

From: Katrinka Ruk, Council of Industries
Re: Review of draft General Plan Elements

Date: December 12, 2009

The following lists specific changes that the COI wants incorporated in the Plan.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

- (1.5) Demographic and Socioeconomic Profile – Representations are based on 2000 (educational) and 2005 (population, income) statistics. Given the impact that the economy has had, particularly in the West County area, these statistics are no longer valid and should be reflective of current economic trends. Reviewing current trends will require changing some of the GOALS.
- (1.6) Employment and Job Base - Statistics used are based on 2005 and following this year the City was impacted dramatically by the recession – these figures should be re-evaluated. Unemployment rates noted at 8% (1.6) now double digit.
- (1.6) Educational levels lower than county so report focuses on job training/ education, also need to look at housing/schools/safety in order to attract employees and businesses into the City
- (1.7) 2500 jobs lost in Technology, Business Services and Manufacturing – WHY? No explanation in this report – City should investigate why there was such a dramatic change in our 2 key job sectors. Gains in logistics/utilities and Dining/Entertainment don't make up for the losses. The City needs to consult the Milliken Institute Report on California Manufacturing Job Losses. The report found that California is continuing to lose manufacturing jobs to other states and nations, and that state and local governments are not doing enough to stem the erosion. The report calls for governments to reduce regulatory and tax burdens, enhance public Incentives for manufacturers to locate in California, support research and development activities and support education and training programs for the next generation of manufacturing workers. The Plan should include incentive programs to retain and attract manufacturing businesses.
- (1.8) Taxable Retail Sales - the statistics shows lagging behind in retail sales per capital, which doesn't support growth of retail industry
- (1.9) Real Estate Market Conditions - notes "...that other communities In eastern Contra Costa County have experienced far greater declines, a testament to Richmond's locational advantage in the Inner Bay Area. "This statement Is not substantiated with referral information. This does not paint an accurate picture of what the current market conditions are in the Richmond area. Several large developers with Plans to add high density housing to the Southern Richmond area have pulled out as a result of the economic downturn. This Information needs to be updated to represent the current trends and impacts of the housing downturn, foreclosures, drop in real estate value, etc. in the area.
- (1.10) Office/ Industrial Market and vacancy information are based on 2007 statistics, prior to the downturn in the economy. These statistics and the resulting recommendations need to be amended to reflect current and future trends.
- (1.11) Port of Richmond – The City's recognition that "The Port of Richmond represents a significant economic asset for the City, "is commendable. However, the statement, "While these private facilities do not directly contribute to the City's finances, they do generate indirect economic benefits," is inaccurate and does

not reflect the key businesses' economic contribution to the City. There is no mention of the port businesses contribution to the City coffers by way of property taxes, sales taxes, utility user tax, franchise lease agreements, Business License Fees, permit fees, fees collected through the master fee schedule, etc.

CHANGE THIS SENTENCE TO: *Both the public and private port industries play a substantial role in providing a direct economic benefit to the City of Richmond by way of their contribution to property taxes, sales taxes, utility user taxes, franchise lease agreements and indirect benefits as well.*

(1.11) "Although the Port invested in container handling cranes in the 1970s, Port facilities lack the dock-side open space to receive container cargo. "This is an over simplification. The *Seaport Plan* (1996) approved by BCDC and MTC and updated on 07/31/09 should be Included In the General Plan. This report analyzes future public port usages in the San Francisco Bay Area over next 20 years. The revisioning of the next 20 years projected the continuing importance of the Richmond private/public port to address increasing bulk cargo needs for the West Coast which should be recognized in the Plan. At the 07/31/09 meeting of the BCDC, the commission reviewed and approved the Richmond public Port's plan to focus on auto cargo with their Honda Agreement. The BCDC, in approving the project, also limited the number of agreement renewals that would be allowed with Honda to plan for other bulk cargo handling increases– this needs to be updated in the Plan. CHANGE SENTENCE TO: *The Seaport Plan envisioned by the BCDC with agreement of the Bay Planning Coalition supports the Richmond Port as becoming a key bulk cargo handling facility in the future to address increasing needs of the West Coast. The facility will plan for increased bulk cargo shipment requirements.*

(1.12) Ford Assembly Building. "Given the Ford Assembly Building's renovation and corresponding influx of green businesses, the Southern Shoreline is poised to become a cluster and incubator of green Industry." The influx of these businesses complements and diversifies the Ford Peninsula's dynamic commercial and industrial business base and further establishes this area as an economic driver for the City of Richmond. It should also be mentioned that this area is within the Enterprise Zone which provides tax incentives for *all business* to hire locally. CHANGE TO: *Given the Ford Assembly Building's renovation and corresponding influx of green businesses, the Southern Shoreline is poised to become a cluster and incubator of green Industry and will provide an economic supplement to the current industrial businesses located in the area. In addition, the Ford Peninsula is within the Enterprise Zone providing tax benefits to employers who hire locally.*"

Key Findings and Recommendations

- (1.14) Finding 1: Richmond has many assets and opportunities that can be leveraged to support local economic development

(1.14) "Infrastructure issues also pose obstacles to economic development in key parts of the City. For example, the Southern Shoreline area, one of the City's most valuable development assets, remains separated from the rest of Richmond by railroad tracks and Interstate 580." The economic viability and growth of this area requires that rail traffic, roads, and thoroughfares be adjacent to this economic area – which also supports growth and recruitment of businesses to the Ford Peninsula area. However, this finding indicates that it is a *detriment* not a benefit. CHANGE SENTENCE TO: *"For example, the Southern Shoreline*

area, one of the City's most valuable development assets, remains separated from the rest of Richmond by railroad tracks and Interstate 580. THE AVAILABILITY OF THE RAIL LINES, MAJOR TRANSPORTATION ROADS AND NODES INCLUDING CUTTING BLVD., HARBOUR WAY AND ACCESS TO INTERSTATE 580 PROVIDES BENEFITS TO THE BUSINESSES CURRENTLY LOCATED IN THE AREA AND FOR BUSINESS ATTRACTION."

(1.15) "Improvements that will support quality of life and local economic development Include: ... Controlling pollution and cleaning up contamination..." Again, the concern here is with this broad statement – where in the City Is there "pollution"? How do you define "pollution?" – air, water, noise? What statistics, studies, etc. is the City using to support this statement? What is considered contamination? Where is the contamination located? What does "control" define? There are regulatory agencies in place that monitor and control air/water/soil contamination and remediation. THIS STATEMENT IS INCORRECT AND MUST BE DELETED. ADD: *The City will continue to support regulatory agencies' oversight of air, water and soil quality.*

(1.15) " Developing Richmond's waterfront as an economic asset and community amenity..." The Plan does not recognize that public/community access to certain port areas are under the jurisdiction of Homeland Security and the Coast Guard and DO NOT allow public access in these areas. Not to address this in the report is an error and misnomer. CHANGE TO: *Developing Richmond's waterfront as an economic asset and as a community amenity in appropriate public areas.*

- (1.15) Finding 2: The City relies on its industry and businesses to provide quality jobs, revenue and services and must continue to diversify and expand its economic base to meet future needs. This finding should include the City statistics on the number of small/medium/large businesses that are located within the City of Richmond. It needs to recognize that the Chevron Richmond Refinery plays a large role in economic support of the city. It should Include Information on the economics of job growth and job loss—what new businesses have been attracted to the City and why (e.g. enterprise zone tax incentive, property rents, etc.), # new jobs created, what types of businesses have left and why (property taxes, utility user tax, fees, permitting problems, etc.). This finding does not indicate where the job growth and job loss is and the reasons for them. We want to see statistics or economic theory to support the finding.

"However, Richmond's existing concentration of heavy industries has led to public concerns regarding environmental health factors." This finding assumes that environmental health Issues are the cause of heavy Industry. As a "Finding" the Plan needs to include the information to support this. There is no Information or findings presenting causal information; there is no information defining modernization; this does not include impact of other sources on environmental health factors, e.g. BAAMQD has reported the emissions issues from the volumes of cars on the freeways.

(1.16) Recommendations: "Promoting underutilized land for potential catalytic redevelopment." Please define this further – what is the City's definition of "catalytic"? The one specific recommendation: "Working with Chevron and BNSF

to develop additional industrial facilities on their larger parcels.” As this is a reference to privately held property and beyond the city’s authority, this should not be included In the Plan. Whereas, the City may work with private parties, specific actions such as this should not be noted. No recommendations are listed regarding business retention and attraction, e.g. tax incentives, express permitting procedures, decreased fees/taxes, etc.

- (1.17) Finding 3: Richmond’s workforce is operating in an increasingly competitive regional and global economy and must expand its skills to meet the needs of 21st century businesses. Recommendations:
 - “Retaining and expanding blue, white and green-collar jobs that match the skills of local workers while offering livable wages.” The definition for “livable” wages NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED. In addition, small businesses and union workers wages are dictated by economics and agreements. Eliminate “livable” and consider “competitive” wages as an alternative; and
 - “Attracting and maintaining Industries that offer a livable wage and continue to provide an important part of local economic development.” DEFINE “Livable” wage. To make such a statement, the author has not considered how the City would define, implement and police such a program. The City should be focused on attracting businesses that can support the skills and abilities of the local and regional workforce and should state this.

Citywide GOALS

GOAL ED1: Improve Richmond’s Appeal as a Place to Live, Work and Visit (1.22)

Policy ED1.4 Air Quality – There is no direction given to the City as to how to “reduce impact.” The City does not have the expertise, staffing or funding to add another regulatory oversight which is already under the authority of acting and funded agencies. The statement: “The City should also ensure that sensitive uses such as schools, childcare centers, parks and playgrounds, housing and community gathering places are protected from adverse impacts of emissions,” is problematic – there is no definition of “protection”, “adverse impacts”, no description of “emissions”. This provides misleading commitments on the City’s part to address these undefined issues. This goes beyond the usual realm of landuse planning. **DELETE THIS POLICY.**

Consideration should be given to investigate incentive plans for businesses, e.g. to convert diesel vehicles and equipment.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

GOAL ED1 / Actions:

Action ED1H Air Quality Monitoring and Reporting Program (1.26)

Establishing and enforcing a program to ensure compliance with the emission standards of the BAAQMD Is misleading. As noted above in comments for Policy ED1.4, the City does not have the authority to impose civil penalties for

violations. Currently the BAAQMD is reviewing air quality In the Bay Area and will be publishing the Bay Area Clean Air Initiative which looks at air quality, impacted communities, and proposals to address sources including funding/grants for source remediation. It is recommended that the City review this initiative before considering such a broad action Plan. In addition, this Action does not include incentives, funding or grants for source remediation.

Action ED1.I Green Building Technologies and Standards (1.26) “Encourage new development throughout the City to use environmentally sound building technologies and to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards to the extent possible. “ This needs to be modified. The Green Building Ordinance includes a level of LEED standard compliance for commercial buildings (not full compliance) AND the associated residential standards for such developments. CHANGE TO: *Encourage new development throughout the City to use environmentally sound building technologies and to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards to the extent possible, and minimally, the requirements of the City’s Green Building Ordinance. Provide workshops on the revised programs to developers in the community. Consider incentive programs for developers to build beyond the implemented program.”*

Action ED1.K Festivals and Events Funding (1.26) Determining which festivals will be funded and at what level is under the purview of the City Council. It does not belong in the Plan. It should also be removed from the other elements: Parks and Recreation, Action PR5.B. *The City might consider language such as: The City will continue to support local Festivals and Events in support of celebration of key activities within the City of Richmond. This may be done in collaboration with nonprofits or organizations.*

Action ED1.L Local Arts Funding Strategy (1.27) Identifying “strategies and resources to support arts endeavors and local arts institutions in Richmond...” is under the purview of the City Council. This should also be removed from the Plan and also Arts and Culture Element, Action AC1.D. *The City might consider language such as: The City will continue to support local Festivals and Events in support of celebration of key activities within the City of Richmond. This may be done in collaboration with nonprofits or other organizations.*

Action ED1M Development Permitting Process Improvements (1.27) The COI supports this recommendation and would like to be included in the process to improve and expedite the permitting process.

GOAL ED2 Increase Quality Jobs and Revenue (1.28)

Policy ED2.1 Local Employment Base (1.28) – Focus on generating diverse job opportunities will provide the economic diversity that the City needs. The COI would be interested in working with the City regarding incentives to attract businesses to Richmond.

Policy ED2.2 Diverse and Expanded Tax Base (1.29) – This focuses on sales and property taxes, diverse land uses, new and well-established employers across multiple industries, but it also needs to address the reported statistics that

the largest employment areas lost the most jobs. The City needs to determine why businesses are leaving the area, and, what the City needs to do to retain and grow the businesses that are here.

Policy ED2.3 A Range of Retail Opportunities (1.29) Needs to include recruitment of local grocery stores – lacking in North and South Richmond areas.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

GOAL ED2 / Actions:

Action ED2A Small Business Support Program (1.31) recommends “Explore strategies to regularly recapitalize the revolving loan fund for businesses in economically depressed areas.” COI would be Interested in finding out more about this revolving loan fund.

Action ED2.F: Coordination with Major Employers (1.32) allows for regular meetings with major employers to discuss concerns. The COI support this continued corroboration with the City.

