

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	4
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	7
DETERMINATION	
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	8
I. AESTHETICS	8
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	10
III. AIR QUALITY	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	18
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMMISSIONS	21
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	22
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	25
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING	
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES	31
XII. NOISE	
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	34
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES	36
XV. RECREATION	37
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	41
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	
SOURCE REFERENCES	45
DETERMINATION FOR PROJECT	46



DATE: May 4, 2018

TO: Public Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties

FROM: Bill Guerin, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE

DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the "Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970" as amended to date, this is to advise you that the Department of Public Works of the City of San Rafael has prepared an Initial Study on the following project:

Project Name:

San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update

Location:

Various locations within the City of San Rafael, Marin County, California

Project Description:

In 2002, the City of San Rafael adopted a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Bicycle Transportation Act (BTA). In order to remain eligible for grants, the Plan must be updated every five years. The San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update is a policy document that would allow the City of San Rafael to continue to meet the requirements of the California Bicycle Transportation Act as described in Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highway Code. All projects and actions proposed in the plan would require separate approval and/or allocation of funds by the San Rafael City Council before implementation. The plan contains goals, objectives and policy actions to guide the City in the construction, upgrades and maintenance of the Citywide bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure system.

Environmental Issues:

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed San Rafael Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan 2011 Update did not identify any environmental issues and therefore, would not result in a significant effect on the environment. Adoption of a Negative Declaration is recommended.

A twenty-day (20-day) public review period shall commence on <u>Wednesday May 9, 2018</u>. Written comments must be sent to the City of San Rafael, Department of Public Works, 111 Morphew Street, San Rafael CA 94901 <u>by May 29, 2018</u>. The City of San Rafael Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Initial Study/Negative Declaration and project merits on <u>Monday, June 18, 2018, 7:00 PM</u> in the San Rafael City Council Chambers at City Hall (1400 Fifth Avenue, City Hall Council Chambers, San Rafael, California 94901). Correspondence and comments can be delivered to Lauren Davini, Traffic Engineer, phone: (415) 485-3361, email: lauren.davini@cityofsanrafael.org.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project Title San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update

2. Lead Agency Name & Address City of San Rafael

Department of Public Works

111 Morphew Street

San Rafael, California 94901

3. Contact Person & Phone Number Lauren Davini, P.E., Traffic Engineer

(415) 485-3361

Email: lauren.davini@cityofsanrafael.org

4. Project Location Various proposed project sites and locations throughout the City

of San Rafael, Marin County, California

5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address Project Sponsor

City of San Rafael

Department of Public Works

111 Morphew Street

San Rafael, California 94901

Sponsor's Representative

Bill Guerin, Public Works Director

111 Morphew Street

San Rafael, California 94901

6. General Plan Designation City-wide. Projects could be located anywhere within the City of

San Rafael that are consistent with this Master Plan and the San

Rafael General Plan 2020.

7. Zoning Not applicable

8. Description of Project

In 2011, the City of San Rafael adopted a Negative Declaration and adopted the San Rafael Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of the California Bicycle Transportation Act (BTA). In order to remain eligible for grants, the plan must be updated every five years. The City of San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update is a policy document that would allow the City of San Rafael to continue to meet the requirements of the California Bicycle Transportation Act as described in Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highway Code. All projects and actions proposed in the plan would require separate approval(s) and/or when allocation of funds by the San Rafael City Council before implementation.

The San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update contains goals, objectives and policy actions to guide the City in the construction, upgrade and maintenance of the citywide bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure system. The goals set the long-term vision and serve as the foundation of the plan. The goals include:

Goal 1: Coordination

Build on existing and ongoing planning efforts to identify changing needs at the local and regional levels, including Complete Street, environmental, and transit projects.

Goal 2: Connectivity

Develop bicycle and pedestrian networks that connect residents and visitors to major activity and shopping centers, existing and planned transit, and schools. Work to close gaps between existing facilities.

Goal 3: Safety

Identify and prioritize bicycle- and pedestrian-related safety improvements.

Goal 4: Universal Design

Promote design standards and support facilities that encourage bicycling and walking among people of all ages and abilities, including children, seniors, families, and people with limited mobility. Work to match project designs to the residents they are intended to serve.

Goal 5: Programs

Support bicycling and walking by providing educational and encouragement programs.

The Plan's strategies identify specific subject areas where effort is required. In summary, the strategies are:

- A. Conduct regular progress reports and updates of the plan
- B. Implement the proposed bicycle and pathway network, as well as proposed crossing, lighting, and traffic calming
- C. Actively identify locations with potential safety concerns based on roadway geometry and identify proven safety countermeasures to address concerns
- D. Maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- E. Support Safe Routes to Schools programming and task forces

The Plan's proposed objectives would help with the review of the Plan implementation and guide day to day decision making in order to reach the Goals set forth in the updated plan. Objectives are identified for each strategy; they are not site specific, nor do they involve identified construction activities. Examples of objectives include:

- A. Develop and complete progress report of bike and pedestrian master plan on a bi-annual basis
- B. Complete feasibility study of bicycle parking at SMART stations, create a citywide inventory of bicycle parking facilities, and implement 25% of the proposed short-turn bicycle parking downtown
- C. Adopt "Vision Zero" policy of eliminating all bicycle- and pedestrian-involved severe injuries and fatalities
- D. Develop bicycle use satisfaction survey instrument; collect baseline survey responses
- E. Maintain or increase school participation; increase average SR2S "report card" score of participating schools to 70 out of 100

The proposed projects begin on page 33. The proposed bicycle facilities were based on the following established routes: North/South Greenway, Northern Bikeway, Cross Marin Bikeway Plus, Commercial Connector, and Bridge Connector. The North/South Greenway generally follows the SMART right of way, the Northern Bikeway is a network of on-street bikeways splitting off from the North/South Greenway, the Cross Marin Bikeway Plus is an east-west bikeway that would connect San Rafael to places west, the Commercial Connector is a detour from the Cross Marin Bikeway Plus that would go through Downtown San Rafael, and the Bridge Connector aims to connect bicyclists and pedestrians Downtown to the Richmond Bridge. The proposed projects were divided into seven geographic groups to help simplify the list for prioritization. The groups are as follows: Civic Center, North Safe Routes to School, West End, Central San Rafael, Point San Pedro Road, Canal, and San Quentin.

