LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
MARIN COUNTY PARKS
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 21000 et. seq. of the Public Resources Code and the Marin County Environmental Impact Review Guidelines and Procedures, the Marin County Parks grants a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following project.

1. Project Name: Paradise Beach Park Master Plan
2. Location and Description: Paradise Beach, Marin County, California
   Assessor's Parcel # 058-041-03 and 058-021-04
3. Project Sponsor: Marin County Parks

4. Finding:

   Based on the attached Initial Study and without a public hearing, it is my judgment that:

   [ ] The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

   [X] Marin County Parks has mitigated the project's significant effects, as described in the attached Initial Study, by modifying the project to reduce the potential adverse effects to a level of insignificance.

   [Environmental Planning Manager]

   Date: 8/17/16

   Based on the attached Initial Study and the comments received during the public review period, the Marin County Parks grants a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

   [Craig Richardson, Open Space Planner]

   Date: 8/17/16

5. Mitigation Measures:

   (Select one of the following statements)

   [ ] The Initial Study did not identify any potential adverse impacts and, therefore, the project does not require mitigation measures.

   [X] Please refer to mitigation measures in the attached Initial Study.

   [ ] The Initial Study concludes that Marin County Parks can modify the project's potential adverse impacts, as noted under the following factors in the attached Initial Study.

   Marin County Parks has incorporated into the project all of the mitigation measures described in the attached Initial Study.

6. Preparation:

   Marin County Parks prepared this Mitigated Negative Declaration and interested parties may obtain copies at the address listed below.

   Marin County Parks
   3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 260
   San Rafael, California 94903
   Telephone (415) 473-6387
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I. INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study complies with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, (commencing with Section 21000 of California’s Public Resources Code), and State CEQA Guidelines. Marin County Parks manages Paradise Beach Park on behalf of the County of Marin, which owns the property.

Marin County Parks has determined that the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan (proposed project) is subject to environmental assessment under CEQA. Early identification of potential environmental impacts provides the basis for necessary revisions to the project design. Thus, the analysis in this document concentrates on aspects of the project that are likely to have a significant effect on the environment and identifies feasible measures to mitigate (i.e. reduce or avoid) these impacts. The CEQA Guidelines define “significant effect on the environment” as a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project ….” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).

This Initial Study consists of the following major sections:

Project Description – provides a brief description of existing site conditions, the proposed Master Plan modifications and improvements, and the discretionary approvals required for the project to proceed.

Environmental Checklist and Discussion – provides specific environmental topic chapters, which address the following:

   i. Environmental setting or conditions that may affect or be affected by the Master Plan

   ii. Potential environmental effects and level of significance likely to result from the Master Plan as proposed

   iii. Mitigation measures to eliminate or substantially reduce the identified potentially significant environmental effects

   iv. References used in the analyses

Appendices – including the Master Plan and relevant technical reports.
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project Title:

Paradise Beach Park Master Plan

2. Lead Agency

Marin County Parks
3501 Civic Center Dr., Room 260
San Rafael, CA 94903

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Craig Richardson, Open Space Planner
(415) 473-7057 or crrichardson@marincounty.org

4. Project Location

Paradise Beach Park, 3450 Paradise Drive, Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Marin County Parks
3501 Civic Center Dr., Room 260
San Rafael, CA 94903

6. General Plan Designations

Marin Countywide Plan
Open Space (OS)

7. Zoning

Marin County Zoning Designations
Open Area (OA)

Introduction

Paradise Beach County Park (Park) is a 19-acre regional park located on the side of the Tiburon Peninsula adjacent to the San Francisco Bay (Figure 1, Project Site Location Map). Having spectacular views of the Bay and with direct water access, the Park is a popular destination for Marin County residents. The existing Park features include a fishing pier, a narrow beach, sites for group events, various group picnic areas, informal lawn areas, bay access for kayaks, a horseshoe court, modern restroom facilities, and a small beach with public access (Figure 2-3). A fee is required for use of the County Park parking lot. The Park’s peak use is generally during daylight hours on Saturdays and Sundays with sporadic use during the weekdays. The main activities at Paradise Beach County Park include group gatherings at the picnic areas and fishing off the pier. Special events, such as weddings, corporate functions, school outings,
summer camps and filming, are also held on occasion. The Paradise Beach Park Master Plan document (Appendix A) incorporates the following guiding principles in developing the Master Plan concept (Figures 4-5).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Improve accessibility throughout the site: A new network of accessible paths allows free and fluid movement to and between all areas of the Park, with four handicap parking spaces in a more central location.

2. Develop a hierarchy of spaces for various outdoor activities: Three main gathering areas are clearly defined – waterfront, large lawn, and central picnic area – while additional picnic areas and seating pods are scattered throughout the Park and integrated into the landscape. Additional small plazas reinforce the hierarchy of spaces and create a sense of ‘place.’

3. Created a sense of arrival: New signage and sculptural elements are installed at the entry of the Park and along the entry road, enhancing the sense of arrival from Paradise Drive. A new arrival plaza marks the pedestrian entry to the Park and provides a dramatic, open view to the Bay and the pier.

4. Restored landscape infrastructure and enhanced native habitats: The primary areas of the proposed infrastructure restoration are the seawall, the retaining wall and slopes north of the pier (currently subject to landslides) and the beach. Native gardens are proposed at the restored slopes and other areas of the Park with potential for tidal pools to be incorporated into the new sea wall.