AREA SPECIFIC GOALS:

GOAL ED 7: Promote a Mix of Uses along the Richmond Parkway (1.48)

Policy ED 7.2 Land Use Compatibility (1.48) COI continues to support the need for clear and consistent buffer zones between industrial areas and residential areas, such as the Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone, and Knox Cutting Specific Plan. This Policy recommends: Implementing Action ED7.C: Industrial Use Buffer (page 1.50). The COI would like to collaborate on this. We want to ensure the safety and security of existing security-sensitive industrial land uses. We recommend the following change: “Building technologies (such as soundproofing) and landscaping ~~should also be used~~ might be considered to provide additional buffers.” Depending upon the site and surrounding issues, there may be other forms of remediation that would be more applicable.

GOAL ED7 / Actions:

Action ED7.A ; Richmond Parkway Specific Plan (1.50) “Work with residents and industries in the City to develop a consolidation, modernization and beautification program that will lead to the creation of new industrial parks on currently underutilized land owned by Chevron and BNSF. The Plan should not Include an item that dictates land use for privately owned property. This should be removed from the Plan. “Promote programs that will help the City’s Industries to modernize.” This is a vague statement – does this include loans, grants, and Incentives?

Action ED7.B Parkway Improvements (1.50) “Develop strategies to improve the Parkway’s visual appeal. Work with major employers in the area to plan for and fund landscaping, signage, lighting, regular maintenance, design guidelines and other elements. “ Is the City recommending an *Assessment District*? If so

this needs to be voted on by the property owners. Secondly, parts of the Parkway are under the jurisdiction of the County, and the State.

Action ED7C: Industrial Use Buffer (1.50) The COI continues to support buffer zones between industrial activity areas and residential areas.

GOAL ED 8: Develop the Southern Shoreline as a Thriving Mixed-Use Neighborhood (1.39) “with green development, new employment center, attractive residential communities, a connection to regional ferry services, an accessible shoreline and a modern port.” *CHANGE TO “proposed ferry services”.*

Policy ED8.1: A range and Mix of Land Uses: (1.51) “ New Serving-serving retail would also establish the Southern Shoreline (particularly the Ford Peninsula, Marina Bay and Campus Bay areas) as an attractive community, potentiality drawing new residents and employers.” The Plan needs to be clear that no residential development is permitted in the established Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone.

“Promote the Southern Shoreline for green businesses and other high-technology and research and development firms.” Policy needs to include retention and growth of the areas current industrial base, as well as the public and private port businesses.

“Encourage University to identify opportunities to integrate UC Field Station research activity with private sector firms in Richmond” The COI also encourages the growth of business opportunities in this area.

Policy ED8.4 Public Access to the Shoreline (1.52) This recommends improvements to public access to the Bay, and to “fully capitalize on the Southern Shoreline’s prime access to the Bay” Included in this review should be clearly designated areas where public access is not available – e.g. private property, private and public port areas per Homeland Security regulations. Policy ED9.2 should also include these comments.

Policy ED8.6 An Economically Viable and Modern Port (1.53) “...maintain Port as strategic regional asset...” Support of the viability of the private port businesses should also be included. “...develop Ford Peninsula as working waterfront that supports the Port’s operations and provides opportunities for recreation, housing, retail and job generating uses. The sentences mix business, recreation, housing and tourism in one contrived area which neglects the clear buffer and separate industrial area. The Policy statement should only speak to the economic viability of the area, not housing, recreation or tourism. This should be and is in a separate GOAL(s). Secondly, there is a blending of the public and private port areas and separate statements should be made for each.

Policy ED8.7 Visual Appearance of Industrial Areas (1.53) “The City supports property owners in their efforts to implement improvements such as Landscaping signage, lighting and other urban design elements. *These will help promote the Southern Shoreline as a model for mixed-use development and attract the co-location of residential and industrial uses in areas beyond the Port Priority Use*

area. “ Again, there is a buffer zone in this area that does NOT allow for the “collocation” of residential and industrial uses In the area. This needs to be DELETED.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

GOAL ED8 / Actions:

Action ED8.B Ferry Terminal Specific Plan (1.54) “Implement the Ferry Terminal Specific Plan to develop the area as a higher density, mixed-use community (see also Land Use and Urban Design Element, Action LU 1.J).” According to the WETA, the current “rooftops” and population in the Marina Bay Area support the population criterion of establishing a ferry service in the area. To suggest that a higher density community is required in order to implement a ferry service is erroneous. Secondly, the ferry service is not established and therefore, the land use planning decision to move to high density residences may not be the best use for this area should the service not be approved. In addition, developers who were planning on high density residential in the area withdrew their project due to the economic downturn. We suggest that this decision and the corresponding high density residential plans be put on hold.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Action ED8C: Port Strategic Business Plan (1.54) The COI would like to corroborate with the City on the strategic Plan as it could dovetail with the current private port businesses, as well as representatives of the BCDC and Bay Planning Coalition. The Plan needs to include the BCDC Seaport Plan. This plan has been emailed to Richard Mitchell and Planning Commission by Katrinka Ruk. Port Director Jim Matzorkis has the plan and has attended meetings with the Bay Planning Coalition and the BCDC on the Seaport Plan.

Action ED8.D: Industrial Property Visual Appearance Ordinance (1.54) The initiation of an ordinance is under the purview of the City Council. This item needs to be DELETED.

GOAL ED 9: Promote San Pablo Peninsula as a Regional Recreation Destination (1.55)

Policy ED9.2 Public Access to the Shoreline (1.55) Policy recommends offering campsites, museums, visitor centers along the San Pablo Peninsula. In order to maintain these types of recreation, the City needs to ensure proper funding, staffing and maintenance. Given the current stress on the City’s budget, this appears to be more of a long-range Plan. The action Item associated with this policy is Action ED9.A: Point Molate Redevelopment Plan (page 1.56) which focuses on the area West of the Ridge Line. This Action Item does not

incorporate the entire San Pablo Peninsula which Policy ED9.2 is referring to. Therefore the policy should focus only on the San Pablo Peninsula specific to the Pt. Molate project. The COI has concerns with the City's consideration for residential areas in close proximity to a working refinery. The safety and security of existing security-sensitive industrial land uses require a very real buffer zone between residential and industrial uses.

LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

- (3.12) The definition of "form based" code provides a circular definition and is not clear. Please redefine. It would be nice to see examples of form based versus traditional zoning and codes.
- (3.20) Live/Work The COI continues to emphasize that since Live/Work includes a residential component, it should not be considered for inclusion within industrial areas. The definition clearly provides for on-site residency in a loft or apartment -- NO RESIDENTS should be placed within a buffer zone -- that defeats the reason for a buffer. Likewise, residents and live/work should not be located near rail tracks or industrial areas.
- (3.21) Business / Light Industrial ~~DELETE THIS SENTENCE: "Uses that serve populations under 18 and over 65 years of age may be conditionally permitted."~~ Business/Light Industrial could serve as a buffer between industrial areas and residential. Allowing for children, and/or nursing homes in a buffer zone area is not responsible and not viable
- (3.21) Port "The Port Land use designation supports activities related to a working waterfront including port terminals, warehousing, commercial fishing, ship repair and related office uses." The definition should include the differentiation between the public and private port areas.

Change Area 3: Ford Peninsula (3.36)

- (3.37) Figure 3.15: Ford Peninsula Area Development Strategy Indicates "Potential opportunities for higher-intensity development" within the Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone area, and within the current Virtual Development area which is zoned commercial. This would create a situation of nonconforming use should the developer need to rebuild or expand their development. This diagram needs to be changed to reflect the current zoning plan. It needs to include: Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone, current land use zoning in private property areas -- commercial/ light Industrial which are changed on the map to "high intensity development," "future ferry terminal" changed to "proposed ferry terminal."
- (3.38) Preferred Future: " The eastern section of the Ford Peninsula is envisioned as a mixed-use waterfront district around the marina that takes advantage of the proposed ferry terminal, easy access to regional highways, waterfront Location and dramatic views and nearby employment (see Simulation: Ford Peninsula Transit Oriented Development, page 3.42)." The statement and the recommendations for development of this area assume that a ferry service will be approved and will require the support of additional high density housing. The

WETA has not determined whether to pursue additional East Bay ferry service at this time, nor have they determined that Richmond would be the recipient of that service. In addition, the WETA has stated that the current residential makeup of the surrounding area would support a ferry service should this be determined as the ideal Location for one. Given that, the need for high density housing is not a requirement of the ferry service, but is the folly of those individuals who have written this document. The COI does not believe that the residents in this area support the need for high density housing; secondly, it conflicts with the agreed to buffer zone; third, it rezones a currently commercial area to high density housing in opposition to the landowner's current Land use and development agreements. The high density housing noted on the map needs to be removed.

(3.38) "The area south of Regatta Boulevard on either side of Marina Way is the heart of the Ford Peninsula and is designated as High-intensity Mixed-Use (Major Activity Center) to promote a mix of high-density residential, commercial, retail, office and entertainment uses on the eastern edge of the peninsula." This is not the current zoning and it is in direct conflict with the residential and business desires for this area. It is also in conflict with the agreed to Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone. This needs to be defined as its current zoning.

(3.38) "Large parcels fronting on Harbour Way are designated as Business / Light industrial to complement adjacent Port uses, create employment opportunities and provide transition to live/work and mixed-use development along Marina Way." The Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone needs to be included in this description as that dictates the usages in the area.

(3.38) Public Realm "...Harbour Way will provide primary access to and from the Port, and should retain much of its utilitarian character and function (see Figure 3.16: Ford Peninsula Area Conceptual Design)." Define "utilitarian character" and "function". In the previous section Marina Way South access is described in some detail, this should also be done in regards to Harbour Way to ensure an understanding, e.g. Harbour Way provides access to public and private port traffic. Public access should be limited and primary access to the public shoreline should be through Marina Way. This figure provides for sidewalk traffic, parking and bike lanes along the Harbour Way area. This would not allow for the passage of two trucks on the street *Paul Minault's Letter for Plant Reclamation, sent to Richard Mitchell and the Planning Commission, goes into more details regarding changes to these area.*

(3.39) Private Realm "The area identified for change on the Ford Peninsula is envisioned as a transit-oriented high-intensity urban center designed to support the proposed ferry terminal. The area may include high-intensity residential, commercial and entertainment uses that capitalize on the views and transit-oriented development potential of the ferry terminal area. There are THREE DIVERSE and DISTINCT areas of the Ford Peninsula that need to be addressed in this summary. One is the residential and light industrial component – Ford Building and East of Marina Way South. Second is the Ford Peninsula Buffer Zone which allows for commercial development. And third are the public and private economic drivers of the port businesses. Each requires different street/circulation needs and allows for different levels of public access. The summary included in the draft Plan is inadequate and needs to cover these three

areas. The COI would be happy to work on the specific wording for this section with the City.

- (3.40) Simulation Revitalized Downtown Define “bulbouts”. Architectural or construction descriptors should be spelled out and not assumed that the public understands the definitions.
- (3.42) Ford Peninsula Transit Oriented Development This paragraph is troublesome as it assumes that the ferry service is in place, it does not include the buffer, the port businesses, and ignores the current land use developments which are in place. This paragraph should be eliminated.
- (3.43) Place-Based Street Typology Summary – Definitions are great addition to provide descriptors of recommendations. *Recommend a glossary(alpha order) at the back of the PLAN to Include all definitions sprinkled throughout the PLAN so that they are easily accessed In one place. Recommend that reference be made as to where these definitions are from.*

Change Area 6: Marina Way Corridor Preferred Future (3.51) “Marina Way is envisioned as a major gateway street that connects Downtown with the planned activity center and ferry terminal at the Ford Peninsula.” CHANGE to *proposed ferry terminal*.

Change Area 7: Cutting Boulevard Corridor West (3.54)

- (3.54) Preferred Future West Cutting is designated as Business / Light Industrial to reflect current uses In this area.” *This should be changed to “Business / Light Industrial and Industrial area.”* The current definition denies the existence of the heavy Industrial users along Cutting adjacent to the Santa Fe Channel although the area is noted as the “existing Industrial and maritime corridor” on the map In the Plan
- (3.54) Public Realm Makes no note of the truck traffic which exists on West Cutting. *This needs to be noted in the verbiage.*
- (3.56) Figure 3.30 Cutting Boulevard Corridor Conceptual Diagram (West Subarea) wording noting “industrial buildings” is cutoff. It is unclear from the revised diagram if it has been changed to *allow for proper truck traffic and need for additional space for truck turn areas. This needs to be reworked with industrial users to ensure safe passage of trucks, cars, and bicyclists in this area.*
- (3.56) Figure 3.31 Cutting Boulevard Corridor Conceptual Diagram (Middle Subarea) Although the verbiage has been removed, the map still shows Middle Cutting - Streetscape design as minimizing traffic volumes and speeds of traffic with landscaped medians planted with double rows of trees and wide planters adjacent to sidewalks. *Planning needs to look at the configuration of Cutting in this area in conjunction with the business needs in the area – there is not enough room to add a middle landscaped medium and allow for smooth traffic flow. Whereas the City might consider this design, it should not be required.*

Change Area 8: Harbour Way Corridor (3.57)

(3.59) Figure 3.35 Harbour Way Corridor Conceptual Diagram, Public Realm:
DEFINE and give an example of a “bulbouts.”

Change Area 9: Ohio Avenue Corridor (3.60)

(3.62) Figure 3.38 Ohio Avenue Corridor Conceptual Diagram, Private Realm : “The private realm should be characterized by mixed-use residential development that co-exists with existing development in industrial areas...” The COI cannot support residential development adjacent to industrial businesses. We support a buffer area between the two developments. CHANGE TO: “The private realm should be characterized by mixed-use residential development that co-exists *with acceptable buffers between these and* with existing development in industrial areas...”