In addition to these bicycle infrastructure projects, the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update includes countywide gap closure and safety projects which are consistent with San Rafael community priorities. Some of these projects will require partnering with other agencies to implement and all will require moderate to extensive planning, design work and public comment and input. These projects include:

- A. Interchange and Intersection Improvements Projects
- B. Multi-use Pathway
- C. Regional Connection Projects
 - a. Bicycle Access across the Richmond Bridge
 - b. San Francisco Bay Trail
- D. Signals, Lighting Improvements and Upgrades

9. Surrounding land uses and setting

City-wide. Projects could be located anywhere within the City of San Rafael and in any General Plan land use or setting.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required [e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements]

- Bay Area Metro
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Congestion Management Agency (CMA)
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District
- County of Marin
- Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

					by this project, involving at leas st on the following pages.
Aesthetics Biological F Greenhouse	Resources Gas Emissions	Cultural 1	re Resources Resources & Hazardous		Air Quality Geology /Soils Hydrology / Water Quality
Land Use / Population / Transportation	Housing	Mineral I Public Se	Resources		Noise Recreation Mandatory Finding of Significance
DETERMINA	ΓΙΟΝ				
On the basis of th	is initial evaluatio	on:			
	hat the proposed p ATIVE DECLAR			ificant	effect on the environment and
there v	vill not be a signi by or agreed to b	ificant effect in	n this case because	e revis	ant effect on the environment, sions in the project have been IVE DECLARATION will be
	that the proposed RONMENTAL IM			t effec	et on the environment, and an
signific adequa been a sheets.	cant unless mitigately analyzed in addressed by mitig	nted" impact of an earlier docur ation measures ENTAL IMPA	n the environment ment pursuant to a based on the earl	, but a pplical ier ana	ificant impact" or "potentially at lest one effect 1) has been ble legal standards, and 2) has alysis as described on attached d, but it must analyze only the
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an EARLIE EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.					
Lauren Davini Traffic Engineer			Dat	e	

one

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Evaluation of the Project environmental impacts is prepared as follows:

A brief explanation is provided for all answers except for "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parantheses following each question below. Answers take into account the whole action involved, including off-site, on-site, cumulative, project-level, direct and indirect, construction and operational impacts. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported by referenced information sources that show the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone; the project involves a minor zoning text amendments that would not lead to or allow new construction, grading or other physical alterations to the environment). A "No Impact" answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factor as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

A <u>"Potentially Significant Impact"</u> is appropriate where there is <u>substantial evidence that an effect may be significant</u>. A final determination of one or more Potentially Significant Impacts shall require preparation of an EIR.

A <u>Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration</u> shall be prepared for the project if it results in a <u>less than significant impact determination based on the analysis, discussion, source reference materials and/or mitigation measures identified herein (to minimize impacts or reduce impacts from a "Potentially Significant" level). Any mitigation measures shall be described and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.</u>

Mitigation measures or discussion from earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier environmental document. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, the Initial Study below includes a brief discussion of the earlier analysis used, impacts that were previously addressed, and mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined. Supporting information sources are attached and cited in the discussion below.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
]	. AESTHETICS				
	ould the project: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which by definition are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on scenic vistas.

The projects that are Class II, Class III, or Class IV bicycle facilities are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. Possible

intrusions into scenic vistas would consist of signs, signposts and traffic signals. Signs, such as those used to alert drivers of pedestrian crossings, would generally be mounted on a seven foot high, 2.5" diameter pipe or 4" by 4" wooden post. Traffic signals, if installed, would typically be standard Caltrans approved three or four lens fixtures and would include standard "walk" and "flashing don't walk" lighted fixtures. Vehicle signal heads are mounted at a minimum height of fifteen feet and a maximum height of twenty-six feet and pedestrian signal heads are mounted at a minimum height of seven feet and a maximum height of ten feet. Although the signs, posts and signal heads would be visible, they are small and not large enough to obstruct a scenic vista.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would have no adverse effects on a scenic vista at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 9) b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? Discussion: As noted above, a significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on scenic resources. Installation of any of the proposed system improvements in the near future would consist of minor excavations to install signs, traffic signals, curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps. All work would be confined to existing rightsof-way which have been previously excavated to build the existing roadway system. For this reason, there would be no scenic resources within the areas of actual construction and there would be no impact to trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings. The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. These projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and have no impact on scenic resources at this time. (Sources: 1, 2) c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Discussion:

The proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update would have no impact on the existing visual character of the surrounding areas as a significant portion relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or surrounding areas.

The physical changes to the environment that would result from any of the improvements completed in the near future would be minor, consisting primarily of the installation of signs, striping, markings and sidewalk in order to designate bicycle lanes and crosswalks and other bicycle and pedestrian circulation enhancements. These

changes are consistent with similar improvements to the existing street environment of San Rafael. Therefore, the system improvements would not substantially change the existing visual character of the area.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. These projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on the visual character of potential project sites at this time.

rces: 1, 2)		
Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		\boxtimes

Discussion:

The San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update does not propose improvements that would create new sources of light or glare. Therefore no impact on day or nighttime views would result from its adoption.