5. Increased educational/interpretive opportunities: Interpretive signage both highlights the natural habitats of the Park and creates a nature-focused and cultural itinerary throughout the Park. The physical remnants of the Park’s history, including concrete blocks and steel balls for submarine nets, are also integrated into the design as accent features.

6. Increased weekday usership with nature-themed integrated play elements: Play elements are integrated into the Park’s physical design, diffusing play activities throughout the site. Sculpted landforms, stair slides, and various play elements allow users to explore the different spaces of the Park, providing play and learning experiences that are unique to Paradise Beach Park.

7. Improved Park facilities for large gatherings: Pavilions and shade structures provide more comfortable opportunities for large private gatherings. Indoor and outdoor kitchen facilities are also envisioned at the pavilions.

8. Improved use of the waterfront: The waterfront is expanded and its use enhanced with additional facilities, such as concessions and kayak rental. A large boardwalk and pier improvements expand the accessible waterfront, while providing additional choices of ways to occupy the transitional zone between land and water.

Proposed Project

According to the Park Master Plan, the project consists of organizing site facilities and activities such that active use is concentrated, quiet and natural settings preserved, and the useable area of the Park is expanded to distribute the impact of a higher number of visitors.
The revised Park is comprised of eight components. The design of these components within the Park delineates a precise hierarchy of spaces that enhances the natural and man-made features of the Park. New or renovated facilities and infrastructure will support those uses. A new system of ADA compliant pedestrian paths, promenades, and trails will be created within the Park to connect these spaces. Added facilities respond to the community and regional needs that have been identified by the Master Plan process. Flexible, multi-use, and adaptive facilities accommodate a process of program development and anticipate changing user needs. The proposed Park components are shown below in Figures 4-5.
Figure 1. Project Site Location Map
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Figure 3.
Map of Existing Conditions
Construction

Future development resulting from the proposed project would be separated into several separate components to limit construction impacts and allow for funding generation. These components may be developed in any particular order. No set period is currently planned for each component, as implementation will be reliant upon available funding. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Furthermore, all future development resulting from the Master Plan would be subject to applicable County regulations and requirements, as well as be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts, if applicable. The proposed project components are as follows:

1. **PIER:** The improvements include the installation of new railing, the proposed boat dock, and all the additional furniture.

2. **RETAINING WALL (northwest of the pier):** The design of the retaining wall will need to address the current landslide problem and will set the framework for the future improvements (boardwalk below, slope stabilization, and native gardens above).

3. **WATERFRONT AT SEA WALL:** The design of the waterfront will affect the area from the edge of the seawall to the landscape area behind the existing picnic grounds. In this phase the existing rangers station and bathroom buildings will be kept in place, and a temporary ADA parking lot will be added allowing accessible path of travel.

4. **PARK GROUNDS:** This component includes the bulk of the landscape renovations. It will include the removal of the existing asphalt road, the construction of the arrival plaza and the new ADA parking, the stairs, the nature play areas and gardens and all the new paths of the Park.

5. **PAVILIONS AND GRAND STAIRS:** This component is limited to the construction of the two pavilions and the grand stairs.

6. **UPPER PARK AREAS:** These improvements include the sculpted landforms and the nature play areas near the redwood grove.

7. **PARK ENTRY:** This component includes the new entry sculptures and signage and adjustment of the landscape along the entry road.

**Grading and Demolition**

Future development of the site may utilize the grading designs proposed in the Master Plan allowing the circulation routes to flow smoothly along the existing and proposed contours of the project site. The removal of the existing road, connecting the parking lots to the waterfront, and the overall re-organization of pedestrian circulation, will imply a significant re-arrangement of the existing grades and a substantial amount of cut and fill. For the entire Master Plan design, approximately 4,000 cubic yards (cy) of soil would be removed from the site and 8,600 cy of fill would be required. This would result in a net surplus of 4,600 cy of soil that would need to be exported from the site.

**Construction Equipment and Timing**

The implementation of the proposed Master Plan could require the use of heavy machinery including but not limited to: excavators, loaders, tractors, dozers, and various trucks (e.g., water,
concrete, haul), as well as paving equipment. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature. Future development resulting from the Master Plan would be subject further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts, if applicable. These regulations would require the staging areas for construction equipment to be located within the Park. In compliance with County Code, project construction would be confined to between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday and Saturday between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and exclude Sundays and holidays. Operation of loud, noise-generating construction-related equipment (e.g., backhoes, generators, jackhammers) would be maintained, operated, or serviced from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except for construction work that would be tide dependent (e.g., pier work).

**Habitat Restoration**

The primary habitat restoration initiatives suggested by the Master Plan focus on three specific items:

1. Replace the existing seawall, south of the pier;
2. Restore the retaining wall north of the pier, currently affected by several landslides; and
3. Explore and implement strategies to stop the erosion of the existing beach.

The Master Plan does not provide specific directions as far as the methodology to be implemented to restore and protect further erosion of the beach. The definition of this strategy is deferred to future coordination with experts. The design team met with representatives of the Romberg Tiburon Center for Environmental Studies, and discussed some potential strategies, including the use of underwater reef balls and beds of eel grass. The Master Plan indicates several opportunities for nature exploration and interpretive signage, the outdoor classroom at the waterfront with the rose of the winds, indicating the prevailing winds of the area, and the viewpoint with interpretive signage for the San Francisco Bay. Additional interpretive signage will be located at the existing wooded area on the southeast corner of the Park, at the existing redwood grove and at the proposed native gardens.