Change Area 11: Northern Parkway (3.71)

(3.71) (3.72) Change Area 11: Northern Parkway
DEFINE: “vegetated swales.”

Change Area 13: Southern Parkway Area (3.76)

(3.77) Figure 3.49 Southern Parkway Area Development Strategy , Preferred Future
“The area east of the Parkway is designated as Live/Work to allow transformation of parcels within residential neighborhoods to more productive uses.” Please define the area in regards to streets. There may be industrial parcels located there and this would result in rezoning of their area from industrial to Live/Work which is not currently economically supportive. COI does not support Live/Work in industrial zoned areas.

Change Area 14: San Pablo Peninsula Area (3.76)

(3.80) Figure 3.52 San Pablo Peninsula Area Development Strategy - WE FIND IT UNCONSCIONABLE THAT THE CITY’S LARGEST EMPLOYER AND ECONOMIC SUPPORTER OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND IS NOT MENTIONED IN THIS STRATEGY. THE CHEVRON REFINERY SHOULD BE NOTED AS A KEY ECONOMIC ANCHOR IN THIS AREA AND FOR THE CITY’S STRATEGIC PLANNING.

(3.81) Figure 3.53 San Pablo Peninsula Area Conceptual Diagram

(3.81) Private Realm- the section allows for “encouragement” of “entertainment, marine and waterfront commercial, storage and manufacturing.” ADD:
Appropriate buffers between public access and proximity to the Chevron Richmond Refinery and industrial manufacturing site are required.

Area 15: Port Priority Use Area (3.82)

(3.83) Figure 3.55 Port Priority Use Area Development Strategy

The map has erroneously pointed out “the Existing port-related uses including container ship loading area” at the Southern-tip of Canal Boulevard. The unloading of cars actually takes place on the Eastern side of Canal Boulevard on the Santa Fe Channel.

(3.83) Preferred Future

(3.84) Figure 3.56 Port Priority Use Area Conceptual Diagram

This Figure does not define what streets it is applicable for – Port priority area follows Harbour Way, Cutting, and Canal. This figure is incompatible with uses required along these streets – the need for traffic turn lanes, as well as railcar plans along Canal Blvd. This Figure should be eliminated and replaced with several different circulation recommendations for the different circulation routes.

(3.84) Public Realm

“...Bicycle connectivity should be improved by extending bicycle routes along Harbour Way and Canal Boulevard onto smaller streets such as Wharf Street and Wright Avenue.” IT IS NOT VIABLE TO RELOCATE BICYCLE TRAFFIC TO WHARF STREET – this is a main thoroughfare for truck traffic, and soon to be increased rail traffic. A working port needs to define clear buffer zones from public usage due to traffic, safety and homeland security Issues. Canal Blvd will be upgraded to include rail traffic that is not included in this Plan. Bike traffic along Canal Boulevard needs a thorough review given the increased truck and rail traffic that is planned for the area. Wharf Street and Wright Avenue should not include bicycle and public access to the shoreline due to safety Issues, and the fact that there is no public access to the Santa Fe Channel at those sites. Traffic should be directed away from the heavy industrial areas through Brickyard Cove area and along the water front for safety reasons. This paragraph should be eliminated and replaced with verbiage noting that the access to the industrial area along Canal Blvd will be determined given review of the Port project at which time circulation and public access will be reviewed. COI would be glad to assist the City in working with the local businesses to ensure a safe bicycle route around the industrial businesses and rail/truck traffic areas. Attention will be given to access the waterfront areas through a safe public access.

Change Area 16: Regatta/Marina Bay (3.85)

(3.85) Figure 3.58 Regatta/Marina Bay Area Development Strategy – Map, change “Future Ferry Terminal” to *proposed ferry terminal*.

Change Area 17: Southern Gateway (3.88)

(3.80) Figure 3.61 Southern Gateway Area Development Strategy – Map, provide a definition and example of “fine grain industrial use.” The COI would like to participate in the development of this Planned Area District.

(3.90) Private Realm “All new uses should respect and underscore the efforts of Habitat restoration and remediation by ensuring appropriate open space, setbacks and circulation design adjacent to ecologically sensitive uses, ADD: *as well as appropriate buffers between residential and industrial areas.*”

Key Findings and Recommendations (3.91)

(3.91) “...In the El Sobrante Valley area, there is potential to improve access, retail service and the quality of hillside development.” This statement should be evaluated. Hillside development in this area is not something that the residents have supported. Secondly, there are slide issues with the hillsides, as well as traffic concerns, limited roads in and out of areas, and watershed limitations.

(3.91) “Further, Richmond can gradually transform its industrial areas to support businesses that will

comprise the green economy of the future. “ Whereas this sentence has been severely tweaked from the first version, it still represents SOMEONE’S desire to move from current business/industrial base to “green economy businesses.” This negates the economic base of the current industrial businesses along the port areas. This also precludes industry/business/green business co-existing, which is possible, and beneficial for the city to welcome diverse businesses to ensure economic viability of the city. CHANGE TO: *The City of Richmond must continue to work with the Green Corridor Program to attract green economy businesses to supplement the current economic business and industrial base.*”

(3.91) “Redevelopment of the Hilltop Area as a vibrant commercial center, along with Downtown redevelopment and a major activity center at the Ford Peninsula area, should create viable mixed-use and commercial destinations in Richmond.” *Not sure what the “major activity center at the Ford Peninsula area” is referring to? If this is in referral to the proposed ferry terminal, then it should be stated as such because the Plan does not include discussion of a “major activity center” there; this is misleading.*

(3.92) “Natural beauty, historic assets and convenient access to Interstate 580 present incredible potential to develop the southern shoreline area into a higher-intensity, mixed-use center.” The Southern Shoreline Area also includes the public and private port area, the Industrial buffer zone, as well as developer agreements (Virtual Development) which are NOT zoned or practical for higher intensity, mixed used residential. This statement is misleading and should be DELETED.

(3.93) Finding 3: Richmond has the capacity to diversify and strengthen the Local economy. *define “physical legibility”*

ADD: “Support the retention, growth and attraction of business and Industry to further strengthen Local economic diversity.”

(3.94) Finding 4: Protecting, enhancing and preserving natural resources will improve environmental conditions and the health of Richmond’s residents.. “Meeting the recreation and health needs of current and future residents and improving the environmental condition of the built environment will enable Richmond to maximize its natural assets to enhance the City’s economy and overall quality of Life.” How does meeting “recreation and health needs” of residents “enhance the City’s economy”? Focus on these areas are actually fiscal drains on a City’s coffers. If this is not the intent of the statement it needs to be clarified.

(3.94) Finding 5: The City has a wide range of land uses that must complement and be compatible with each other to build a balanced and cohesive community. The Plan neglects to address that there are land uses that are *not compatible* with each other, e.g. you would not have residential in industrial areas or buffer zones, or Live/work in industrial or buffer zones. These are inherent incompatible uses. That is the reason for the Plan, zoning ordinances and buffer zones. We disagree with this Finding. CHANGE TO: The City has a wide range of land uses that must complement and be compatible with each other to build a balanced and cohesive community IN APPROPRIATE AND VIABLE AREAS.

(3.94) “Creating a dynamic and enjoyable, mixed-use shoreline that supports a productive, working waterfront, while also providing recreation amenities for residents and visitors...”

What defines “mixed-use” in this sentence? You cannot have private and public port use in the same area as public access where homeland security and private property excludes public access. Change the sentence to: *Creating a dynamic and enjoyable shoreline that supports a productive, working waterfront, while also providing recreation amenities for residents and visitors In designated, safe areas.*”

(3.94) ” Requiring that the type, intensity and mix of uses are compatible with surrounding uses and complement the design of adjacent structures and neighborhoods”

They shouldn’t be compatible with surrounding uses, but with the designated zoning Plan.

GOAL LU1 Improve the Urban Environment (3.96)

“...developing the Southern Shoreline, Ford Peninsula and San Pablo Peninsula as regional and recreational destinations...” This ignores the economic vitality and drivers in these areas. Need to add this: *“...developing the Southern Shoreline, Ford Peninsula and San Pablo Peninsula as vibrant economic areas with appreciation for regional and recreational destinations in specific planned areas...”*

GOAL LU3 Expand Economic Opportunities (3.97)

The City envisions catalytic development in the Hilltop Area, the Southern Shoreline, along the Richmond Parkway and in other areas that have great potential as mixed-use regional destinations and new employment centers.”

DEFINE “catalytic development.”

GOAL LU4 Enhance Environmental Quality (3.98)

“The City will also take steps to protect water quality in creeks and bays, and to reduce or mitigate air, water and soil pollution and contamination.”

Mitigation of such is under the purview of specific agencies that have the staff, funding, and legal responsibility to mitigate this, not the City. DELETE.

GOAL LU5 Encourage Balanced and Compatible Uses (3.98)

“Continue to encourage a context-sensitive approach to land use planning, physical improvements and infrastructure development to minimize conflict, nuisance and risks to public health and safety.”

DEFINE “context-sensitive approach.”

Goal LU 1 Improve the Urban Environment (3.100)

Policy IU1.1 Higher Density and Infill Mixed-Use Development (3.100)

“Promoting higher-density, transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly development along key commercial corridors, at key intersections (community nodes and gateways), especially Downtown, along the Ford Peninsula (site of the proposed ferry terminal) and in the Hilltop Area;” **Higher density mixed use in certain areas along the Ford Peninsula In the buffer zone is not**

in alignment with the Industrial Buffer Zone Ordinance, or developer agreements.
ADD: *excluding Industrial Buffer Zone area and where developer agreements exist.*

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

GOAL LU1/Actions

Action IU1.G Community Facilities Assessment (3.104)

Schools should not be included in Community Facilities – they are under the direction and supervision of the School District as is their maintenance and funding. The City can partner with the West Contra Costa County Unified School District to provide recommendations of improvement, but they have no authority to go beyond that.

Action LU1.I Ferry Terminal (3.104)

“Develop the proposed ferry terminal as a higher-density, mixed-use community (see also Economic Development Element, Action ED8.A). **DELETE** this sentence. **ADD:** “The Ferry Terminal will be developed at the time that the WETA approves the project. The Specific Plan will include public review and comment.”

GOAL LU2/Actions

Action LU2.B Streetscape Improvement Plans (3.106)

DEFINE: “pedestrian-scale lighting”, “bioswales,” “permeable pavements.”

Action LU2.C Public Safety Design Guidelines(3.106)

The summary is inadequate. It should not only include physical changes, e.g. lighting, accessibility, etc., but also area patrol and crime prevention measures based on recommendations by the Police Department and Office of Neighborhood Safety.

GOAL LU3/Actions

Policy LU3.5 An Economically Viable and Modern Port (3.108)

The COI supports and will continue to work with the City to improve and expand the public port’s capacity. The Bay Planning Coalition Seaport Plan requires review, compliance, and inclusion in the “Port Strategic Business Plan.” The COI would ask to be included in the discussion of the Port Strategic Business Plan.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Action LU3.A Green Business Strategic Plan (3.110)

The COI will support a collaboration with the City “to consider developing criteria for green business certification for new and existing businesses.” We believe that in addition to green technology, the City should develop a diverse economic strategic plan to recruit other types of businesses including manufacturing, food-based, technology, biotech, etc.

Action LU3.E Southern Shoreline (3.111)

The COI will continue to work with the City of Richmond to “guide improvements in the Southern Shoreline Area.”

Action LU3.H Industrial Lands Retention (3.111)

“Ensure that industrial uses are consolidated around rail and port facilities.”

This is a new Action Item --- it was not included in the initial draft Plan. How does the City propose to do this? Considering businesses are private enterprises and we have private property issues? CHANGE: Ensure that industrial uses consolidated around rail and port facilities are retained.

Action LU3.I Industrial Modernization (3.111)

“The City will encourage heavy industries to modernize and upgrade their plants to reduce energy use, increase efficiency and reduce emissions.”

This is a new Action Item --- it was not included in the initial draft Plan. How does the City propose to do this? Businesses are currently regulated to reduce emissions. Is the City going to take on this additional regulatory role? Reduction of energy usage and efficiency issues are under the purview of the business entity not the City. DELETE THIS ACTION ITEM.

Goal LU 4 Enhance Environmental Quality

Policy LU4.3 Habitat and Biological Resources Protection and Restoration (3.113)

The recommendations sited in this paragraph are under the auspices of several regulatory agencies including the Water Quality Control Board, The Bay Planning Coalition, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to name a few. These agencies are experts in their areas and their regulatory purview should *not* be minimized. Troubling statements that are not supported by scientific data include:

“Marshes and baylands should be protected to ensure they are not polluted or damaged from bay filling and dredging.” No Bay fill or dredging can be done without review by regulatory agencies.

“Creek corridors and riparian areas should continue to be protected and restored to ensure they function as healthy wildlife habitat and biological areas.”
DEFINE “riparian areas.”

Policy LU4.4 Toxic and Contaminated Sites (3.113)

Require appropriate mitigation measures and clean-up of sites that are known to contain toxic materials as a condition of allowing reuse.”

DELETE this sentence and CHANGE to: *The City of Richmond will work with appropriate local, state and federal agencies to promote the clean-up and reuse of contaminated and toxic.* Depending upon which agency will be lead will determine the authority and level of mitigation. The appropriate regulatory agency oversees the mitigation of cleanups (e.g. Bay Area Air Quality Management Board, Water Resources Board, Department of Toxic Substances, etc.) This is adding additional regulatory review by the City which may not have the budget or skilled staff to implement, plus adding additional costly and duplicative requirements on the businesses. The City cannot circumvent this process.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

GOAL LU 4 / Actions

Action LU4.A Waterfront Redevelopment Plans (3.114)

The COI would like to participate in the creation of these plans and would recommend the inclusion of other shoreline businesses.