The projects that may be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. The proposed projects include the addition of pedestrian signal heads to existing traffic signals which would be a new, however, insignificant source of light. The lenses of these signals are designed to minimize or completely eliminate glare and the signal light is focused on the roadway, thus avoiding adverse impacts. Relocation of existing traffic signal heads may be required, however, no new installations are proposed.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, not create light or glare at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2)

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project: {In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.} In determining whether impacts to a forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Project: and forest carbon assessment measurement methodology provided in Forest

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Protocols adopted by the Calife Board. a. Convert Prime Farmland, or Farmland of State (Farmland), as shown on pursuant to the Farmla Monitoring Program of Resources Agency, to non-	Unique Farmland, wide Importance the maps prepared and Mapping and for the California				\boxtimes
Discussion:					
There are no agricultural resource	ces in the proposed p	project area.			
(Sources: 1, 3)					
b. Conflict with existing zoni use, or a Williamson Act c					
Discussion: There are no agricultural resourd (Sources: 1, 3)	ces in the proposed p	project area.			
c. Conflict with existing zor rezoning of, forest land (a.	s defined in Public etion 12220(g)), Public Resources timberland zoned (as defined by				\boxtimes
Discussion:					
There is no forest land in the pro (Sources: 1, 3) d. Result in the loss of forest of forest land to non-forest	land or conversion				\boxtimes
Discussion:					
There is no forest land in the pro (Sources: 1, 3)	oposed project area.				
e. Involve other changes environment which, due to nature, could result in Farmland, to non-agri	o their location or n conversion of				

Potentially Significant Impact Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-Significant Impact No Impact

conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

D .	
1)1901	ission:
	ibbioii.

There are no	' 1, 1		· ·	1 1 '	41	1	• ,
I hara ara no	agricultural	racourcac	Or toract	lande in	the nro	nocad nr	AIDOT ATDA
THEIR AIR HO	agnicultural	resources	OI TOTEST	ianus in	uic bio	いいろとは いい	лесь агса.
						p p	-,

(Sources: 1, 3)

(Source	ES. 1, <i>3)</i>						
III.	AIR QUALITY						
a. Co	d the project: onflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				\boxtimes		
_	ificant portion of the proposed San Rafael guidelines which are not site specific and the	•			Jpdate relates to		
promote of vehice internal constru (see dis Plan, 2	The proposed projects described in the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update would promote the use of bicycling and walking which would potentially reduce the reliance on vehicles and the number of vehicle miles traveled within the City. This in turn would tend to reduce the amount of air pollution caused by internal combustion engine emissions. Minor amounts of air pollution would be generated during the construction of the various proposed improvements, but would not result in a significant environmental impact (see discussion in section III.b of this document). Furthermore, the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update does not propose any projects that would directly or indirectly generate any pollution after construction.						
(Source	es: 1, 2, 5)						
co	iolate any air quality standard or ontribute substantially to an existing or rojected air quality violation?				\boxtimes		
Discuss	sion:						

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on air quality. The plan is consistent with the San Rafael General Plan 2020, which is consistent with the San Francisco Bay Air Plan (Bay Area Air Quality Management District).

The projects that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. Implementation of the proposed projects would result in minor pollution due to construction activities such as excavating holes for the installation of signposts, curb, gutter, and sidewalk and painting stripes for bicycle lanes. These activities would be insignificant due to the small scale and short duration of construction and because of the prevailing weather patterns that tend to disperse pollutants.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature and would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed. Therefore, there would be no impact on air quality at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 5)

		Significant Impact	Less-Inan- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	Impact
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non – attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				\boxtimes

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on air quality. The plan is consistent with the San Rafael General Plan 2020, which is consistent with the San Francisco Bay Air Plan (Bay Area Air Quality Management District).

The projects that could be built in the near future would not obstruct implementation of any air quality plan nor would they substantially contribute to existing or projected air quality violations. For the five years between 2013 and 2017 there have been three days where the California PM10 standard was exceeded at the San Rafael Air Quality Monitoring Station. There were no ozone, nitrogen dioxide or carbon monoxide recorded during this time period in excess of the California Standard and the proposed projects do not involve the exclusive and focused production of any criteria pollutant over a sustained period of time. When implemented, the proposed projects are designed to reduce reliance upon motor vehicles. To the extent such reduction is achieved, the projects would potentially reduce air pollution emissions.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and do not result in any increase in air pollution at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 5, 11)

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on air quality.

The projects that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. The most sensitive receptors in the area are likely to be very young or elderly individuals. The construction phase of the proposed projects would be of limited duration and would not produce concentrated or sustained emissions that would follow pathways of direct exposure to these populations. With the natural ventilations prevalent in the area, odors would not affect people associated with the business and residential land uses around the proposed project locations. Once construction is complete, no odors or other pollution would be generated.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and do not result in any additional air pollution at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 5)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\boxtimes
Discussion:				
The proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian M because a significant portion of the plan relates to po				able odors
In the unlikely event that objectionable odors are prothe natural ventilation prevalent in the area would be term effects. These impacts will be reviewed on a odors or other pollution would be generated.	reduce the numb	per of people affec	eted and the assoc	iated long
(Sources: 1, 2, 5)				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project: a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the status species.	-		_	
The San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan or other human activities in habitat areas. All constr of-way, which do not contain habitat for special stat	ruction would be			
(Sources: 1, 2)				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
<u>Discussion:</u>				

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

The proposed projects would not result in any construction or other human activity within habitat areas. All construction would be within the developed areas of existing rights-of-way, which do not contain riparian habitat.

(Sources: 1, 2)

<i>c</i> .	Have a substantial adverse effect on		
	federally protected wetlands as defined by		
	Section 404 of the Clean Water Act		
	(including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal,		\boxtimes
	filling, hydrological interruption, or other		
	means?		

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which by definition are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on federally protected wetlands.

The proposed projects described in the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update would not result in any construction or other human activity in federally protected wetlands. All construction would be within developed areas of existing rights-of-way assuring that there is no hydrological interruption.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of		
	any native resident or migratory fish or		
	wildlife species or with established native		
	resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or		\boxtimes
	impede the use of native wildlife nursery		
	sites?		

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact any fish or wildlife species.