**Tree Removal and Landscaping**

Any future development under the Master Plan would be required by the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) to incorporate water conserving fixtures and landscaping. All landscaped areas will also be required to meet the provisions established by the California Water Efficient Landscapes Ordinance.

Under the County of Marin Native Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (NTPPO), certain tree species with diameters ranging from a minimum of 6 to 10 inches at breast height, depending on the species, are considered Protected or Heritage trees and may require a permit for removal. During the September 2, 2014 site visit by WRA biologists, several trees were observed at the project site that may meet the size requirements of the NTPPO. However, the NTPPO provides exceptions to the prohibition on removal of a Protected tree for the routine management and maintenance of public land by a public agency.

Whenever feasible, existing mature trees on the project site would be protected in place. However, because some trees may pose safety concerns due to disease or otherwise poor health, there is always a potential that some on-site trees would have to be removed or trimmed to accommodate expanded facilities. Nonetheless, according to the Master Plan, new trees would be planted throughout the project site, which would ensure that any tree removed during from the site would be replaced.
Surrounding Land Uses and Urban Context

The project site is located within unincorporated Marin County, adjacent to the Town of Tiburon. This portion of the County is predominantly single-family homes on large lots. Homes bound the western and eastern edges of the Park. The San Pablo Bay abuts the north edge of the Park. A large forested area is located south of the Park. Access to the Park is from Paradise Drive via Trestle Glen Boulevard and Tiburon Boulevard (State Route 131). Paradise Drive is a local street that provides access for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Intended Use of the Document

This Initial Study or the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration is being circulated to all agencies that have jurisdiction over the subject property or natural resources affected by the project and to community groups and interested parties to attest to the completeness and adequacy of the information contained in the Initial Study as it relates to the concerns that are germane to the agency’s jurisdictional authority or to the interested parties’ issues. The State Clearinghouse review period for the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is 30 days as required by CEQA.

Marin County Agencies

1. Marin County Parks
2. Marin County Department of Public Works (DPW), Land Use & Water Resources Division
3. Marin County Community Development Agency, Environmental Review
4. Marin County Fire Department
5. Marin County Deputy Zoning Administrator

Trustee Agencies (via State Clearinghouse):

1. United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
2. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
3. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
4. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB)
5. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District (Corps)

Required Approvals

The project may require regulatory permits from:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
- National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS)
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involve mitigation measures that avoid any potentially significant impacts as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- X Cultural Resources
- X Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

PROJECT SPONSOR’S INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Acting on behalf of Marin County Parks, I (undersigned) have reviewed the Initial Study for the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan and have particularly reviewed the mitigation measures and monitoring programs identified herein. As this is a public project, all mitigation measures are included in the project.

Signature
Date:
Name and Title:
Determination

Pursuant to Sections 15081 and 15070 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the following Initial Study evaluation, and the entire administrative record for the project: (Completed by Marin County Environmental Coordinator)

☐ I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the project MAY have a “Potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature
Date:
Name and Title:
IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The points enumerated below describe the primary procedural steps undertaken by Marin County Parks in completing an Initial Study evaluation and, in particular, the manner in which significant environmental effects of the project are made and recorded.

A. The determination of significant environmental effect is to be based on substantial evidence contained in the administrative record and Marin County Park’s environmental database consisting of information regarding environmental resources and environmental goals and policies relevant to Marin County. As a procedural device for reducing the size of the Initial Study document, relevant information sources cited and discussed in topical sections of the checklist evaluation are incorporated by reference into the checklist (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion of topical issues where appropriate.

B. In general, a negative declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when the Initial Study demonstrates that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have one or more significant effects on the environment. A negative declaration shall also be prepared if the Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions to the project made by or agreed to by Marin County Parks prior to release of the negative declaration for public review, would avoid or reduce such effects to a level of less than significant, and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, will have a significant effect on the environment. A signature block is provided in a negative declaration to verify that the project sponsor has agreed to incorporate mitigation measures into the project in conformance with this requirement.

C. All answers to the topical questions must take into account the whole of the action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts shall be identified in Section 0 of this Initial Study (Mandatory Findings of Significance).

D. “No Impact” means that no impact to the resource would occur as a result of implementing the project.

E. “Less Than Significant Impact” is appropriate if an effect is found to be less than significant based on the project as proposed and without the incorporation of mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study.

F. “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The Initial Study must include a description of the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section V, may be cross-referenced).

G. “Significant Impact” is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the Lead County Department lacks information to make a finding that the effect is less than significant. If there are one or more effects, which have been determined to be significant and unavoidable, an EIR shall be required for the project.

H. The answers in this checklist have also considered the current California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and the Initial Study Checklist contained in those Guidelines.
V. ISSUES:

A. AESTHETICS -- Would the project

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

1. Background

Paradise Beach County Park is a 19-acre regional park located on the side of the Tiburon Peninsula adjacent to the San Francisco Bay (Figure 1, Project Site Location Map). Having views of the Bay and with direct water access, the Park is a popular destination for Marin County residents. Views of existing facilities including walking trails and paths, maintenance shed, and beach and pier access are provided in Figures 6-11 below. The Park provides scenic views of the San Francisco Bay and shoreline. The Park is visible from Point Richmond, Paradise Cay, San Quentin, and local properties. The existing Park features include a fishing pier, a narrow beach, sites for group events, various group picnic areas, informal lawn areas, bay access for kayaks, a horseshoe court, modern restroom facilities, and a small beach with public access (Figures 5-11).