GOAL LU 5 Encourage Balanced and Compatible Uses

Policy LU5.1 A Range and Mix of Land Uses (3.116)

“An appropriate mix of uses such as business, industrial, waterfront commercial, live/work and open space will enhance economic vitality and provide the flexibility needed to adapt to changing economic conditions.” Industrial areas require a buffer zone from residential for obvious reasons – traffic, noise, lights, etc. Live/work is a residential mode of living; COI cannot support this in an industrial area.

“Along Richmond’s shoreline diverse uses should balance community needs for recreation, interpretation, conservation, historic and cultural preservation with economic development opportunities.” Recreation areas in, and, public access through Industrial areas are unacceptable. The Public Port and private port industrial areas must comply with Homeland Security and do not allow public access through these areas or recreation along the associated shoreline. CHANGE THIS SENTENCE: *Where public access is appropriate – in non-port or industrial areas - Richmond’s shoreline can offer diverse uses including recreation, Interpretation, conservation, historic and cultural preservation.*

Policy LU5.2 A Mixed Use Waterfront (1.17)

(3.117) “The Richmond Port (public and private) is recognized as a productive and important component of the community’s economy and identity. The adjacent industry is known for embracing high standards and providing excellent, local jobs. Creative transitions should be developed between the Port, the urban core and potential mixed-used neighborhoods along the waterfront to provide strong connections, design cohesion and effective buffers where necessary.” ADD: *The City supports the Industrial Buffer Zone as an important transition from the public and private industrial port area to commercial, light Industrial areas eastward to the area East of Marina Way.*

(3.117) “The Peninsula’s historic Ford Assembly Plant, open space, connection to the Bay Trail and convenient freeway access present great potential for developing the eastern portion of the area as an active, high-density, mixed-use neighborhood with housing for local residents and amenities that attract visitors from around the Bay.” Adding “the eastern portion” is beneficial in describing where the potential for high-density, mixed-use neighborhood would be. However, it is still not clear as to what specific area the city is referring to. The Ford Peninsula is currently zoned commercial and the current land owners are not interested in changing their land use to high-density, mixed-use. *See letter from Richard Poe, Virtual Development, submitted to Richard Mitchell and the Planning Commission.* COI cannot support this recommendation – this is not being supported by the property owners, nor the

residential community. ADD *additional language that would protect the current owner's developer agreement as has been done in the Plan at other locations.*

Policy IU5.3 Land Use Compatibility (3.118)

(3.118) "Minimize conflicts between land uses to protect human and environmental health and safety and preserve community character." Supporting Live/Work residences in industrial areas is in direct conflict with this statement.

(3.118) "New development should complement the character and scale of existing neighborhoods, cultural resources, historic structures and landscapes. In particular, industrial uses and residential living can more successfully co-exist through well-conceived land use, circulation and urban design strategies including buffers (which may be in the form of sound walls and/or enclosed buildings) and transitional uses, rerouting of truck traffic and design components that signal residential neighborhood character such as sidewalks, lampposts and street trees." Residential and Industrial uses CAN NOT COEXIST- cannot "exist together In the same place" (Webster's II Dictionary, 1984). As indicated further in the sentences, BUFFERS and transitional uses between industrial areas and residential living are imperative. CHANGE TO: *Transitions from industrial uses to residential living can be successful when the transitional areas include well-conceived land use planning with adjacent buffer zones.*

Recommending rerouting of truck traffic is not possible in the Ford Peninsula as there are only two major roads into the area. Denoting residential neighborhoods by "sidewalks, lampposts and street trees" are not replacements for buffer zones.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal LU5/Actions

Action LU5.A Zoning Ordinance Update (3.119)

"...Promote a place-based approach to encourage mixed-use, pedestrian and transit oriented development and interface between the public and private realm." Whereas the consultants are recommending a "place-based" approach – is this being supported by the Planning Commission and the Planning Department? The COI would like to participate in the update of the Zoning Ordinance.

Action LU5.B Design Guidelines (3.119)

The COI would like to participate in the development of the Design Guidelines.

Action LU5.C Industrial Use Buffers (3.119)

In the first draft of the Plan, language included the following: "Restrict the location of residential and other sensitive uses within the designated buffers." *This language had now been removed and we want to ADD it back in.* We would also like to ADD: *Restrict the location of residential, Live/Work and other sensitive uses within the designated buffers including schools, daycares, hotels, motels, half-way houses, residential care, that allow for residency or schooling, etc."*

Goal LU6 Promote High-Quality and Sustainable Development (3.121)

Policy LU6.5 High-Quality Design, Planning and Construction (3.121)

CHANGE: “Promote sustainable development and best practices in terms of green building, crime prevention, seismic and environmental safety and pedestrian-friendly design.” TO: Provide guidance regarding green building standards, seismic requirements, and pedestrian friendly design through the implementation of the Green Building Ordinance. Promote best practices for crime prevention.”

“Sustainable,” “best practices” and “green” have varying degrees of definitions and understanding. The State Building Code and the City of Richmond Green Building Ordinance ensure a level of building standards that require compliance in respect to sustainability and “green” building standards as well as seismic requirements.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Action LU6.C Development Standards and Guidelines (3.122)

“Update standards and guidelines that encourage high-quality design and construction. Include provisions for environmentally sustainable design, green construction and maintenance standards and best practices for wastewater management and use of permeable surfaces to reduce storm water runoff.”

This statement is too broad – how do you define “high-quality design”, “environmentally sustainable design”, “green construction and maintenance standards”? The State Building Code requires compliance levels and the City should support this. The City has constructed a “Green Building Ordinance”, and that is in the final stages of review and acceptance by the City Council.

“... and best practices for wastewater management and use of permeable surfaces to reduce storm water runoff.” This does not define who/what “best practices for wastewater management” which is a compliance issue with appropriate regulatory agencies. The “use of permeable surfaces to reduce storm water runoff” may not be the best application, or what the regulatory agency might recommend or demand. Again, this is under regulations and or project review by regulatory agencies.

CHANGE TO: *Implement the City’s Green Building Ordinance and provide regular review and update of such to ensure the City is in compliance with State regulations.*
~~Update standards and guidelines that encourage high-quality design and construction. Include provisions for environmentally sustainable design, green construction and maintenance standards and best practices for wastewater management and use of permeable surfaces to reduce storm water runoff.”~~

Regulatory Framework

(3.123)– City needs to add the Bay Planning Coalition which is responsible for supporting port business development and waterfront Industrial usages.

/Note – thank you for added the Seaport Plan into this Element – it will be crucial for planning development of port future uses./

EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES ELEMENT

(2.12) **Childcare and Preschool**

The YMCA provides childcare for students at Kennedy High and runs a daycare in Parchester Village. They also have other programs (before/after school) at several of the elementary schools. If the City is going to list organizations that provide support, these should be added in.

(21.4) **Libraries**

Pt. Richmond library, although not part of the county-wide libraries, can be used by Richmond residents.

(2.15) **Services for Children and Youth**

The YMCA holds classes on nutrition and exercise. The County's new youth center should be noted. The Ed Fund provides additional courses at the schools.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EH 2 Prepare and Educate a Skilled Workforce (2.25)

Action EH2.A Workforce Development Strategy (2.26)

ADD: Continue to support and expand the summer works program for youth in conjunction with the Workforce Investment Board and YouthWorks.

ADD: Continue to support summer youth development programs, e.g. Rosie's Girls.

Goal EH 3 Provide Equitable and High-Quality Human Services (2.27)

Policy EH3.4 Special Needs Services (2.27)

Regarding Human Services, the City should also focus on programs for those returning to the City from juvenile hall and prison. The Office of Neighborhood Safety, Richmond PD and Richmond Police Activity League would be excellent resources.

The City should also consider working with the schools on truancy programs, absenteeism and violence in the schools.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Action EH3.B Community Needs Assessment (2.29)

"Conduct a community needs assessment to determine where service gaps exist in community facilities and where particular types of programming could best meet neighborhood needs." The action item goes into a great deal of depth as to the scope of the assessment. RECOMMEND a more general statement

as the assessment approval and scope of the assessment would be determined by the City Council in conjunction with city staff and funding availability. *The City should consider a Community Needs Assessment which may include....”*

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Richmond Today (4.5)

(4.5) Are there other photos that can be used? Note the billboard advertisement, “Gambling problem? Call....” *Is this really how we want to project RICHMOND TODAY?*

(4.5) First paragraph describing Richmond today, should also include Highways 580, 880 and the Richmond Parkway, as well as major roads like Cutting, Carlson, 23rd Street, Macdonald, etc.

(4.6) Travel to Work Patterns -- please list the year of the US Census Data in the paragraph. It is noted as **2000** --- ISN'T THERE MORE CURRENT CENSUS DATA INFORMATION? So much has changed in the last 8 years regarding financial status of individuals, which could impact their jobs and commute decisions. The information needs to be updated, reviewed and determined if current data changes or adds to the Element's analysis and recommendations.

“Richmond residents' overall carpooling and transit trips are higher than the Bay Area average. In contrast, commuters to jobs in Richmond tend to drive alone at a higher-than-average rate of 79%. This difference in mode choice may reflect the range of transit access and connectivity available to Richmond residents as compared to those available to employees coming from other parts of the Bay Area. More Richmond residents are likely able to access the many bus routes and the Downtown BART station. “ “The latter two areas are not as well connected to Richmond by public transit, which may be related to the higher drive alone rates for non-resident employees in Richmond.

Although this analysis may hold weight, it is made without support data. There may be other reasons – besides availability of transit choices – as to why commuters coming into Richmond choose to drive alone – for example, they do not know anyone else coming into/working in Richmond; they want to be able to come and go without relying on the timing of public transportation; they need flexibility to address childcare issues; they feel safer in their own form of transportation, etc. These broad brush statements don't help the City determine what the issues are and how to address them. **RECOMMEND THAT:** *This statistic is interesting and that more information is needed to derive the reasons behind the higher rate of sole commuters into the City of Richmond – It warrants further review.*

(4.13) “The Richmond City Council has gone on record supporting the potential new ferry terminal to be located in the Marina Bay area of Richmond.” This statement is misleading and does not include the entirety of what the City Council agreed to. In a Study Session on July 31, 2007 – the City Council was presented with an overview of the proposed Ferry Terminal and agreed (8 ayes/1 abstention) to acknowledge the

preferred ferry site, but to make no decision on the General Plan Issues raised. These would become part of the GPAC and PLAN process of review and consideration. A PARAGRAPH NEEDS TO BE ADDED: *In a Study Session on July 31, 2007 – the City Council was presented with an overview of the proposed Ferry Terminal and agreed to acknowledge the preferred ferry site in Marina Bay. The details of the development would become part of the GPAC and Plan process of review and consideration.*

It is also noted that the City Council was not presented with nor did they review the Final Richmond Waterfront Transit Oriented Development Plan as this was not completed until January 2008 and was never brought to the Planning Commission, or City Council for review and approval. A GOAL should be *established that the WETA's Development Plan be agenized with the Planning Commission and the City Council as It has not gone through the final review and approval processes yet.*

(4.14) "Vehicular analyses based on traffic volumes and service Levels"⁹ according to the footnote : 9. Transportation Research Board. Transportation Highway Capacity Manual 2000." *Isn't more current data available?*

(4.14) Appendix X: Existing Traffic Counts and level of Service. NOT ATTACHED.

(4.16) "Simeon Properties" should be changed to Campus Bay.

(4.17) "There are a number of at-grade railroad crossings in Richmond where trains pass through established neighborhoods and the Downtown, creating traffic and noise conflicts and separating residential areas from community amenities such as Richmond's shoreline, parks and schools. Overhead-grade crossings also create visual barriers and can negatively impact adjacent land uses, street connections and character. The planned expansion of the Port of Oakland will likely exacerbate these conditions and increase air pollution in Richmond."

DELETE: "The Planned expansion of the Port of Oakland will likely exacerbate these conditions and Increase air pollution In Richmond." Unclear as to what this sentence is referring to – what will be exacerbated? Increased rail traffic? Increased truck traffic? Where is the data that supports that? Where is the data that indicates there will be an increase in air pollution? What are the sources of the increase? This is an erroneous statement and needs to be deleted.

(4.17) "The City will work with Federal and State transportation agencies BART , MTC , AMTRA K, AC Transit, and WCTAC to explore the possibility of relocating the railroad **traks** [misspelled – tracks] underground as they pass through the City." In addition to these agencies, *The City needs to establish a dialogue with the BNSF and UPRR regarding relocation of tracks.*

(4.19) The Port ADD: "The Port handles a total of 19 million tons annually. The majority of the cargo is oil and other petroleum products," as well as aggregate and building materials.

(4.19) The Port ADD: *The BCDC Seaport Plan provides that the Public Port will be a focal point for increased bulk container shipments over the next 20 years.*

(4.28) *Community Activity Street Does not allow for truck usage according to the matrix on pg. 424. One example of a Community Activity Street is Marina Way South. This may be in conflict with delivery trucks servicing the stores and businesses at Marina Way South as well as the County Health Services campus. Wouldn't Marina Way South fall into the definition of a Community Connector, or a Regional Connector Street?*

(4.30) **Highways** "Automobiles, motorcycles, buses and trucks are the only transportation modes that are permitted to use highways, where the primary intent is an efficient movement of vehicles. Interstate 580 and Interstate 80 are Richmond's highways." ADD: *Richmond Parkway*

(4.35) Finding 4: Richmond relies on efficient and effective goods movement to support economic development opportunities in industrial areas, but noise, air quality and traffic safety remain concerns.