The projects that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. These projects would not result in the alteration of any wildlife corridors or affect the movement of any fish or wildlife species. All construction would be located within developed areas of existing rights-of-way assuring that there is no interruption to fish or wildlife species, which, with the possible exception of quadrupeds such as deer, skunks, raccoons, etc., tend not to use the developed, urban rights-of-way for movement. The anticipated increase in bicycle and pedestrian activity in the rights-of-way, after installation of the proposed projects, are unlikely to affect these species, which are already acclimated to human activity.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature. As such, they would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed. Therefore, these projects would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or
ordinance?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Further, development within the existing urban rights-of-way would not impact existing tree resources.

The projects that would be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, curb, gutter, sidewalk traffic markings, curb markings, etc. Addition of signing and striping to delineate bicycle and pedestrian routes would not result in any physical changes that would conflict with local environmental protection policies and/or ordinances.

Specific improvements for the remaining projects have not been designed and therefore it is not possible to fully evaluate whether the projects would conflict with local environmental protection ordinances. However, each of these ordinances, consisting chiefly of Section 11.12 of the San Rafael Municipal Code and various provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would include public review procedures to assure compliance.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10)

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and would not conflict with any adopted conservation plans.

The projects that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. Signing and striping to designated bicycle and pedestrian routes therefore would not result in any physical changes that would conflict with any conservation plans.

The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature and would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed. Therefore, these projects would have no impact on any adopted conservation plan at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? □ □ □ □	ates to
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as	ates to
	in the
<u>Discussion:</u>	in the
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relapolicy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not cause a substantial adverse change significance of any historical resources.	, .
The proposed improvements that could be completed in the near future would occur within existing, deverights-of-way. There are no known historic resources, as defined in §15064.5, within any of the rights-ot that may be improved as part of the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update.	
The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature and would be subject to future environmental review when site specific proposals are developed. Therefore, these projects have no impact on any historical resourch time.	
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 16)	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?]
Discussion:	
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relapolicy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact any archaeological resources.	ates to
The system improvements that could be completed in the near future would occur within existing rights-or and no improvements would require additional large scale excavation. Furthermore, the areas within the roof-way have already been disturbed as a result of the original construction of the roads and other improvements that could be resourced as a result of the original construction of the roads and other improvements are previous construction activity would likely have reduced or eliminated the significance of archaeological resources if they were encountered. The City of San Rafael implements specific adopted archeological resources in the event resources are encountered during grading.	rights- ments. logical
The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. These projects would be subject to future environn review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no adverse change significance of an archaeological resource at this time.	
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 16)	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?]

Potentially Less-Than- Less Significant Significant With Significant With Impact Mitigation In Incorporation

Less-Than-Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact a unique paleontological resource, site or unique geologic feature.

There are no known paleontological resources in the proposed project areas. The proposed projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on any paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature at this time.

geor	ogic reature at tims time.				
(Sou	rces: 1, 2, 3, 16)				
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				\boxtimes
Disc	ussion:				
	gnificant portion of the proposed San Rafael by guidelines which are not site specific and the				Jpdate relates to
and disturbed wou Nation	system improvements that could be completed not require additional excavation. Furthern arbed as a result of the original construction of Id likely have reduced or eliminated the significate American archeological resources, if they we remainder of the projects are conceptual in national with and when site specific proposals are development.	the roadificance ere encounture.	he areas within the rads and other improve of human remains, rountered. Such projects would b	ights-of-way ha ments. This con nost likely to be e subject to futur	ve already beer struction activity associated with re environmenta
	time.				
(Sou	rces: 1, 2, 3, 16)				
7	I. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Wo	buld the project: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			\boxtimes	

Potentially Less-T Significant Significa Impact Mitigo

Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-Significant Impact

No Impact

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault.

None of the projects that could be built in the near future are located within an Alquist-Priolo zone. Although the general area is subject to ground shaking due to the close proximity of the San Andreas Fault, the various projects would not significantly increase the exposure of people to ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction or landslides. The proposed projects would not directly increase risk in that such improvements as painted bicycle lanes, traffic signs, curb, gutter, sidewalk and bicycle racks are not hazardous to people in an earthquake or other geologic event. There could be increased exposure of people to the risk of injury from an earthquake or other geologic event in that the planned improvements may bring additional people into the area; however, this indirect impact is determined to be less than significant as the system improvements will occur within the existing rights-of-way that are currently subject to moderate to heavy use by the public. The increased usage that may result from improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian circulation system would be a minor percentage increase and is therefore deemed not significant.

The remaining projects are conceptual in nature and would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed. Therefore, these projects would have no geologic impact at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 6)			
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		\boxtimes	
Discussion:			
See response to Section VI.a.i above.			
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 6)			
iii) Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?		\boxtimes	
<u>Discussion:</u>			
See response to Section VI.a.i above.			
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 6)			
iv) Landslides?		\boxtimes	
<u>Discussion:</u>			
See response to Section VI.a.i above.			
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 6)			
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss		\boxtimes	

of topsoil?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The amount of excavation required for the projects that could be built in the near term would be minimal. Any potential impact would be fully mitigated by application of all applicable regulations including the Uniform Building Code and Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (MCSTOPPP) regulations.

The remainder of the proposed projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no soil related impact at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 7, 12) c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in \boxtimes on, or off, site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on soil stability. The proposed system improvements that could be built in the near future would be located within existing rightsof-way. These areas have already been improved to accommodate streets and other public facilities, including mitigation for unstable solids conditions. For this reason, the proposed system improvements would not be subject to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on soil stability at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to

policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on expansive soil.

The proposed system improvements that could be built in the near future would be located within existing developed rights-of-way. These areas have been improved to accommodate streets and other public facilities, including mitigation for expansive soil conditions. For this reason, the proposed system improvements will not be subject to risks associated with expansive soils.

The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. These projects have the potential to be located at locations where settlement of the soils may occur. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on expansive soil at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 13)

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems.

The proposed system improvements that could be built in the near future would not involve the use of alternative wastewater disposal systems. The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMMISSIONS

Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either
directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not generate greenhouse gas emissions.