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the aesthetic quality of the environment or adversely affect scenic resources. Future development resulting from the Master Plan would not have a substantial impact on scenic vistas. Proposed buildings are relatively minor structures and would be designed to conform to the visual character of the Park. The Pavilion would not be located in an area of the Park that would block views of the Bay from Paradise Drive. Furthermore, all future development resulting from the Master Plan would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts at the time when specific Master Plan improvements are proposed.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within a State scenic highway. No State or locally designated scenic highways are located within Marin County (MCOSD, 2014).

c) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the aesthetic quality of the environment or adversely affect visual resources. Future development resulting from the Master Plan would not substantially degrade the visual character of quality of the site. The proposed project components are specifically designed to enhance the visual character of the site. The proposed site design intends to highlight the natural and man-made features of the Park by integrating sweeping views of the Bay, accentuating visual corridors, and opening views at key points. Furthermore, all future development resulting from the Master Plan would be guided by applicable County regulations and requirements, as well as be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts.

d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Future development resulting from the Master Plan could result in an increase in light intensity adjacent to the project site, although the impact on surrounding properties would be expected to be less than significant. New lighting sources would be required to meet the performance standards set forth in Marin County Code Title 22 Planned District General Standards [22.16.030] stating: “Exterior lighting visible from off-site should be allowed for safety purposes only, shall consist of low-wattage fixtures, and should be directed downward and shielded to prevent adverse lighting impacts on nearby properties, subject to the approval of the Director.”
Figure 6. – View looking north from walking trail.

Figure 7. – View looking east from walking path.
Figure 8. – View of picnic area from walking path.

Figure 9. – View of maintenance shed from upper parking lot.
Figure 10. – View of kayak launch from pier.

Figure 11. – View looking west from the eastern Park border.
B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526)?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Resulting in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The project site does not contain any farmland or forestry land and is not designated for agricultural or forestry uses or Prime, Statewide, or Locally Important Farmland (California Department of Conservation, 2010).
2. Discussion of Impacts

a) 

\textit{Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.}

b) 

\textit{Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.}

c) 

\textit{Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).}

d) 

\textit{Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.}

e) 

\textit{Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.}

\textbf{No Impact.} The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Furthermore, all space within the Park’s boundaries are designated “Other Land” or “Urban and Built Up Land” by the California Department of Conservation (CDC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (CDC 2010). The project site is not located within or adjacent to any lands protected by the Williamson Act, nor is the area zoned for agricultural use. The County of Marin has zoned the project site as Open Area (OA). The lands within the project site and adjacent to it do not meet the definitions of forest or timberland, and therefore the Master Plan would not impact forest or timber land. The proposed Master Plan would be located on County parkland and would not involve any other changes that would result in conversion of farmland. Therefore, any future development that could result from the proposed Master Plan would not have the potential to impact agriculture or forest resources.
C. AIR QUALITY

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The project is located in Marin County, which is part of the Bay Area Air Basin and under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Marin County is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by San Francisco and San Pablo Bays, on the south by the Golden Gate and on the north by the Petaluma Gap. The prevailing wind directions throughout Marin County are generally from the northwest and wind speeds are in the range of five miles per hour. In the summer months, areas along the coast are usually subject to onshore movement of cool marine air. In the winter, proximity to the ocean keeps the coastal regions relatively warm, with temperatures varying little throughout the year. Coastal temperatures are usually in the high-50s in the winter and the low-60s in the summer. The warmest months are September and October (BAAQMD 1999).

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated “nonattainment” for state and national (1-hour and 8-hour) ozone standards, for the state PM$_{10}$ standards, and for state and national (annual average and 24-hour) PM$_{2.5}$ standards. The Bay Area Air Basin is designated “attainment” or “unclassified” with respect to the other ambient air quality standards.
A project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plans if it is inconsistent with the growth assumptions, in terms of population, employment, or regional growth in vehicle miles traveled. BAAQMD uses local general plans as a basis for its growth assumptions. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development that would increase population growth or vehicle miles traveled for the County. Furthermore, any future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan would have emissions well below BAAQMD thresholds and would not interfere with implementation of any of the plan measures. In addition, the Master Plan does not require any General Plan amendments that would change land use planning in such a manner that regionwide emissions would be affected.

b) **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.**

c) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described above, the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and implementation would not have an impact on air quality. Furthermore, any future development resulting from the Master Plan would provide improvements to the existing Park. Such improvements would potentially have only a minimal air quality impact during construction and less with long-term operation. Any future development from the proposed project would result in air pollutant emissions well below the BAAQMD significance thresholds and its individual impact on regional air quality would be less than significant. Future development resulting from the proposed project would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis.

d) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As noted in the discussion on item A above, operation of the proposed project would not generate substantial pollutant concentrations, and thus, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.**

**No Impact.** The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. In general, the types of land uses that pose potential odor problems include refineries, chemical plants, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities, and transfer stations. Any future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan would not include any of these uses and therefore, would not result in impacts related to objectionable odors.
D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</th>
<th>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</th>
<th>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</th>
<th>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

Paradise Beach County Park is located on the northeast side of the Tiburon Peninsula, and the northern boundary of the Park meets the San Francisco Bay. The Park includes a pier and kayak launch into the Bay on its north side. The Park is surrounded by residential development on its east and west. An unnamed, intermittent stream runs immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Park, carrying water from the adjacent watershed into the San Francisco Bay. A smaller intermittent stream flows through the center of the Park and discharges into the adjacent stream near its mouth, approximately 150 feet before entering the San Francisco Bay.
Paradise Drive forms the southern boundary of the Park; primarily undeveloped parcels with some residential development near the western-most portion of the Park occur to the south of Paradise Drive across the Park’s boundary.