"Maintaining efficient goods movement throughout Richmond is essential to the City's economic vitality. However, potential impacts due to traffic congestion and diesel emissions are concerns, especially in relation to quality of life in residential areas and sensitive uses such as hospitals and schools."

Finding 4 states that "diesel emissions are concerns" however, there is no information or data to backup what this "concern" and/or impact is, if any.

(4.35) Finding 5: While Richmond enjoys an extensive public transit network, the City can further encourage sustainable circulation options that reduce impacts on the environment and build healthy communities.

"... "Promoting the development of green street design standards for new and existing streets." DEFINE "green street design standards."

GOAL CR5 Promote Sustainable and Green Practices (4.39)

"In order to create sustainable and clean circulation options, the City encourages the use of low-impact alternative fuels and green technologies and transportation demand management programs. The City also encourages measures to treat and retain storm water in the design of pedestrian and parking amenities."

"Encourage the use of low impact alternative fuels" – DEFINE "low impact alternative fuels." California has the highest standards and requirements on fuels than other states.

What would "green technologies" entail? This statement needs to be DELETED – It is a broad brush statement and it is not clear the relationship this has to CIRCULATION.

What encompasses a "transportation demand management program"?

"The City also encourages measures to treat and retain storm water in the design of pedestrian and parking amenities." This sentence is confusing and unclear as to what it is suggesting. This should be studied by the City to determine the breadth and scope of such a program.

Goal CR 1 Expan [spelling] the Multimodal Circulation System (4.38) All headings for

this Goal are misspelled.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(4.42) Action CR1.B Mass Transit and Paratransit Service Improvements

CHANGE: "...Major employers should ~~be~~ encouraged to provide employer-based "open-door" shuttles to BART, the ~~future-~~ proposed ferry terminal and other transit hubs.

This should be the employer's decision based on their employee's needs and budgetary constraints. In addition, the Commuter Benefits Ordinance and WCCTAC/511 are assisting employers with their employee commuter needs and include alternatives to shuttles including carpool and vanpools.

(4.43) Action CR1.D Bicycle and Pedestrian Standards

"...In accordance with the Subdivision Map Act, require owners of property along the shoreline to provide maximum feasible public access to the shoreline." ADD: *providing public access does not conflict with private property or homeland security issues restricting public access.*

What is the Subdivision Map Act and can we access a copy of it at the City Website?

Goal CR 2 Promote Walkable Neighborhoods and Livable Streets (4.47)

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(4.49) **Action CR2.C Streetscape Improvement (4.53)** DEFINE: "bioswales, planter strips and permeable pavements"

Goal CR 3 Create a Safe and well-Maintained Circulation System (4.51)

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(4.52) **Action CR3.A At-Grade Railroad Crossings Improvements** "Work with the railroads to improve safety at at-grade railroad crossings. Provide fair-share contributions to improvements where grade separations will enhance safety, community linkages and access for pedestrians, bicyclists and public transit." DEFINE: "fair-share contributions to improvements."

(4.52) Action CR3.C Road Fees Program and Construction Traffic Fees
[spelling] **Program**

The COI is not aware that the City had an "existing Traffic Facilities Fee Program

and Construction Traffic Road Fees Program.” We understood that a program was being considered, but was not implemented. We would like a copy of it.

(4.52) “...They would also insure that sufficient fees are recovered to improve the City’s road network deteriorated by construction vehicle traffic for projects that include new construction, minor remodeling, grading and hauling and the installation of pools, tennis courts and retaining walls.”
This is in conflict with gasoline tax fees used for road repair. This would be a duplication of fees.

Goal CR 4 Ensure an Efficient Movement of Goods (4.54)

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(4.54) **Action CR4.A Goods Movement** “Consider developing and regularly updating a citywide goods movement plan to integrate Port operations, rail movement and truck routes, and to provide a high level of goods movement capacity.”

ADD: Include participation from private Port businesses and the Bay Planning Coalition. Incorporate the Seaport Plan in this process.

The COI would like to participate in the development of the “citywide goods movement plan.”

~~(4.54)~~ **Action CR4.B Truck Routes** “Consider making recommendations for re-routing diesel trucks away from neighborhood streets and sensitive uses..” The COI would like to work with the City on this.

Goal CR 5 Promote Sustainable and Green Practices

(4.56) **Action CR5.C Climate-Friendly Fuel** DEFINE “climate-friendly fuel” – is this biofuels?

(4.56) **Action CR5.E Diesel Engine Idling** “Limit idling of diesel engines in the City including trucks, railroads and ships.” This smells like an ORDINANCE (which in the first draft it was listed as the Diesel Engine Idling Ordinance) which should be removed from the Plan as all ordinances are under the purview of the City Council. Secondly, this should be DELETED as the language does not delineate diesel engines that have been retrofitted, nor, the length of idling time. Third, it should be DELETED because this is already being regulating and the regulations are being updated.

(4.56) **Action CR5.F Green Streets** “Support a sustainable approach to stormwater drainage, groundwater recharge and landscaping. Incorporate green street elements in all streetscape improvement projects in the City”

CLARIFY “sustainable approach to stormwater drainage, groundwater recharge and landscaping.”

Regulatory Framework

ADD: BCDC Seaport Plan

HOUSING ELEMENT

CANNOT COMMENT ON THIS BECAUSE IT HAS NOT BEEN POSTED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW. THE COI WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK TO THE CITY ON THIS ONCE THE DRAFT ELEMENT IS RELEASED.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT

(6.6) Richmond Today: Civic Center “The Civic Center City Hall houses City offices, police services and the City Council chambers.” *Aren’t police services located in Marina Bay?*

(6.8) “The City of Richmond has entered into a Term-term contract with Veolia Water North America to operate and maintain Richmond Municipal Sewer District’s sewer treatment and codification facilities.” Please list the specifics of the contract – contract dates (beginning, ending) and any provisions to extend.

(6.8) West County Wastewater District – DEFINE: “anaerobically digested sludge”

(6.9) Flood Control and Storm Drainage Facilities

“...The Capital improvement cost for these zones is estimated to total \$16,800,000, based on market values as of 2005.⁴” *The COI has concerns that estimating the cost on 2005 market values is not adequate for current cost analysis.*

(6.11) Public Utilities Facilities: Telecommunications Facilities ADD: Comcast Cable is the cable resource only offered in Carriage Hills/ El Sobrante Valley area.

Key Findings and Recommendations

(6.13) DEFINE: “bioswales” – in the illustration. And on pg. 6.15

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CF 1 Serve a Diverse Range of Community Needs

(6.21) **Action CF1.D Municipal Sewer System Master Plan** “The Plan should also identify strategies to recover methane to cogenerate electricity and reuse wastewater and biosolids generated at the treatment plants.” This is a broad reaching statement, and requires research on the City’s part to determine feasibility and cost analysis.

CHANGE STATEMENT TO: *The City may want to investigate the feasibility of*

methane recovery programs, cogeneration, and, wastewater and biocides reuse programs.

(6.25) **Goal CF2 Walkable Neighborhoods and Livable Streets**

(6.26) **Policy CF2.3 Continued Public Use of School Sites**

CHANGE: "School District" TO West Contra Costa County Unified School District.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(6.26) **Action CF2.E Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Plan** CHANGE: "All development and redevelopment *community facilities* shall comply with the City's disaster preparedness and recovery plan."

(6.27) **Policy CF3.2 Green Infrastructure and Landscape**

"Promote ecologically-sensitive approaches in landscaping, stormwater drainage, groundwater recharge and flood control." DEFINE: ecologically-sensitive approaches for each of these areas; not sure what this would entail.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

(6.28) **Action CF3.A Green Building Ordinance** "Require that newly constructed or renovated City-owned and private buildings and structures meet recognized Green Building standards superior to the requirements of the State Building Code. The City should periodically upgrade these requirements as mainline construction practices develop and new materials and building products become available with the goal of meeting the State's Net Zero Energy goals by the year 2020." ***This is NOT in compliance with the Green Building Ordinance.*** The Ordinance looks at meeting levels of LEED building standards for different construction projects. REWORD THIS: *When approved by the City Council,, implement the City Green Building Ordinance. Train staff in the new Ordinance. Provide educational workshops for developers and the public to review the new requirements.*

(6.28) **Action CF3.B Green Streets** "Support a sustainable approach to stormwater drainage, groundwater recharge and landscaping. Incorporate green street elements in all streetscape improvement projects in the City." DEFINE: "a sustainable approach" and what that means for each of the areas "stormwater drainage, groundwater recharge and landscaping."

CONSERVATION, NATURAL RESOURCES AND OPEN SPACE

(7.2) DEFINE: "riparian systems."

(7.6) Richmond Today: Hillsides and Scenic Resources DEFINE: “the urban heat island affect.”

(7.9) Creeks and Riparian Systems “Creeks play other important roles In Richmond’s ecosystem by storing and filtering sediment and nutrients, recharging groundwater aquifers and reducing flood potential.” DEFINE “groundwater aquifers.”

(7.10) “Many of Richmond’s native Plants and wildlife are designated as special status species that play an especially significant role in enriching natural areas and maintaining biodiversity.⁶ DEFINE: “biodiversity”

(7.10) Urban Forest “...countering the heat Island effect” DEFINE

(7.11) DELETE: “This General Plan aims to achieve both regulatory and planning goals while allowing for appropriate development and maintenance activities. *Only the City Council can establish regulations/ordinances, programs, plans and goals.*”

(7.12) Air, Water and Energy Resources: Air Quality Air quality for state one-hour ozone standard and the state and federal annual standards for PM10 (particulate matter of 10 microns or less) are only noted for 2004 and 2006 – *Statistics for 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 should be included.*

(7.13) Water Quality and Urban and Storm water Runoff - (second paragraph) “chemically fertilized lans” *Misspelling, should be LA WNS.*

Key Findings and Recommendations

(7.20) Finding 1: Many of the natural resources in the City are preserved, but some sensitive areas such as wetlands, baylands, marshes and creeks and riparian areas need to be protected and restored. “ ...Daylighting and restoring these creeks will provide opportunities to create green streets...” DEFINE: “daylighting of creeks.”

Goal CN1: Preserve and Restore Natural Habitat and Biodiversity

(7.25) Policy CN1.3 Urban Creek Restoration DEFINE “daylighting of creeks”.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN 1 / Actions

(7.28) **Action CN1.F Special Status Species Protection Methods** “The City will implement the special status ~~special-status~~ survey methods of the California...”

Goal CN 2 Conserve Open Space

(7.30) **Policy CN2.2 Richmond Shoreline** DELETE: “The City should also prepare to protect natural and built environments from adverse potential impacts of ~~se~~ [spelling] level rise due to climate change.” ADD: *The City should create and implement a Climate Change Policy.*

(7.32) **Policy CN2.7 Parkland Dedication and Fees** “The City shall maintain adequate and high quality parklands and play areas to serve current and future residents. The City shall revise the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure provision of additional parkland or funding to purchase and maintain parklands. The City will update its Park Impact Fee Ordinance and prevent the loss of parklands.” This policy requires the city to *revise an Ordinance* and Park Impact Fee Ordinance. This is under the purview of the City Council and therefore should not be included here. CHANGE TO: “The City *may consider revising* ~~shall revise~~ the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure provision of additional parkland or funding to purchase and maintain parklands. The City *may consider updating* ~~will update~~ its Park Impact Fee Ordinance and prevent the loss of parklands..”

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN 2 / Actions

(7.33) **Action CN2.A Transfer of Development Rights Program**

The COI would like more Information on the scope of this program.

(7.33) **Action CN2.C Parkland Dedication and Fees and Parkland Loss**

Prevention “Revise the Subdivision Ordinance to require new development and redevelopment projects to provide park and recreation opportunities to maintain a 3.0 acres per 1,000 **population** [spelling] standard in applicable planning areas through a combination of parks as defined in the Parks and Recreation Element. Parkland dedication should be given priority over impact fees.” .This policy requires the city to *revise an Ordinance* and associated impact fees. This is under the purview of the City Council and therefore should not be included here. In addition, this could be a deterrent to attracting development into the City if more fees are levied on them than in other cities.

(7.33) **Action CN2.D Open Space Plan** “Consider **developing** [spelling] an open space plan...”

Goal CN 3 Improve Water Quality (7.37)

(7.37) **Policy CN3.3 Flood Management** Define: “seethe”

(7.38) **Policy CN3.4 Water Conservation** “Promote water conservation Encourage *CITY STAFF AND OFFICES*, residents, businesses and industry to conserve water especially during drought years.”

(7.38) **Policy CN3.5 Municipal Sewer System** “The City shall ensure the safety of Richmond’s citizens by requiring that wastewater treatment facilities have the capacity to avoid overflows of untreated sewage.” This could be complicated and costly for the City. The current sanitary sewer systems are in need of repair. *Perhaps this policy should focus on the assessing the current sewer system and developing a program, plan of action, and budgetary to address required improvements for the municipal sewer system.*

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as

these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN 3/ Actions

(7.39) Action CN3.A NPDES Compliance and Permit

It is unclear why this ACTION ITEM is included as the NPDES permit will determine the scope of what is required to be done on the project. It may require more or less. Therefore it is recommended that this be deleted, or a summary statement be made that NPDES permits require full compliance. Although that is redundant also.