The proposed improvements will not generate greenhouse gas emissions following installation. Furthermore, after construction, it is anticipated that the proposed projects will create a mode shift from vehicle trips to pedestrian and bicycle trips, thereby reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions generated in the City as a whole. The implementation of the plan would ultimately reduce greenhouse gas emission impacts, which would be consistent with the City's adopted Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP).

Minor amounts of greenhouse gas emissions could be generated by the vehicles during construction; however, by applying standard construction practices, the amount generated will be minimized and this impact is considered to be minimal.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 15)				
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			\boxtimes	
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the			_	
The proposed improvements are anticipated to enco on vehicles. This mode shift is in direct affiliation the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhour reduce greenhouse gas emission impacts, which we Action Plan (CCAP).	with all applica use gases. The	ble plans, policies implementation o	and regulations of the plan would	adopted for lultimately
Minor amounts of greenhouse gas emissions could lapplying standard construction practices, the amoun be minimal. (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 15)	-		-	-
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS M	IATERIALS			
Would the project: a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			\boxtimes	
<u>Discussion:</u> A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the environment through the routing transport, use o	erefore would	not create a signifi		
Minor amounts of hazardous materials, such as ye during the construction phase of the proposed impr OSHA regulations would reduce the risk of expos regulations to be followed on all construction pro- materials would be involved during the operational pro-	ovements. Follower to a less-theojects located	lowing routine cor nan-significant leve with the public ri	nstruction practicel. The City receipts. No	es and Cal- quires these hazardous
Projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects wo specific proposals are developed and would, there materials at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 14)	-			
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions				

involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The bicycle and pedestrian projects will not involve hazardous materials in their operational phases. As indicated in section VIII.a of this document, minor amounts of hazardous materials could be involved during construction, but their use would be effectively mitigated through the application of standard construction practices and Cal-OSHA regulations.

0011111 0 01111101101				
The projects listed in this document are concept environmental review if and when site specific prop of hazardous materials at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 14) c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials,			erefore, not invol	
substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
<u>Discussion:</u>				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael I policy guidelines which are not site specific and t proposed school to hazardous materials.	•			
The proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects with hazardous materials could be involved during constitute application of standard construction practices at location basis.	ruction, but the	ir use would be ef	fectively mitigate	ed through
The projects listed in this document are concept environmental review if and when site specific prop of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions a	osals are develo		•	
(Sources: 1, 2, 14)				
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
Discussion:				

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

The majority of the projects are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. None of the proposed project sites are located on a known hazardous materials site and would, therefore, not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment at this time.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project

or working in the project area?

result in a safety hazard for people residing

Discussion:

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would pose no safety hazard for people residing within two miles of a public/public use airport.

The proposed projects are not located within an airport land use plan and are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on people residing or working within two miles of a public/public use airport at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would pose no safety hazard for people residing or working within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

None of the proposed near term projects are located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature environmental review if and when site specific proposals are depeople residing or working within two miles of a public/public to (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	eveloped and w	ould, therefore, hav	•
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes
Discussion:			
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore response plan or emergency evacuation plan.			•
The majority of the proposed projects would consist primarily bicycle lanes and pedestrian street crossings. These improven would not create any physical barriers to the movement of enemergency response plans of the City of San Rafael or the Countries.	nents are propo mergency vehi	osed for existing rig	hts-of-way and
The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptuture environmental review if and when site specific proposimpact on an adopted emergency response or emergency evacual (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	als are develo _l	ped and would, the	•
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where		\boxtimes	

Potentially

Significant

Impact

Less-Than-

Significant With

Mitigation

Incorporation

Less-Than-

Significant

Impact

No

Impact

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not expose people or structures to risks associated with wildland fires.

The majority of the proposed improvements would be constructed within existing rights-of-way and would not increase the exposure of people or structures to the risk of wildland fires.

The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, not expose people or structures to risks associated with wildland fires at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

residences are intermixed with wildlands?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				\boxtimes
<u>Discussion:</u>				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and th discharge requirements.				
None of the proposed bicycle or pedestrian circulati	ion improvemer	nts would involve th	ne discharge of w	astewater.
The projects listed in this document are concept environmental review if and when site specific pro- water quality standards or waste discharge requirem	posals are deve	loped and would, t		
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				\boxtimes
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and interfere with groundwater recharge.	-		_	
The majority of the proposed projects are propose would significantly increase the amount of impermisupplies.				
The remainder of the projects are conceptual in na review if and when site specific proposals are dev supplies or groundwater recharge at this time.		•	•	
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-			\boxtimes	

site?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not alter existing drainage pattern.

The majority of the proposed improvements would be confined to developed areas of existing rights-of-way which are currently paved and therefore would not alter existing drainage patterns. During construction, which could include minor excavation, standard erosion control techniques such as siltation fences and hay bales would be used to prevent erosion and siltation. Projects would conform to Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (MCSTOPPP) regulations.

The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on existing drainage patters at this time.

(So	arces: 1, 2, 3, 12)			
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site?			
Disc	cussion:			
	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle a cy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore wo			•
alte: incr	proposed improvements do not require alterations to a red as explained in section IX.c above. None of the pease the amount of impermeable surface area or alter to out of runoff.	roposed improve	ment projects wo	uld significantly
env	projects listed in this document are conceptual in nationmental review if and when site specific proposals are ting drainage patterns at this time.			
(So	urces: 1, 2, 3)			
e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			
Disc	cussion:			

Potentially Less-Than-Significant Significant With Impact Mitigation Incorporation

Less-Than-Significant

Impact

No**Impact**

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

The projects that could be built in the near future would not increase the amount of runoff as they would not significantly increase the amount of impermeable surfaces in the project areas (see sections IX.c and IX.d above). It follows that demand on the stormwater drainage system will not change. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements would not generate pollution and therefore would not result in an increase in polluted runoff.

