIS/SEIR, other//, such as the funding issue, would be developed as the project progressed.

TABLE 1.2

## COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Category	Alt. 1	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4
Land Use and Planning	B	M	M	S
Geology, Soils, Seismicity	S	S	M	N
Hydrology and Floodplains	S	S	N	N
Biotics	S	S	M	N
Noise	S	S	S	S
Air Quality	B	M	M	M
Water Quality	S	S	S	N
Energy	B	S	S	S
Visual Resources	M	M	M	N
Residential Areas and Communities	B	N	S	S
Socioeconomics	B	B	M	S
Public Services				
Police	B	B	B	N
Fire	B	B	B	M
Schools	M	M	M	M
Water Supply	M	M	M	N
Sewer Service	M	M	M	N
Gas and Electric Service	M	M	M	N
City and County Parks	B	B	B	N
Telephone Service	M	M	M	N
Public Health and Safety	P	P	S	S
Historic and Archaeological Resources	P	P	F	N

Key: S = Significant Adverse Impact  
M = Minor Adverse Impact  
N = No Impact  
B = Beneficial Impact  
P = Potential Adverse Impact

TABLE 1.3

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(\$ million)

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Construction Cost	43.9	24.1	38.0	0
Right-of-Way Cost	0.39	0.39	10.0	0
Total Cost	44.29	24.49	48.0	

PERMITS REQUIRED

Table 1.4 lists permits which must be issued for the proposed project.

TABLE 1.4  
PERMITS REQUIRED

Agency	Permit
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	404 Permits for creek crossings
California Department of Fish and Game	Streambed Alteration Agreements for creek crossings
State Lands Commission	Bridge permit for creek crossing
Contra Costa County	Drainage permits for runoff to creeks Encroachment permit for use of county right-of-way