Issues with this Action Item include:

“Require development to comply with the Contra Costa Clean Water Program Stormwater Guidebook;” Redundant/ already required by regulations DELETE

“Establish a working group to review stormwater control plans and work with developers to ensure compliance with the City’s minimum standards and NPDES requirements; Redundant; meeting City’s minimum standards are already required through the permitting process. Not sure what a working group would add- who would be in the “group”? What level of expertise would they have? DELETE

“Encourage all projects to cluster structures, disconnect downspouts, minimize land disturbance and utilize micro detention such as low impact development (LED) and use pervious pavements where soil infiltration is feasible;” Detail such as this should not be listed in this Action item—it may include unnecessary, and/or costly suggestions, and it may not be required under the NPDES permit requirements. DELETE

“Inspect private business facilities and construction sites to enforce requirements;” Regulatory agencies already have this authority. Who in the City has the expertise to do this? And is the city willing to take on this liability? DELETE

“Require adequate source control measures to limit pollution generation in businesses including draining non-stormwater discharges such as swimming pools and fountains, trash and food compactor racks, vehicle outdoor storage, fire sprinkler test water and equipment washing, air conditioning condensate, ongoing large volume landscape runoff, foundation food drains, and pumped groundwater;” How will this be monitored and enforced? DELETE

*“Require businesses that may be susceptible to polluting stormwater to implement best management practices (BMPs), including covering drains and **storage** [spelling] precautions for outdoor material storage, loading docks, repair and maintenance bays and fueling areas;” How would the city determine which businesses MAY BE SUSCEPTIBLE TO polluting stormwater? What criterion would be used to judge this? And, who would monitor this? DELETE*

“Implement an Enforcement Response Plan for consistent actions to achieve timely and effective compliance from businesses, construction sites and to abate illicit discharges; This would be a duplication of actions that would result of violations of the NPDES permit. DELETE.

“Inspect construction sites to prevent pollution discharges;” *What would constitute a “pollution discharge”?* *Doesn’t the city already have the authority to inspect construction sites if they are permitted through the city?* *DELETE.*

“Adopt an integrated pest management (IPM) policy or ordinance and advocate (IPM) through public education;” *This is a good idea, however ordinance construction is under the purview of the City Council.* *DELETE.*

“Manage waste generated from cleaning and treating of copper architectural features including copper roofs;” *How would the City propose to manage this?* *DELETE.*

“Adopt a local ordinance for installing a sanitary sewer connection and prohibiting discharges of copper-based chemicals or other fungicides from pools, spas and fountains;” *Again, ordinance’s are under the purview of the City Council and do not belong in the General Plan.* Installing a sanitary sewer connection is covered under the permitting procedures. It would be impossible to control these types of discharges.

(7.40) Action CN3.C Water Recycling **DUPLICATION of Action EC3.G Water Recycling** “Establish a water recycling program for residents, businesses and developers to install localized water recycling systems.” *This would be monetarily restrictive. The City doesn’t have the authority to require this.* *DELETE*

(7.41) Action CN3.D Monitoring and Enforcement “Continue the monitoring and enforcement program to control water pollution. The program should restrict and identify illicit discharges and ensure best management practices for all developments. **DELETE THIS ACTION ITEM** – enforcement of discharge is already regulated under the NPDES, Bay Area Water Quality Management District, etc.

(7.41) Action CN3.E Groundwater Protection Ordinance The City **SHOULD NOT** “create an ordinance” Creating and Ordinance is under the purview of the City Council.

(7.41) Action CN3.G Flood Control Requirements “Require new development to install flood control measures to address sea level rise as appropriate.” *This remains controversial and it is not clear as to what the potential sea level rise would be – if any.* *DELETE*

(7.41) Action CN3.H Water Conservation Program The City **SHOULD NOT** “create a water conservation program ” **BUT INVESTIGATE or RESEARCH THE FEASIBILITY** of establishing such a program. The actions listed are so restrictive, residences would not be able to comply and developers might decide not to build In the City.

Goal CN 4 Improve Air Quality (7.42)

(7.43) Policy CN4.1 Air Quality --The language as it is stated is not enforceable and cannot be implemented. **DELETE AND REPIACE WITH:**

The City should continue to participate in regional Planning efforts with nearby jurisdictions and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to meet air quality standards; and support regional, state and federal efforts to enforce

existing pollution control laws and strengthen regulations.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN 4/ Actions

(7.44) Action CN4.A Bay Area Air Quality Management District Partnership

“Work closely with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to meet air quality standards set in the BAAQMD’s Clean Air Plan and to ensure projects incorporate feasible mitigation measures if not already provided for through project design.” The City would be taking on a duplicative role of what the BAAQMD will be doing. CHANGE TO: “Work closely with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to meet air quality standards set in the BAAQMD’s Clean Air Plan and to ensure projects incorporate feasible mitigation measures if not already provided for through project design.”

(7.44) Action CN4.B Air Pollution Reduction Strategy “ This would also include support *[spelling]* for programs...] Again, the City would be taking on a duplicative regulatory role to implement such.

(7.44) Action CN4.C Climate-Friendly Fuel Guidelines

The City should define what “climate-friendly” fuels are.

(7.44) Action CN4.D Air Quality Monitoring and Reporting Program Should the City investigate the feasibility of such a program, they need to consider that regulations are in place requiring monitoring of sites, reporting of releases and mitigation. This would be a duplication of current regulations. DELETE.

(7.44) Action CN4.E New Development Emissions Reduction “The City shall review proposed development projects to ensure projects incorporate *[spelling]* feasible measures that reduce construction and operational emissions for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter (PM10 and PM23) through project design.” DELETE. CHANGE TO: *The City may review proposed development projects to ensure projects incorporate State and Federal emissions requirements for construction projects.*

Goal CN5 Promote Environmental Sustainability

(7.45) Policy CN5.1 Energy Efficiency and Conservation *The scope of this program falls under the Green Building Ordinance. This would be a duplication.*

(7.45) Policy CN5.1 Energy Efficiency and Conservation

DELETE CURRENT LANGUAGE AND CHANGE TO:

The City will ensure that the State and Local building codes are adhered to and will update the Green Building Ordinance in alignment with changes in State and Federal code changes. The City may communicate energy rebate programs offered by local energy providers (EBMUD and PG&E) to the community at large to incentivize energy efficiency and conservation. The City will implement joint purchasing agreements for the purchase of environmentally sustainable products and services.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN5/Actions

(7.46) **Action CN5.C Green Building Ordinance** *The Green Building Ordinance has been approved by the State Energy Commission, but it has not been presented to the City Council yet. Since this is an Ordinance in process, it should not be included in the General Plan as it is still under the purview of the City Council. DELETE.*

(7.47) **Action CN5.E Climate Action Plan** *The City has agreed to have the COI participate in the construction of the Climate Action Plan. Mitigation language should be DELETED – regulatory agencies have authority to mitigate noncompliance issues. This would be a duplication.*

Z97.47) **Action CN5.F Construction and Demolition** *DUPLICATION with Action EC3.E.*

Goal CN 6 Create a Healthy Urban Environment (7.48)

(7.48) Policy CN6.1 Toxic and Contaminated Sites

“Promote the clean-up and reuse of contaminated sites. Work with property owners and the Lead regional agency/es or regional agency on the clean-up of contaminated sites. to reduce soil and water contamination from industrial operations, the Port and other activities that use, produce or dispose of hazardous or toxic substances. Require appropriate mitigation measures and clean-up of sites that are known to contain toxic materials as a condition of allowing reuse. Support remediation and reuse of large, disturbed sites such as the Naval Fuel Depot at Point Molate, Campus Bay and the Terminal 4 site at Point San Pablo”

It is the lead agency that would determine appropriate mitigation measures.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal CN 6 /Action (7.49)

(7.49) Action CN6.B Hazardous Substance Management

The City of Richmond shall:

- *Require In coordination with the business or developer, determine if a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment for any development proposal where site contamination is suspected. is required.*
- *Implement the Zoning regulations as they relate hazardous substances for commercial and industrial properties. Not clear on what this is inferring. Changes in zoning require purview of the Planning Commission and the City Council. DELETE.*

- Coordinate with the Contra Costa County Department of Health Services and the State Department of Toxic Substance Control in the implementation of their regulations and standards. *The City does not have the authority to implement the County or the DTSC's regulations and standard. The City can assist in coordinating the agencies activities and follow-up with the agencies to determine if there is compliance.*

(7.49) Action CN6.C Pollution Prevention Program

Please reference where the public/ COI may obtain a copy of the City's Pollution Prevention Program.

(7.50) Action CN6.F Coordination with Utility Providers "Coordinate with utility providers to identify [?] or locate [?] underground utility lines that are in close proximity to native and other landmark trees. Work with utility providers to coordinate transmission line location and other potential impacts associated with undergrounding utilities."

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ELEMENT

//NOTE: The majority of Action Items in this Element are duplicates of Action Items in **CONSERVATION, NATURAL RESOURCES AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT**. If the City chooses to keep a list of Action Items- which we do not support as part of the Plan - for ease of monitoring – there should be only one # attached to an item. //

(8.5) Richmond's Adaptation Advantages: Access to Public Transportation – CHANGE "future ferry terminal" to "proposed ferry terminal"

GOAL EC5 Support Community Revitalization and Economic Development (8.21)

We support the city and businesses in developing relationships and open communication; and the businesses providing education on the key programs that business sector have implemented and future programs to address GHG emissions, and, energy efficiency and improvement programs.

Goal EC 1 Provide Leadership to Manage Climate Change (8.22)

(8.22) Policy EC1.1 Leadership and Advocacy "Encourage a leadership role at all levels of government and private sector to advocate for local, regional and national solutions to climate change." The City committed to include the COI and key member representatives (PG&E, EBMUD, etc.) in the construction of the Climate Control Plan.

Goal EC2 Promote Clean and Efficient Transportation Options (8.24)

(8.24) Policy EC2.2 Climate-Friendly Fuel

(8.26) Policy EC2.7 Climate-Friendly Goods Movement This is under the auspices of several regulatory agencies including the Department of Transportation which has regulations set out to reduce GHG emissions in trucks and rail sources. The City does not have the staff or budget to add another layer of regulations to this.

The suggestion is that the City continues to support educational workshops on Carl Moyer funding for conversion of vehicles, and, encourage regulatory agencies to present other educational workshops in the City.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EC2 / Actions

(8.26) **Action EC2.A Climate-Friendly Fuel**

– DEFINE “climate-friendly fuel.”

(8.26) **Action EC2.B City Vehicles Transition** CHANGE TO “Consider Increasing the share of climate-friendly vehicles and use of climate-friendly fuels in the City and consider including bicycles in a corporate fleet where feasible” This would be a budgetary decision, under the purview of the City Council.

(8.26) **Action EC2.C Public Transit and Paratransit Service Improvements**

“...Major employers should provide employer-based “open-door” shuttles to BART, the future ferry terminal and other transit hubs.” **INCLUDED IN:: (4.42) Action CR1.B Mass Transit and Paratransit Service Improvements**

CHANGE TO “...Major employers ~~should~~ *are encouraged to* provide employer-based “open-door” shuttles to BART, the ~~future~~ *proposed* ferry terminal and other transit hubs.

This should be the employer’s decision based on their employee’s needs and budgetary constraints. In addition, the Commuter Benefits Ordinance and WCCTAC/511 are assisting employers with their employee commuter needs and include alternatives to shuttles including carpool and vanpools.

(8.27) **Action EC2.D Transit Incentives** CHANGE “planned ferry terminal” to *proposed ferry terminal*.

(8.27) **Action EC2.F Promote Bicycle Use** “...Encourage businesses to provide bicycle amenities such as secured bicycle parking, showers and lockers for employees who bike to work.” This is beyond the purview of the City’s Plan; businesses employees may not be interested In this amenity; businesses may not have the budget for this, and there may be security issues preventing businesses from pursuing this.
DELETE.

(8.28)) **Action EC2.H Carshare Program**

DELETE: “Encourage employers to develop programs to promote carsharing and reduce reliance on private automobiles.” The City should establish a carsharing program for their employees and once it is established, share the program with Local employers. For employers with 10+ employees, they fall under the Commuter Benefit Ordinance.

(8.28) **Action EC2.J Port Emissions Reduction**

There is a Public Port – over which the city has jurisdiction, and private port

businesses – which the city does not have jurisdiction over.

REWORD THIS ACTION TO ADDRESS ONLY THE PUBLIC PORT. The City Port has established a Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) Advisory Board which is tasked with reviewing the public port activities, regulations, etc. and providing a summary report to the City in 18 months with recommendations on port improvements considering reductions in GHG's and emissions. The CAAP is already reviewing the viability of some of the examples given. This action Item should support the CAAP activities to complete the summary Plan within the associated time frame.

Regarding the private port industries – whereas the COI will support conversations with the City on this topic, not all port Industries are members of the COI. First and foremost, it is recommended that the City continue to educate themselves on the port businesses and what emissions reduction Plans they have in place. The COI would like to be included In this. The City should also be educated on new and updated regulations which will also impact emissions standards.