The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no

•	urces: 1, 2, 3)	me.					
f.	Otherwise quality?	substantially	degrade	water				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:							
						nd Pedestrian Ma ıld not impact wat		Jpdate relates to
imp inc	pacts to the s	surrounding wa	ter quality v	vould b	e fully mi	ring the construct tigated by applica nwater Pollution F	tion of all applic	able regulations
and		ecific proposal	_			s would be subject refore, have no im		
g.	hazard are Hazard Bo	using within of a as mapped of oundary or Flo aer flood hazard	on a federal od Insuranc	Flood e Rate				\boxtimes
Dis	cussion:							
	•		•		•	nd Pedestrian Ma ald not impact on l		Jpdate relates to
No	ne of the prop	posed projects i	nvolve the co	onstruct	ion of hou	sing.		
(So	urces: 1, 2)							
h.		in a 100-year which would i	•					

Potentially Significant **Impact**

Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation

Less-Than-Significant **Impact**

No Impact

flood flows?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would have no impact on flood flows.

The improvements that could be completed in the near future will consist of bicycle lanes, crosswalks, signs and other small structures that by their nature are not physical barriers to flood flows.

The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on flood flows at

this time.				
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
<u>Discussion:</u>				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the	•			relates to
Portions of the proposed bicycle facilities and ped pedestrians and cyclists are already using these rout not considered high enough to raise the impact to a routes are available, and flooded areas are marked a risk of injury. There are no dams or levees within the	es. The increase significant level. and blocked by s	ed usage that may Also, the risks ar safety personnel du	result from these e avoidable in tha iring emergencies	projects is at alternate s to reduce
The projects listed in this document are concept environmental review if and when site specific properly related impact at this time.		1 3		
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael	Bicycle and Pe	destrian Master Pl	an. 2018 Undate	relates to

policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would pose no risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

None of the proposed project areas are subject to tsunamis or seiches although mudflows could occur in some areas. The potential damage to bicycle lanes and similar proposed system improvements would not be significant

Potentially Less-Than-Significant With Significant Impact Mitigation Incorporation

Less-Than-Significant Impact

No **Impact**

 \boxtimes

 \boxtimes

relative to the cost of repair. Potential risk to pedestrians and bicyclists is judged to be less than significant as the existing risk is low, the projects will not change the conditions that could cause these events, and the increase usage factor will not be large enough to raise the risk to a significant level.

The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on potential inundation from seiche, tsunami or mudflow at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

X.

Would the project:		
a. Physically divide an established community?		
Discussion:		

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not divide an established community.

Improved bicycle and pedestrian circulation resulting from the proposed projects would reduce physical divisions within the community.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

Discussion:

b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan,
	policy, or regulation of an agency with
	jurisdiction over the project (including, but
	not limited to the general plan, specific plan,
	local coastal program, or zoning ordinance)
	adopted for the purpose of avoiding or
	mitigating an environmental effect?

LAND USE AND PLANNING

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not conflict with land use plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect.

The City's staff has reviewed the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update and determined it is consistent with the Circulation element of the San Rafael General Plan which states that a key recommendation is to "expand bicycle and pedestrian networks, and improve connections between the different modes" of transportation. In particular, the proposed projects and policy recommendations would promote the following San Rafael General Plan 2020 policies:

- Policy C-4: "Design of roadways should be safe and convenient for...bicycles and pedestrians."
 - Policy C-4b: "Support alternative transportation modes to better meet user needs and minimize conflicts between competing modes."

Impact Mitigation Impact Incorporation Policy C-20: "Provide convenient and safe connections and support for bus, rail, shuttle, bicycle and pedestrian users...using transit services". Policy C-23: "Identify opportunities to improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections between San Rafael neighborhoods and between San Rafael and adjacent communities." Policy C-24: "Seek opportunities to increase connectivity between San Rafael neighborhoods and activity Centers." Policy C-26: "Make bicycling and walking an integral part of daily life in San Rafael." Policy C-27: "Promote walking as the transportation mode of choice for short trips." Policy C-27e: "Consider new projects and programs to increase pedestrian safety." Policy C-27f: "Continue efforts to improve access for those with disabilities." (Sources: 1, 2, 3) c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community \boxtimes conservation plan? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not conflict with an applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan. The majority of the projects are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. The addition of signing and striping to designate bicycle and pedestrian routes would not result in any physical changes that would conflict with an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The remainder of the projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no conflict with an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project: a. Result in the loss of availability of a known

Potentially

Significant

Less-Than-Significant With Less-Than-

Significant

No

Impact

Discussion:

mineral resource that would be of value to

the region and the residents of the state?

 \boxtimes

None of the proposed projects would impact the availability of a known mineral resource. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bieycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. There is no delineated mineral site that would be impacted by the proposed projects as listed in the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) XII. NOISE Would the project: a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact or noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the mineral resource.				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan,	None of the proposed projects would impact the ava	ilability of a kno	own mineral resor	irce.	
locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan,	(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. There is no delineated mineral site that would be impacted by the proposed projects as listed in the San Rafae Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) XII. NOISE Would the project: a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact or noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan,				
policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. There is no delineated mineral site that would be impacted by the proposed projects as listed in the San Rafae Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) XII. NOISE Would the project: a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<u>Discussion:</u>				
Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update. (Sources: 1, 2, 3) XII. NOISE Would the project: a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	policy guidelines which are not site specific and the			_	
Would the project: a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update.	impacted by the	proposed project	as as listed in the	San Rafae
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Discussion: A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	XII. NOISE				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other				
policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of any adopted standards. Persons using the proposed bicycle facilities and pedestrian paths would be exposed to the high ambient noise levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<u>Discussion:</u>				
levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these elevated noise levels are permitted within the rights-of-way and are consistent with existing policy. The projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	policy guidelines which are not site specific and the				
environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact or noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	levels caused by motor vehicles. However, these el	_	_		
	environmental review if and when site specific proj				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of	(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
	b. Exposure of persons to or generation of				

Potentially

Significant Impact Less-Than-

Significant With

Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-

Significant Impact No

Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-Significant Impact No Impact

excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels.