**Regulatory Setting**

*Sensitive Biological Communities*

Sensitive biological communities include habitats that fulfill special functions or have special values, such as wetlands, streams, and riparian habitat. These habitats are regulated under federal regulations (such as the Clean Water Act [CWA]), state regulations (such as the Porter-Cologne Act, the McAteer-Petris Act, and CEQA), or local ordinances or policies (such as City or County Tree Ordinances, Special Habitat Management Areas and General Plan Elements).

*Waters of the United States Regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulates “Waters of the United States” under Section 404 of the CWA. Waters of the United States are defined in the Code of Federal Regulations as waters susceptible to use in commerce, including interstate waters and wetlands, all other waters (intrastate waterbodies, including wetlands), and their tributaries (33 CFR 328.3). Corps jurisdiction in tidal waters extends up to the elevation of the High Tide Line (HTL). The placement of fill material into Waters of the United States generally requires an individual or nationwide permit from the Corps under Section 404 of the CWA.

*Waters of the State Regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board*

The term “Waters of the State” is defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as “any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) protects all waters in its regulatory scope and has special responsibility for wetlands, riparian areas, and headwaters. These waterbodies have high resource value, are vulnerable to filling, and are not systematically protected by other programs. RWQCB jurisdiction includes “isolated” wetlands and waters that may not be regulated by the Corps under CWA Section 404. Waters of the State are regulated by the RWQCB under the State Water Quality Certification Program which regulates discharges of fill and dredged material under Section 401 of the CWA and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Projects that require a Corps permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact Waters of the State, are required to comply with the terms of the Water Quality Certification determination. If a proposed project does not require a federal permit, but does involve dredge or fill activities that may result in a discharge to Waters of the State, the RWQCB has the option to regulate the dredge and fill activities under its state authority in the form of Waste Discharge Requirements.

*San Francisco Bay and Shoreline Regulated by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission*

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has regulatory jurisdiction, as defined by the McAteer-Petris Act, over the San Francisco Bay and its shoreline. BCDC’s Bay jurisdiction includes all areas of San Francisco Bay up to the elevation of the Mean High Water (MHW), or if tidal vegetation is present, to the inland extent of tidal vegetation, up to five feet above mean sea level. BCDC’s shoreline band jurisdiction includes all areas located within 100 feet of their Bay jurisdiction.
Special-Status Species

Special-status species include those plants and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts afford protection to both listed and proposed species. In addition, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Species of Concern, which are species that face extirpation if current population and habitat trends continue, USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern, sensitive species included in USFWS Recovery Plans, and CDFW special-status invertebrates are all considered special-status species. Although CDFW Species of Special Concern generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under CEQA. In addition to regulations for special-status species, most birds in the United States, including non-status species, are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918. Under this legislation, destroying active nests, eggs, and young is illegal.

Bat species designated as “High Priority” by the Western Bat Working Group (WBWG) qualify for legal protection under Section 15380(d) of the CEQA Guidelines. Species designated “High Priority” are defined as “imperiled or are at high risk of imperilment based on available information on distribution, status, ecology and known threats” (CDFW 2014). Plant species on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Lists 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species. Impacts to these species are considered significant according to CEQA.

Relevant Local Policies, Ordinances, Regulations

County of Marin Native Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance

Under the County of Marin Native Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (NTPPO), certain native tree species with diameters ranging from a minimum of 6 to 10 inches at breast height are considered protected or heritage trees and may require a permit for removal. However, the NTPPO provides exceptions to the prohibition on removal of a Protected tree for the routine management and maintenance of public land by a public agency.

Biological Communities on the Project Site

WRA biologists assessed the project site for existing conditions and sensitive biological resources, including sensitive habitats and special-status species on November 8, 2012 and September 3, 2014. See Appendix B for the Site Inventory and Constraints Assessment prepared by WRA, Inc., including an environmental constraints map and a list of species documented to occur in the vicinity of the project site.

The project site’s 13 acres consist of an interface between remnant and planted natural habitats (e.g., oak-bay woodland, redwood forest, coastal scrub habitat) and developed areas (e.g. landscaped lawns and picnic areas, a kayak launch, a pier). Despite regular use of the Park, because of active management (the developed areas) or the dominance of perennial, woody vegetation (the natural areas), the vegetation habitat types are unlikely to change. These communities are shown in Figure 13. The Shoreline Band, as defined by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), extends 100-feet landward from the San Francisco Bay into the project site.
The project site is also located within designated as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for various life stages of fish species. Fishery Management Plans (FMP) for species with EFH within the Study Area include Pacific Groundfish FMP (e.g., English sole, brown rockfish, starry flounder, leopard shark etc.), Coastal Pelagic FMP (e.g., northern anchovy, Pacific sardine), and Pacific Coast Salmon FMP.