Goal EC3 Encourage Sustainable and Efficient Energy Systems (8.29)

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EC 3/ Actions (8.30)

(8.30) **Action EC3.C Energy Demand Reduction** "...Collaborate with neighboring jurisdictions to share best practices and implement regional programs to help residents and businesses meet regional demand reduction targets." The City is stepping beyond their municipal area of responsibility to implement regional demand reduction targets on residents and businesses. PG&E already has programs in place to incentivize energy reduction usage. DELETE.

(8.30) **Action EC3.E Construction and Demolition Ordinance** DUPLICATION w/ **Action CN5.F** COI and Chamber working with Councilmember Butt on this ordinance.

(8.37) **Action EC3.F Water Conservation Program** DUPLICATION WITH **Action CN3.H Water Conservation Program** The City SHOULD NOT "create a water conservation program" BUT INVESTIGATE or RESEARCH THE FEASIBIIITY of establishing such a program. The actions listed are so restrictive, residences would not be able to comply and developers might decide not to build In the City. The City needs to focus on EDUCATION of residents rather than jumping directly to regulating and fines.

(8.38) **Action EC3.G Water Recycling Program** DUPLICATION of **Action CN3.C Water Recycling** "Establish a water recycling program for residents, businesses and developers to install localized water recycling systems." *This would be monetarily restrictive. The City doesn't have the authority to require this.* DELETE

GOAL EC4 Promote Sustainable Development (8.32)

(8.32) **Policy EC4.1 Mixed-Use and Infill Development** CHANGE: "Planned to

“PROPOSED ferry terminal”

(8.32) Policy EC4.5 local Urban Agriculture and Food

CHANGE: “Support urban agriculture and encourage Local farmers to provide fresh food locally. The City should ~~support~~ *investigate the feasibility of* urban and local agriculture on publicly owned vacant land that is suitable for growing food.”

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EC 4/ Actions

(8.34) Action EC4.G Green Building Technologies and Standards DELETE LANGUAGE, REPLACE WITH: The City should *implement the Green Building Ordinance which includes building technologies and standards.*

(8.35) Action EC4.H landscape Design Guidelines

“Update the City’s Landscape design and development guidelines” ADD: *with input from the Design Review Board and the Planning Commission.*

(8.43) Action EC4.I Green Building Ordinance DUPLICATE OF **Action EC4.G**

DELETE LANGUAGE, REPLACE WITH: The City should *implement the Green Building Ordinance which includes building technologies and standards.*

GOAL EC5 Support Community Revitalization and Economic Development (8.37)

(8.37) Policy EC5.3 Air Quality Should the City investigate the feasibility of such a program, they need to consider that regulations are in place requiring monitoring of sites, reporting of releases and mitigation. This would be a duplication of current regulations. DELETE.

Air quality is highly regulated by State and Federal agencies. The City should “continue to participate in regional Planning efforts with nearby jurisdictions and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to meet air quality standards; and support regional, state and federal efforts to enforce existing pollution control laws.”

This statement should be DELETED: “The City should also ensure that sensitive uses such as schools, childcare centers, parks and playgrounds, housing and community gathering places are protected from adverse Impacts of emissions.” It is unclear If there is any data to support this assumption, there is no definition as to what an “adverse Impact” is quantitatively, and, there is no clarification as to how the City “should protect” these uses from “adverse impacts.” In contradiction to this concern for “adverse Impacts on sensitive uses,” under the Land Use Element it is stated that high density housing should be moved Into the Industrial Buffer Zone at the Port area.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EC 5 / Actions

(8.48) Action EC5.A Green Business Strategies

The COI would like to collaborate with the City to develop a strategic Plan to attract diverse businesses to the City. Diversity of businesses – not just green technology businesses - supports economic growth and minimizes economic downturns in one industry or technology area.

(8.49) Action EC5.D Air Quality Monitoring and Reporting Program

DUPLICATION OF Action CN4.D Air Quality Monitoring and Reporting Program

“Collaborate with the County Health Department, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and state agencies to establish baseline exposures and to the extent feasible, document health effects associated with monitored baseline exposures.” Again, the City might want to investigate such, but the scope of this project would be enormous and is currently under the responsibility of the County Health Department and other agencies. This is a duplication of efforts by these agencies. how the City would “document health effects associated with monitored baseline exposures” and what data would be used to support the effects.

“Include provisions to hold businesses and operations financially accountable for their impacts on the environment or community due to air pollution exceeding legal thresholds.” This is a broad statement that does not define “Impacts”, how these “Impacts” would be scientifically determined, what data would be used to correlate “Impacts” to “environment or community”. The City needs to rethink their legal responsibility.

Should the City investigate the feasibility of such a program, they need to consider that regulations are in place requiring monitoring of sites, reporting of releases and mitigation. This would be a duplication of current regulations. **DELETE ACTION ITEM.**

Goal EC 6 Build Climate Resilient Communities (8.39)

(8.39) Policy EC6.1 Habitat and Biological Resource Protection and Restoration

DELETE: “Marshes and baylands should continue to be protected to ensure they are not polluted or damaged from bay filling and dredging.” This is a generic statement, assuming pollution results from filling and dredging. Dredging is a requirement that must be done to ensure proper channel usage by both the City port, and the private ports. And, the Plan supports the port businesses and economic growth so dredging needs to continue. Where is the supportive data that shows that bay filling and dredging causes pollution or damage to the marshes and baylands?

DELETE: “Creek corridors and riparian areas should be protected and restored to ensure they function as healthy wildlife habitat and biological areas. The City should ensure the protection and restoration of creek corridors and riparian areas and improving creek access.” **CHANGE TO:** *The City may investigate the feasibility of restoring creek corridors and riparian areas.*”

(8.51) Policy EC6.3 Adapting to Climate Change

DELETE: “Prepare for and adapt to future impacts of changing weather patterns and sea level fluctuations. Work with regional regulatory agencies and local property owners to develop strategies aimed at reducing the potential impacts of climate

change and sea level fluctuations. All projects proposed for construction within 300 feet of the existing shoreline (high tide) will include an evaluation of the impact of a one meter rise in sea level.” CHANGE TO: *The City is in process of creating a Climate Change Plan under the leadership of the City Environmental Manager, in collaboration with local business and community leaders.*

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal EC 6 / Actions (8.40)

(8.40) Action EC6.B Habitat Restoration Plan

CHANGE language to ensure that It is referring to City owned property.

“Create a work Plan for restoring sensitive habitat *ON CITY OWNED PROPERTY OR REDEVELOPMENT PROPERTY* that has been degraded and has potential for rehabilitation. This Includes *CITY OWNED PROPERTY OR REDEVELOPMENT PROPERTY THAT HAS DETERMINED TO BE A brownfield and- OR* contaminated sites. Seek funding opportunities from state and federal agencies and from nonprofit foundations for restoration and remediation work *OF THESE CITY OWNED SITES.*

Private property sites will fall under regulatory compliance and cleanup of such will be determined by the established lead agency.

(8.40) Action EC6.D Shoreline Protection

DELETE: “Restore shoreline areas and prepare for potential sea level rise. Address a range of issues including: impacts on development adjacent to low-lying areas; soil erosion along the shoreline; inundation of public and private property; disruption of infrastructure such as streets, railroad lines, the Port, sewer lines, sewage treatment plants and stormwater drainage lines; and impacts to marshes, wetlands and floodplains..”

CHANGE TO: “*THE CITY’S CLIMATE CHANGE PLAN MIGHT INCLUDE REVIEW OF SHORLINE AREAS AND POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THOSE AREAS AS WELL AS LOW LYING AREAS.*”

(8.41) Action EC6.F Storm Water Drainage Master Plan

CHANGE: “*INVESTIGATE THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A program to Eliminate or reduce direct discharges of polluted stormwater into the San Francisco Bay INCLUDING BUDGET AND STAFFING SUPPORT.*

(8.41) Action EC6.H Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Plan

ADD: *PUBLIC TRAINING OR INFORMATION PROGRAM*

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

(9.7) Finding 1: Richmond will experience new Infill development In the coming decades.

DEFINE: “*greenfield* development opportunities”

(9.8) Measure J Capital Improvement Projects

CHANGE: “\$45 million for ~~new~~ proposed ferry service in West County including service between Richmond and San Francisco.” *Is this \$45 million still earmarked for a potential ferry terminal in West Contra Costa County?*

Goal GM 1 Coordinate Land Use and Transportation Planning (9.10)

(9.12) Policy GM2.2 Community Amenities for New Development

New development should pay costs attributable to that development including impacts on: local streets; local and regional transportation systems; and public facilities such as parks and recreation, schools and emergency services.

/AND/

(9.17) Action GM2.C Local Development Mitigation Program “Update the City’s impact fee schedule to raise adequate revenues from Development projects for new or upgraded facilities and amenities.”

/AND/

(9.13) Action GM2.B Regional Development Mitigation “Support regional development mitigation measures consistent with the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan that funds regional and subregional transportation projects. Regional mitigation measures may include fees, assessments, exactions or other contributions that provide community facilities and infrastructure for planned and proposed development.”

????ARE COMMUNITY AMENITIES FEES, LOCAL DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAM, IMPACT FEE SCHEDULES, and the COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN /REGIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES referencing the same fee assessment? Or are these individual fee assessments? If they are all independent fee schedules for levied on developments there may be duplication of fees.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Goal PR 1 Develop an Integrated System of Parks, Green Streets and Trails

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal PR 1 / Actions

(10.42) **Action PR1.F Shoreline Parks Plan** The Pt. Molate and Terminal 4 should be removed from this Plan as they fall under a separate Planned Development.

(10.44) **Action PR1.H Parkland Dedication Ordinance**” Update the parkland dedication ordinance that requires new development and redevelopment projects to provide adequate park and recreation opportunities to maintain the 3.0 acres per 1,000 population standard in applicable Planning areas”

ORDINANCES SHOULD NOT APPEAR IN THE PLAN. These require Planning Commission and public review and comment as well as City Council approval, including updating and ordinance.

Goal PR 2 Create Safe and High-Quality Parks and Recreational Facilities

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal PR2 / Actions

(10.46) Action PR2.F Parks and Recreational Facilities Improvements

“...Create a program to renovate all park and recreational facilities to state-of-the-art standards and explore the feasibility of constructing a new 70,000 square foot multiple-use gymnasium and state-of-the-art sports and activity center..”

DELETE THIS ACTION. THE CITY DOES NOT HAVE THE BUDGET TO SUPPORT THIS.

Goals PR 4 Promote Stewardship of the Natural Environment

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal PR4 / Action

(10.54) Action PR4.C Bay Trail and Shoreline Access Ordinance

“Develop and adopt an ordinance that requires future developments near the shoreline to provide public access where the San Francisco Bay Trail is planned and to provide public access to the shoreline where feasible..”

DELETE ACTION ITEM / Ordinances must go through a review process and have public review, Planning Commission review and approval by the City Council.

Goal PR 5 Provide a Range of Quality Recreation Programs and Services

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal PR 5/ Actions

(10.61) Action PR5.B Festivals and Events Funding “Evaluate opportunities to expand major festivals and events celebrating arts, culture and history on a regional scale. The City should consider dedicating additional resources to popular cultural events such as Juneteenth, Cinco de Mayo and the Richmond Home Front Festival.”

Individual events should not be noted as these have to have approval – on an annual basis – by the City Council.

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ILLNESS ELEMENT

Key Findings and Recommendations

(11.27) Finding 9: “Although Richmond benefits from its strategic location in the Bay Area and surrounding natural resources, many residents and workers are impacted by air, water, soil and noise pollution. Improvements to environmental quality may include: o Regulating and containing air emissions from industry, ships, trucks and private automobiles while reducing exposure to sensitive population groups such as children and seniors;”

Air emissions are being monitored by the Bay Area Air Quality Management Board. Therefore, CHANGE TO:

Although Richmond benefits from its strategic location in the Bay Area and surrounding natural resources, many residents and workers are impacted by air, water, soil and noise pollution. Improvements to environmental quality may include: o ~~Support current regulations that~~ ~~Regulating and containing~~ air emissions from industry, ships, trucks and private automobiles while reducing exposure to sensitive population groups such as children and seniors;

Goal HW 1 Improve Access to Parks, Recreation and Open Space

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal HW 1 / Actions

(11.34) **Action HW1.B Parkland Dedication and Fees and Parkland Loss Prevention** **DUPLICATION OF ACTION ITEM Action PR1.H Parkland Dedication Ordinance** ORDINANCES SHOULD NOT APPEAR IN THE PLAN. These require Planning Commission and public review and comment as well as City Council approval, including updating and ordinance OR revising an Ordinance. DELETE.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal HW 3/ Actions

(11.41) **Action HW3.C Health Coverage Guidelines**

“Collaborate with local trade organizations to update health coverage guidelines. Provide information to local employers that assists them with their efforts to provide health coverage to employees.”

DELETE ACTION ITEM. This is beyond the scope of the City’s responsibilities and could be on the verge of an unfair labor practice as wages and benefits are subject to negotiation between the bargaining unit and the company or public sector representative.

Goal HW 4 Encourage Save and Convenient Public Transit and Active Circulation Options

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal HW 4/ Actions

(11.44) **Action HW4.B Transit Access Guidelines and Incentives**

CHANGES: “Develop guidelines that encourage the location of public and senior housing units, ~~major employers with more than 500 employees~~ and significant public facilities within a quarter-mile of a local transit stop or a half-mile of a regional transit stop. ~~Collaborate with major employers to establish shuttle service to a nearby regional transit stop if they do not meet these requirements.~~” Major employers will fall under the Commuter Benefits Ordinance which provides guidance on what options are available to employers in regards to commuter benefits.