The projects that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing developed rights-of-way. Jackhammers and other equipment could generate ground borne vibration during construction of the proposed improvements, however, this would be a one-time occurrence for each proposed project, would be short in duration, and limited to daytime weekday hours as permitted by the City. As the projects are implemented they will be required to comply with the City of San Rafael Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.13)

The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on ground borne vibrations or noise levels at this time.

(So	urces: 1, 2, 17)		•			
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes		
Dis	cussion:					
pol	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael cy guidelines which are not site specific and the pient noise levels.					
stri traf inst	The majority of the projects are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. The noise generated by bicycle and pedestrian traffic will be insignificant and will be less than the background noise generated by motor vehicle traffic. The installation of audible pedestrian signals would increase to the ambient noise levels, however, these are not considered to be "substantial" as they create minimal sound levels and will be installed at selective locations.					
The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on ambient noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2)						
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes		
Dis	cussion:					

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

The project that could be built in the near future are proposed for existing streets that already contain traffic signals, signs, lane striping, crosswalk striping, traffic markings, curb markings, etc. There could be noise impacts during construction when signs, striping, etc. are installed. These noise levels would occur only once per project and are therefore judged to be less than significant. As the projects are implemented they will be required to comply with the City of San Rafael Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.13)

The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 17)

е.	ror a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
Disc	eussion:				
poli	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael cy guidelines which are not site specific and ic/public use airport to excessive noise levels.	•			•
Non	e of the proposed projects are located within an	airport laı	nd use plan or with	in two miles of a	public airport.
(Sou	arces: 1, 2, 3)				
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not expose people residing or working within the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels.

None of the proposed projects are located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bi policy guidelines which are not site specific and there directly or indirectly.	-		_	
None of the proposed projects involve or promote her Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update proposes is construction of new roads. The development of nonmarker improvement of bicycle and pedestrian facilities employees and will create additional capacity within especific or cumulative growth. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	mprovements otorized facility would tend to	to existing infr ies is not known p provide conges	astructure rather to have an effect of tion relief for resi	than the on growth. dents and
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bi policy guidelines which are not site specific and the nousing.	-		_	
The projects that could be built in the near future do not be confined within the existing rights-of-way.	ot include any p	proposals to displ	ace housing as all	work will
The remainder of the projects listed in this document future environmental review if and when site specific any housing at this time. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	•	· ·		•
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bi policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore	-		_	relates to

Potentially Significant Impact Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-Significant Impact No Impact

The projects that could be built in the near future do not include any proposals to displace substantial numbers of people as all work will be performed within the existing rights-of-way.

The remainder of the projects listed in this document are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, not displace any population at this time.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

maintain acceptable service ratios, res times or other performance objectives for a the public services:	ponse						
a. Fire protection?				\boxtimes			
Discussion:							
A significant portion of the proposed San I policy guidelines which are not site specific impacts on the provision of fire protection set	and therefore w			•			
The proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update proposes improvements to the publicly owned infrastructure, consisting mainly of bicycle lanes, crosswalks and signs, which are judged to be beneficial. These projects would not create the need for other supporting facilities to maintain acceptable service levels or other performance objectives.							
(Sources: 1, 2)							
b. Police protection?				\boxtimes			
<u>Discussion:</u>							
A significant portion of the proposed San I policy guidelines which are not site specific impacts to the provision of police protection Also, see previous discussion in secion XIV.	e and therefore w services.	ould not result in		•			
(Sources: 1, 2)							

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact	
c. Schools?				\boxtimes	
Discussion:					
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and timpacts to the provision of school services.	•				
Also, see previous discussion in section XIV.a of th (Sources: 1, 2)	is document.				
d. Parks?				\boxtimes	
Discussion:					
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and timpacts to the provision of park services.	-		_		
See previous discussion in section XIV.a of this doc	cument.				
(Sources: 1, 2)					
e. Other public facilities?				\boxtimes	
Discussion:					
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which by definition are not site specific and therefore would not result in any substantial adverse physical impacts to the provision of services through other public services.					
See previous discussion in section XIV.a of this doc	cument.				
(Sources: 1, 2)					
XV. RECREATION					
Would the project: a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					
<u>Discussion:</u>					

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational activities.

By providing additional access to, the proposed infrastructure improvements may increase park usage. This incremental change is not expected to be significant.

(Sources: 1, 2)

b.	Include recreational facilities or require the		
	construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		\boxtimes

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not include construction of recreational facilities or require the construction/expansion of recreation facilities which would have an adverse environmental impact.

The proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update includes recommendations for bicycle parking in the downtown area. Bicycle parking can be installed with minimal or no impact to the physical environment.

(Sources: 1, 2)

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance		
	or policy establishing measures of		
	effectiveness for the performance of the		
	circulation system, taking into account all		
	modes of transportation including mass		
	transit and non-motorized travel and		
	relevant component of the circulation system,		
	including but not limited to intersections,		
	streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian		
	and bicycle paths, and mass transit)?		

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The City's staff has reviewed the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update and determined it is consistent with all applicable plans, ordinance and policies including the Circulation element of the San Rafael General Plan 2020 which states that a key recommendation is to "expand bicycle and pedestrian

 \boxtimes

	orks, and improve connections between the dif- e project will also improve connectivity to mass				d improvements
Also	refer to the discussion in section X.b.				
(Sou	arces: 1, 2, 3)				
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			\boxtimes	
Disc	ussion:				
police the 1	gnificant portion of the proposed San Rafael by guidelines which are not site specific and the evel of service standard established by the co- ways.	erefore	would not exceed, e	ither individually	or cumulatively,
volu	reducing motor vehicle trips, the proposed prime that could otherwise cause level of service strees: 1, 2)			eficial impact of	reducing traffic
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
Disc	ussion:				
	gnificant portion of the proposed San Rafael by guidelines which are not site specific and the				
The j	proposed projects do not involve any constructi	ion that	would impact air tra	ffic patterns.	
(Sou	rces: 1, 2)				
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
Disc	ussion:				

Potentially Significant Impact

Less-Than-

Significant With

Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-

Significant Impact No

Impact

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not increase hazards due to a design feature.