**Special-Status Species on the Project Site**

**Plants**

Eighty-six special-status plants have been documented in the vicinity of the project site. Two species, Brewer’s calandrinia (*Calandrinia breweri*) coastal triquetrella (*Triquetrella californica*), have moderate potential to occur, primarily due to the presence of disturbed coastal scrub habitat. Suitable habitat for the remaining 84 special-status plant species is not present in the project site, primarily due to a lack of serpentine substrate, marshy habitat, non-landscaped grassland, and various wooded habitats. No rare plants were documented at the project site during a site visit on November 8, 2012 and September 3, 2014.

Brewer’s calandrinia is known to occur in sandy or loamy disturbed sites or burns in coastal scrub and chaparral. At the project site, there are approximately 0.52 acres of coyote brush scrub and ruderal coastal scrub that have the potential to support this species.

Coastal triquetrella is known to occur on thin, gravelly, rocky, or sandy soil in coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland. It grows within 10 miles of the coastline and has been reported from trails, roadsides, picnic areas, playgrounds, and rock outcrops. The project site contains suitable rocky and sandy soils in coastal scrub and disturbed areas. Though this species is known from a small number of occurrences, its general habitat requirements make it difficult to rule out.

**Wildlife**

Eighty-four special-status wildlife species, four bird and one insect species with breeding sites/roosts protected by CDFW, and one commercially important fish have been documented to occur within the vicinity of the project site. Eighteen species have moderate or high potential to occur, primarily due to the presence of San Francisco Bay waters and oak woodland habitat on the site. Suitable habitat for the remaining 76 special-status wildlife species is not present in the project site, primarily due to a lack of tidal marsh, non-landscaped grassland, and freshwater wetland habitats. No special-status wildlife species were observed at the project site during a site visit on November 5, 2012 and September 3, 2014. Species with moderate or high potential to occur on the project site are discussed in more detail below.
Fish

Green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*). Federal Threatened Species, CDFW Species of Special Concern. Green sturgeon is considered an anadromous species and utilizes both freshwater and saltwater habitats. Adults live in oceanic waters, bays, and estuaries, and migrate to freshwater to spawn in deep pools in large, turbulent river mainstems. The study area does not contain spawning habitat for the species; however, green sturgeon have a moderate potential to occur in the study area as it is located within NMFS designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and provides marginal foraging habitat for the species. Additionally, the study area is within a migration corridor for the species and individuals may occur in the area during migration to suitable freshwater habitats.

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Sacramento winter run ESU (Federal Endangered, State Endangered, NMFS jurisdiction), Central Valley spring run ESU (Federal Threatened, State Threatened, NMFS jurisdiction), and Central Valley Fall/Late Fall run ESU (CDFW Species of Special Concern). Moderate Potential. Chinook salmon are anadromous (adults migrate from a marine environment into the fresh water streams and rivers of their birth) and semelparous (spawn only once and then die). They are fairly faithful to the home streams in which they were spawned, using visual and chemical cues to locate these streams. Eggs are laid in large depressions (redds) hollowed out in gravel beds. Large pools with cold water are essential over-summering habitat for this species. These three ESUs of this species are anadromous and have a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Central California Coast DPS and Central Valley DPS, (Federal Threatened, NMFS jurisdiction). Moderate Potential. Steelhead are anadromous (sea-run) forms of rainbow trout that exhibit highly variable life histories. Within California, steelhead can occupy freshwater streams, estuaries or coastal marine waters, depending on their developmental stage. Steelhead utilize the San Francisco Bay as adults during migration and as smolts for migration, foraging, and rearing. The project site is within the range of the Central California Coast DPS and the Central Valley DPS for steelhead and within NMFS designated critical habitat for the species. The project site does not provide spawning habitat for the species; however, there is a moderate potential for this species to occur within the study area during migration. Additionally, the study area provides marginal rearing and foraging habitat for outmigrating smolts. These two DPSs of this species are anadromous and have a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

Longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*). Federal Candidate, State Threatened, CDFW Species of Special Concern. Longfin smelt is an anadromous smelt found in California’s bays, estuaries, and nearshore coastal environments, including San Francisco Bay. Adult longfin smelt are mostly found in mid-water or near the bottom of estuaries and bays, and migrate to freshwater or low salinity areas to spawn. In April and May, juveniles are believed to migrate downstream to San Pablo Bay. Juveniles tend to inhabit the middle and lower portions of the water column. Longfin smelt tend to be abundant near freshwater outflow, where higher-quality nursery habitat occurs and potential feeding opportunities are greater. This species is anadromous and has a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