Action HW4.C THERE IS NO ACTION ITEM NOTED – THE ITEMS GO FROM HW4.B TO HW4.D... THE REMAINDER OF THE ACTION ITEMS NEED TO BE RENUMBERED.

(11.46) **Action HW4.E Bicycle and Pedestrian Standards**

DELETE: “...Encourage all new commercial, industrial, mixed-use, civic, assembly, and residential development to provide access for construction and operation of a trail where a local or regional trail is designated or planned..” *This could be In conflict with Homeland Security Issues, safety Issues, and private property issues.*
CHANGE TO: Where feasible, encourage all new commercial, industrial, mixed-use, civic, assembly, and residential development to provide access for construction and operation of a trail where a local or regional trail is designated or planned..”

(11.48) **Action HW4.M Road Fees Program and Construction Traffic Fees Program**
DUPLICATION OF Action CR3.C Road Fees Program and Construction Traffic Fees Program The COI is not aware that the City had an “existing Traffic Facilities Fee Program and Construction Traffic Road Fees Program.” We understood that a program was being considered, but was not implemented. We would like a copy of it.

“...They would also insure that sufficient fees are recovered to improve the City’s road network deteriorated by construction vehicle traffic for projects that include new construction, minor remodeling, grading and hauling and the installation of pools, tennis courts and retaining walls.”
This is in conflict with gasoline tax fees used for road repair. This would be a duplication of fees.

(11.48) **Action HW4.N Street Design**

Either DELETE this action Item or refer back to the Circulation and Land Use elements which go into detail regarding street design area by area.

Goal HW 5 Provide a Range of Quality and Affordable Housing

(11.49) Policy HW5.2 A Range of Housing Types

To maintain economic diversity and support for the City, we also need to have middle to high end housing units.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we

have the following comments.//

Goal HW 5 / Actions

(11.50) **Action HW5.A Inclusionary Housing Ordinance** “Update the City’s existing ordinance requiring inclusionary housing units in new housing development and redevelopment housing projects. Include an in-lieu fee provision.”

DELETE – Ordinance Revisions need to be determined by City Council and Staff with input from the public.

(11.50) **Action HW5.C Existing Housing Restoration Program** “Develop a program and funding mechanism to support restoration of heritage homes in the City.” *DELETE – Because this would require budgetary funding, it is under the purview of the City Council and requires their review and assessment.*

(11.55) **Action HW5.D Senior and Affordable Housing Design Guidelines**
CHANGE: “Develop standards and guidelines for senior and affordable housing units to ensure high-quality Planning, design and construction while maintaining affordability. ~~Require~~ *ENCOURAGE* projects to provide the same *OR SIMILAR* design standards for affordable units as for market rate units. *DELETE – Because this would require budgetary funding, it is under the purview of the City Council and requires their review and assessment.*

(11.50) **Action HW5.E Rehabilitation Assistance Program**
DELETE – Because this would require budgetary funding, it is under the purview of the City Council and requires their review and assessment.

Goal HW 7 Develop Complete Neighborhoods

(11.62) **Policy HW7.1 Higher Density and Mixed-Use Infill Development**

CHANGE “Planned ferry service” to “*proposed* ferry service.”

The recommendation for high density housing in the Ford Peninsula does not apply to the Industrial Buffer Zone.

Goal HW 8 Improve Safety in Neighborhoods and Public Spaces

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal HW 8 / Actions

(11.59) **Action HW8.C Liquor Store Ordinance**

DELETE ACTION ITEM – Ordinances must go through the public review, Planning Commission process, and then to City Council.

Goal HW 9 Improve Environmental Quality

(11.60) **Policy HW9.1 Air Quality** DUPLICATION OF **Policy EC5.3 Air Quality**
Should the City investigate the feasibility of such a program, they need to consider that regulations are in place requiring monitoring of sites, reporting of releases and mitigation. This would be a duplication of current regulations. DELETE.

(11.60) Policy HW9.2 Toxic and Contaminated Sites DUPLICATION OF **Policy CN6.1 Toxic and Contaminated Sites**

~~“Promote the clean-up and reuse of contaminated sites. Work with property owners and *the Lead regional agency/ies or regional agency on the clean-up of contaminated sites.* to reduce soil and water contamination from industrial operations, the Port and other activities that use, produce or dispose of hazardous or toxic substances. Require appropriate mitigation measures and clean-up of sites that are known to contain toxic materials as a condition of allowing reuse. Support remediation and reuse of large, disturbed sites such as the Naval Fuel Depot at Point Molate, Campus Bay and the Terminal 4 site at Point San Pablo”~~

It is the lead agency that would determine appropriate mitigation measures

(11.72) Policy HW9.8 Noise Levels

DELETE/ DUPLICATION OF REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS – CAIOSHA.

(11.61) Policy HW9.3 Water Quality – DUPLICATION OF VARIOUS POLICIES IN CONSERVATION, NATURAL RESOURCES AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

(11.62) Policy HW9.9 Transportation-Related Noise “Prevent and mitigate noise Impacts from roadways and railroads on residential areas and sensitive uses In the community. Mitigate transportation noise Impacts through use of technology, Location and design of transportation facilities as Ill as the Location and design of noise sensitive uses. Support traffic and highway Improvements that will reduce noise Impacts of highways.”

DELETE THIS ACTION ITEM. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE NOT FEASIBLE. THE CITY HAS A QUIET ZONE ORDINANCE IN PLACE FOR RAIL CAR NOISE ABATEMENT.

(11.72) Policy HW9.10 Second-Hand Smoke “Reduce exposure to harmful effects of second-hand smoke In Indoor and outdoor areas. The City should make efforts to protect vulnerable populations such as children and seniors from exposure to second-hand smoke.

DELETE THIS ACTION ITEM. THE CITY HAS IMPIEMENTED A SECOND HAND SMOKE ORDINANCE.

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal HW / Actions

(11.63) Action HW9.A Air Quality Monitoring and Reporting Program
DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE

(11.73) Action HW9.B Air Pollution Reduction Strategy

Develop strategies that reduce air pollution In the City. This may Include measures to reduce auto use, expand transit and non-motorized transportation options and reduce congestion and idling time. Include programs

to reduce air pollution from stationary sources such as power Plants, oil refineries and commercial and residential buildings, among others. Work with these entities to closely monitor air quality Impacts and establish best practices for reducing emissions

DELETE THIS ITEM. OTHER ITEMS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN THE PLAN WHICH RECOMMEND MONITORING AND WE HAVE ADDED COMMENTS THERE.

(11.63) Action HW9.C Engine Replacement and Retrofitting Program DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE

(11.64) Action HW9.D Port Emissions Reduction DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE

(11.64) Action HW9.E Indoor Air Quality Guidelines Reduction DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE

(11.64) Action HW9.F Sensitive Use Location Guidelines Rather than “develop” guidelines, the City should consider the feasibility of developing and Implementing guidelines. ***DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE***

(11.74) Action HW9.G Air Quality Impact Analysis Guidelines
DELETE PARAGRAPH. CHANGE TO: *The City may consider air quality impact analysis guidelines based on the California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommendations for cumulative impact assessment.*

(11.65) Action HW9.H Truck Routes Study This assumes there is an exposure issue along truck routes, but it does not support it with scientific data. ***DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE***

(11.65) Action HW9.J Site Remediation Strategy DUPLICATE PROGRAM/ DELETE

(11.66) Action HW9.K Hazardous Substance Management Standards
DELETE . DUPLICATION OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE ISSUES & DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM

(11.68) Action HW9.R Noise Ordinance
DELETE. The Noise Ordinance is in place; it must be in compliance with CalOSHA. Updates to the Noise Ordinance must be submitted to the Planning Commission, open to public review and comment, and then to City Council.

(11.68) Action HW9.S Quiet Zone Feasibility Study ALREADY IN PLACE/ DELETE

(11.68) Action HW9.T Second-Hand Smoke Ordinance
DELETE. The City has implemented an ordinance covering most of this action Item. Adding additional restrictions would require that the Ordinance go back through the

public review process and approval process by the Planning Commission and the City Council. THIS IS A DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM.

(11.71) *Action HW10.A Climate Action Plan* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.71) *Action HW10.B Green Building Ordinance* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.71) *Action HW10.C Green Building Technologies and Standards* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.71) *Action HW10.D Renewable Energy* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.72) *Action HW10.E Waste Reduction and Recycling* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.72) *Action HW10.F Construction and Demolition* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.72) *Action HW10.G Water Conservation Program* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.73) *Action HW10.H Water Recycling* DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/DELETE

(11.88) **Action HW11.B Healthy Development Criteria**
DELETE. This review process takes place during an EIR review for major projects.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NOISE

(12.10) Noise Conditions and Compatibility Standards: RailCars - *Need to ADD that there are several “quiet” zone areas throughout the city in which the trains cannot blow their horns.*

Goal SN 1 Manage Risk from Natural and Human Caused Disasters

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal SN 1 / Actions

(12.20) **Action SN1.A Earthquake Fault Special Studies Zone**

CHANGE this action item from “develop” to *consider conducting a feasibility study on earthquake zones.” This should be done with input from ABAG and USGS. The City should consider disseminating earthquake preparedness information to the community, including workshops. Building codes require that Plans include potential earthquake impacts therefore, It should not be Included In this action Item.*

(12.20) **Action SN1.B New Utility Installations**

When installations take place, they go through the permitting process. During this

time, the project is reviewed for safety Issues. DELETE.

(12.21) Action SN1.F Dam Failure and Seiche Monitoring

DELETE: "Monitor the San Pablo Dam in coordination with the East Bay Municipal Utility District to ensure safety from the possibility of dam failure and seiches."

Explain how the City is going to "monitor" the dam safety? CHANGE TO: *The City will meet with East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) on a regular basis to discuss the viability of the San Pablo Dam, potential failures, and the EBMUD's emergency action Plan should a failure occur.*"

(12.21) Action SN1.H Hazardous Waste Management Plan DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/ DELETE

(12.21) Action SN1.I Hazardous Material Regulation

DELETE. Duplication with State and Federal Laws; these agencies already have mitigation responsibilities and authority. The City has an ordinance in place that requires companies handling hazardous materials to submit an emergency action Plan.

(12.22) Action SN1.J Hazardous Waste Reduction Targets

DELETE. It is unclear as to who this is targeted at – City hazardous waste reduction? landfill hazardous waste reduction – If so, then this needs to be a collaboration with the Landfill operators. If Businesses/Industry –these Individuals are under strict regulations regarding hazardous waste disposal and a hazardous waste reduction program. If residents, then one might consider an educational program, and system to fine those who dump illegally.

(12.22) Action SN1.K Hazardous Materials Response Plan

"Develop guidelines, protocols and strategies to respond to a Local hazardous materials spill. Create a response Plan as part of a comprehensive Hazardous Waste Management Plan." DELETE – Already In place; business/Industry must provide a response Plan to the Fire and Police Department; Large business/Industry participate in training and drills with the first responders. Regulations set out what a Hazardous Materials Response Plan must include.

Goal SN2 Maintain High Levels of Police and Fire Service

//We believe that Action Items should be removed from the General Plan as these are under the purview of the City Council in consultation with the City Staff. Should the city consider the Action Items recommended in the draft Plan, we have the following comments.//

Goal SN2 / Actions

(12.24) Action SN2.D Liquor Store Ordinance DUPLICATE ITEM/ DELETE

Goal SN 3 Prepare for Emergencies

(12.27) Action SN3.E Corporation, Industry and Utility Emergency Plans

DELETE. Already required by regulatory agencies. DELETE

(12.28) Policy SN4.1 Noise levels

DELETE/ REDUNDANT – Already regulated by OSHA.

(12.28) **Policy SN4.2 Land Use Compatibility** DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/ DELETE. Action puts the City into a regulatory role; noise issues are already regulated by state and federal OSHA.

(12.28) **Policy SN4.3 Transportation-Related Noise** DUPLICATE ITEM/ DELETE. Action puts the City into a regulatory role; noise issues are already regulated by state and federal OSHA.

(12.29) **Action SN4.A Noise Study Report Requirement** DELETE. Action puts the City into a regulatory role; noise issues are already regulated by state and federal OSHA.

(12.29) **Action SN4.C Noise Ordinance** DUPLICATE ACTION ITEM/ DELETE. Updating and ordinance requires the full review process to determine what should be included in the update.

(12.29) **Action SN4.D Truck Traffic Noise Regulation** DUPLICATE ITEM/ DELETE/ CHANGE TO: *Truck traffic noise is not consistent or predictable. Noise comes from living in an urban area. Buffer zone implementation provides an excellent way for distancing residential from industrial areas.*

(12.30) Action SN4.D Truck Traffic Noise Regulation DUPLICATE ITEM/DELETE

(12.30) Action SN4.E Quiet Zone Feasibility Study DUPLICATE ITEM/DELETE

(12.30) Action SN4.F Construction Traffic Plan Guidelines DUPLICATE ITEM/DELETE

ARTS AND CULTURE

(13.22) **Action AC1.D Local Arts Funding Strategy** *This requires the review and approval of the City Council as it is a funding/budgetary decision. DELETE*

(13.30) **Action AC2.C Festivals and Events Funding** DUPLICATE ITEM/ DELETE. Funding decisions fall under the purview of the City Council.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Pages 14.15 and 14.16 are blank.

(14.28) Action HR1.A Historic Preservation Ordinance

The ordinance cannot be amended to include the various items; changes to the ordinance need to go through the review process including Planning Commission, public review/comment, and City Council.