The proposed projects in the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update would conform with accepted state and federal standards for the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, thereby insuring the safety of design improvements. Infrastructure improvements will improve safety beyond the existing level through appropriate separation of bicyclists and pedestrians from motorized traffic. The proposed projects are intended to rehabilitate the existing facilities that are not in conformance with the current accepted standards and to improve the safety and performance of such facilities. The San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update is expected to improve the conditions for both motorized and non-motorized users by eliminating traffic and safety hazards.

(Sources: 1, 2, 8)					
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? <u>Discussion:</u>				\boxtimes	
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not result in inadequate emergency access.					
The proposed projects are expected to reduce motor vehicle congestion, which would result in improved emergency response time.					
The proposed projects are conceptual in nature. Such projects would be subject to future environmental review if and when site specific proposals are developed and would, therefore, have no impact on emergency access by public safety agencies at this time. (Sources: 1, 2)					
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, o programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	e, e			\boxtimes	
Discussion:					

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

All of the proposed projects in the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update support, rather than conflict with, the use of alternative modes of transportation.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

	Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYST	EMS			
Would the project: a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
Discussion:				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and the Board wastewater treatment requirements.			_	
None of the projects proposed in the San Rafael Bic wastewater. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	cycle and Pedest	rian Master Plan, 2	2018 Update would	d generate
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
<u>Discussion:</u>				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and th water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion	erefore would n	ot require or resul		
See previous discussion in section XVII.a.				
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)				
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				\boxtimes
<u>Discussion:</u>				
A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael policy guidelines which are not site specific and th storm water drainage facilities or expansion of exist	erefore would n		_	
The projects proposed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian storm water runoff and therefore would not create the (Sources: 1, 2, 3)		_		amount of

Potentially Significant Impact

Less-Than-

Significant With

Less-Than-Significant Impact

No

Impact

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
Disc	cussion:				
poli	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael cy guidelines which are not site specific and the water resources.	•		•	
	ne of the projects proposed in the Bicycle and plies.	l Pedestrian Ma	ster Plan, 2018 U	Jpdate would requ	uire water
(Soı	urces: 1, 2, 3)				
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				\boxtimes
Disc	cussion:				
poli	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael cy guidelines which are not site specific and acity.	•			
was	the of the projects proposed in the San Rafael Bic tewater requiring treatment. 1, 2, 3)	ycle and Pedestr	rian Master Plan, 2	2018 Update would	d generate
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes
Disc	cussion:				
	ignificant portion of the proposed San Rafael cy guidelines which are not site specific and then	•			relates to
	project area is served by the Redwood Landfi not generate significant quantities of solid waste		d pedestrian and l	bicycle circulation	n facilities
(Sou	urces: 1, 2, 3)				
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes				\boxtimes

Potentially Significant Impact Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation Less-Than-Significant Impact

No Impact

and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not impact solid waste disposal regulations.

The proposed circulation system improvements will comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

XV	VIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIG	GNIFICANCI	E		
a. 1 a. s v p l. a. r	Id the project: Does the project have the potential to legrade the quality of the environment, ubstantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife copulation to drop below self-sustaining evels, threaten to eliminate a plant or unimal community, reduce the number or estrict the range of a rare or endangered clant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
Discus	ssion:				
	nificant portion of the proposed San Rafael guidelines which are not site specific and the				
signal	rojects that could be built in the near future s and signs, striping and markings, crosswa e and pedestrian routes would therefore not ha	lks, curb mark	ings, etc. Signing	g and striping to	
review degrad	emainder of the projects are conceptual in nat if and when site specific proposals are dev de environmental quality at this time. ees: 1, 2, 3)				
i c n p	Does the project have impacts that are ndividually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" neans that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects,				\boxtimes

the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not individually or cumulatively impact the environment

environment.			•	7 1	
The proposed projects would not have individual or	or cumulative in	mpact on the en	vironment.		
(Sources: 1, 2, 3)					
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	·			\boxtimes	
Discussion:					

Discussion:

A significant portion of the proposed San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update relates to policy guidelines which are not site specific and therefore would not have any adverse environmental effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The proposed projects would not have any adverse environmental effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3)

APPENDIX

SOURCE REFERENCES

The following is a list of references used in the preparation of this document. Unless attached herein, copies of all reference reports, memorandums and letters are on file with the City of San Rafael Department of Community Development. References to Publications prepared by Federal or State agencies may be found with the agency responsible for providing such information.

- Staff Review
- 2. San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2018 Update
- 3. City of San Rafael General Plan 2020, adopted November 15, 2004; amended thereafter
- 4. City of San Rafael General Zoning Ordinance, City of San Rafael, May 1996; amended thereafter
- 5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, revised December 1999
- 6. State Division of Mines and Geology; Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps
- 7. California Building Code, 2016 Edition
- 8. Caltrans Highway Design Manual
- 9. California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
- 10. San Rafael Municipal Code
- 11. BAAQMD Bay Area Air Pollution Summaries (2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017)
- 12. Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (MCSTOPPP)
- 13. Uniform Building Code, 1997 Edition
- 14. California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1532.1
- 15. San Rafael Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP); 2009
- 16. City adopted Archeological Resource Protection Procedures; 2001
- 17. San Rafael Muncipal Code Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.13)

DETERMINATION FOR PROJECT

Potentially Significant Effect on the environment. A N	egative Declaration will be prepared.		
Jamen J Bavin	May 4,2018		
Signature	Date		
Lauren G. Davini	Traffic Engineer		
Printed Name	Title		

On the basis of this Initial Study and Environmental Checklist I find that the proposed project would not have a

REPORT AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS Lauren Davini, P.E., Traffic Engineer City of San Rafael, Department of Public Works