River lamprey (*Lampetra ayresi*), CDFW Species of Special Concern. River lamprey prey on a variety of fishes in the 10-30 cm TL size range, but the most common prey seem to be herring and salmon. Unlike other species of lamprey in California, river lamprey typically attach to the back of the host fish, above the lateral line, where they feed on muscle tissue. Little is known
about habitat requirements in California, but presumably, the adults need clean, gravelly riffles in permanent streams for spawning, while the ammocoetes require sandy backwaters or stream edges in which to bury themselves, where water quality is continuously high and temperatures do not exceed 25°C. Adults migrate back into fresh water in the fall and spawn during the winter or spring months in small tributary streams. This species is anadromous and has a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*). Pacific herring is a coastal marine fish that uses large estuaries for spawning and early rearing habitat. Though this species is not listed as a sensitive species, it is of note because it is an important commercial fishery species in San Francisco Bay. On the basis of spawning biomass (i.e., an estimate of the number of spawning fish), the San Francisco Bay estuary is the most important spawning area for eastern Pacific populations of the species (CDFG, 2002). Pacific herring supports a commercial fishery, primarily for roe (herring eggs) but also for fresh fish, bait and pet food. In the Bay, the Pacific herring fishery is the last remaining commercial finfish fishery (BEIS 2003). The peak spawning period in San Francisco Bay and Tomales Bay is from January to March (Miller and Schmidtke 1956). Herring will typically spawn in rocky intertidal areas or areas with marine vegetation but may also spawn on boats, pilings, tires, and other debris. The species typically avoids spawning in sand and mud. Pacific herring have a high potential to occur in the study area as it contains pilings that provide suitable spawning structure for the species.

**Birds**

Oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*), USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. High Potential. The oak titmouse occurs in open woodlands oak woodland, open broad-leaved evergreen forests containing oaks, and riparian woodlands. The nest is built in woodpecker holes and natural cavities; titmice sometimes partially excavate their own cavity. There is a high potential for the bird to occur within the project site due to the presence of suitable oak woodland habitat, and it may forage within the landscape trees on the rest of the site.

Nuttall’s woodpecker (*Picoides nuttallii*). USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. High Potential. Nuttall’s Woodpecker, common in much of its range, is a year-round resident throughout most of California west of the Sierra Nevada. Typical habitat is oak or mixed woodland, and riparian areas (Lowther 2000). Nesting occurs in tree cavities, principally those of oaks and larger riparian trees. This species forages on a variety of arboreal invertebrates. The project site contains highly suitable woodland habitat for the species, and it may forage within the landscape trees on the rest of the site. Nuttall’s woodpecker has a high potential to occur in the study area.

Allen’s hummingbird (*Selasphorus sasin*), USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Moderate Potential. Allen’s Hummingbird, common in many portions of its range, is a summer resident along the majority of California’s coast and a year-round resident in portions of coastal southern California and the Channel Islands. Breeding occurs in association with the coastal fog belt, and typical habitats used include coastal scrub, riparian, woodland and forest edges, and eucalyptus and cypress groves (Mitchell 2000). This species feeds on nectar, as well as insects and spiders. Areas most likely to be utilized for breeding include riparian corridors interfacing with scrub habitats and planted tree groves. There is a moderate potential for Allen’s hummingbird to occur in the project site, which contains some nectar-producing flowers and marginal breeding habitat for the species.
Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*), CDFW Species of Special Concern, USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Primarily a year-round resident in open habitats including woodland, grassland, savannah and agricultural areas. Prefers areas with sparse shrubs, trees, posts, and other suitable perches for foraging. Preys upon large insects and small vertebrates. Nests are well-concealed in a densely-foliaged shrub or tree. The project site contains woodland habitat that could support breeding in this species, and the mix of human-influenced and more natural habitats could support foraging.

Long-eared owl (*Asio otus*), CDFW Species of Special Concern. The long-eared owl is a resident in open woodlands, forest edges, riparian strips along rivers, and wooded ravines and gullies. Breeding habitat includes thickly wooded areas for nesting and roosting with nearby open spaces for foraging. There is a moderate potential for long-eared owl to occur in the woodland portions of the project site as trees may provide suboptimal oak-woodland edge habitat for nesting and individuals may occasionally use the area for foraging.

California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*), Federal Delisted, State Delisted, CDFW Fully Protected Species. The California brown pelican nests in colonies on offshore islands, from the Channel Islands southward, that are free of mammalian predators and human disturbance. This pelican is found throughout the San Francisco Estuary and nests and roosts on rocky or low brushy slopes of undisturbed islands. The species is a winter/non-breeding visitor to estuarine, marine subtidal, and marine pelagic waters along the California coast. Individuals use breakwaters, jetties, sand spits and offshore sand bars for loafing and night roosts. In the project area, there is a moderate potential for individuals to use the pier for daily loafing and may occasionally forage in the surrounding water. Nesting habitat is not supported in the study area as California brown pelicans do not nest in the San Francisco Bay area. Limited potential noise disturbance to loafing and foraging birds may occur; however, any disturbance associated with the project would be temporary and therefore not anticipated to impact the species.

American white pelican (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*); CDFW Species of Special Concern. This pelican is primarily an inland species, occurring in the San Francisco Bay region as a migrant and winter visitor (though it is found nearly year-round here). The nearest breeding locations are in northeastern California. Prey consists primarily of small, schooling fishes; foraging typically occurs in shallow waters, often cooperatively. On the project site, there is a moderate potential for individuals to use the pier for daily loafing and may occasionally forage in the surrounding water. Nesting habitat is not supported in the study area as American white pelicans do not nest in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mammals

Townsend's Western Big-Eared Bat, (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*), State Candidate (Threatened), CDFW Species of Special Concern, WBWG High Priority. Moderate Potential. This species ranges throughout western North America, from British Columbia to the central Mexico. They are typically associated with caves, but are also found in man-made structures, including mines and buildings. While many bats wedge themselves into tight cracks and crevices, big-eared bats hang from walls and ceilings in the open. Males roost singly during the spring and summer months while females aggregate in the spring at maternity roosts to give birth. Females roost with their young until late summer or early fall, until young become independent, flying and foraging on their own. Hibernation roosts tend to be made up of small aggregations of individuals in central and southern California. Foraging occurs in open forest habitats where they glean moths from vegetation. This species may use accessible buildings on the project site for roosting and may forage in the area.
Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), CDFW Species of Special Concern, WBWG High Priority. Moderate Potential. The pallid bat is found in a variety of low elevation habitats throughout California. It selects a variety of day roosts including rock outcrops, mines, caves, hollow trees, buildings, and bridges. Night roosts are usually found under bridges, but also in caves, mines, and buildings. Pallid bats are sensitive to roost disturbance. Unlike most bats, pallid bats primarily feed on large ground-dwelling arthropods, and many prey are taken on the ground (Zeiner, et al. 1990). CNDB records show maternity colonies found in residential buildings in the vicinity of the project site (CDFW 2014). Suitable roost habitat is present throughout the site in tree cavities and accessible buildings. This species may also forage in the project site. Presence of this species may also indicate suitable habitat for other sensitive bats including such species as Townsend’s big-eared bat and others.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Plants

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. Any future development would be subject to the applicable federal, state, and local regulations that protect biological resources. Future projects would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts. Development improvements resulting from the proposed Master Plan have the potential to impact special-status plant and wildlife species. Special-status plants that may be impacted include Brewer's calandrinia and coastal triquetrella. The following avoidance and mitigation measures would avoid significant impacts to these plant and wildlife special-status species during potential future development of the site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:
Appropriately timed surveys shall be completed for Brewer’s Calandrinia and coastal triquetrella in habitat with potential to support these species prior to commencement of any future development. If rare plants are detected during pre-construction surveys, they shall be flagged and avoided. If rare plants cannot be avoided, the County shall provide compensatory mitigation as deemed appropriate by CDFW.

Monitoring Measure BIO-1:
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure BIO-1 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

Wildlife

Special-Status Fish, Critical Habitat, and Essential Fish Habitat

The project site has the potential to act as a migratory corridor for special-status fishes and may also serve as low-quality foraging, rearing and/or spawning habitat for these species. Additionally, the project site is located within NMFS designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and steelhead, and within designated EFH for Pacific Groundfish FMP, Coastal Pelagic FMP, and Pacific Coast Salmon FMP.
Depending on proposed project activities, impacts to special-status fish and fish habitat include the direct harm of individual fish and disturbance to spawning. Additionally, in-water work consisting of the addition, repair, or replacement of piles, pile repair or driving activities may impact special-status fish species within the project site if performed when piles are inundated. Piles driven into standing water may result in hydroacoustic impacts to fish. Other proposed project activities, such as tree removal and construction of the interpretive plaza, could result in increased sediment erosion and inadvertent discharge of fuels and chemicals into the Bay and into the adjacent stream, affecting fish and reducing habitat quality. The discharge of fuels, chemicals, and other pollutants into the Bay or adjacent stream is a violation of the Clean Water Act. Lastly, temporary increases in suspended sediment loads could result in a temporary reduction in foraging or spawning habitat quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Birds**

Nuttall’s woodpecker, oak titmouse, Allen’s hummingbird, olive-sided flycatcher, long-eared owl, and nesting birds are protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code (FGC). Special-status and non-special-status birds have the potential to nest within the project site. The MBTA and California FGC provide for the protection of most birds, including both common and special-status species from incidental take. Construction activities including the removal of trees and other vegetation and excessive noise could destroy active nests, harm individual birds and eggs, or cause nest abandonment. Construction disturbance and other activities that cause abandonment of a nest are also considered non-permitted take and would be a violation of the MBTA and/or FGC. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Bats**

The project has the potential to impact Townsend’s big-eared bat and pallid bat. These two bat species may roost in buildings found within the study site. Potential impacts include direct mortality of day-roosting bats from the demolition of buildings at all times of the year and the destruction and mortality of entire maternity colonies of females and young during the maternity season. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2:**

Potential adverse effects to special-status fish, EFH, and critical habitat shall be avoided or minimized by following the measures outlined below.

1. All work below MHW shall be restricted to low tides so that all work is conducted out of water.

2. The work windows for in-water work are informed by NOAA Fisheries recommendations for avoidance of potential impacts to fish species in this region of the Bay. In-water work conducted within the work window will minimize the possibility that project activities may impact fish species, as listed fish species are less likely to utilize the project site as a migratory corridor during this period. Although approved work windows exist for steelhead and juvenile Chinook salmon (June 1 through November 30), and Pacific herring (March 1 through November 30), there are no approved work windows for green sturgeon, longfin smelt, and river lamprey. If in-water work is done outside of the approved work windows for a particular species, consultation with USFWS, NMFS and/or CDFW will be required and undertaken. Any mitigation, avoidance, and minimization measures resulting from this consultation shall be implemented by County
Parks to avoid and minimize impacts to listed fish species in accordance with the CESA and FESA. Such measures may include conducting additional surveys and conducting construction activities in aquatic habitat in the presence of a qualified biological monitor.

3. A turbidity curtain shall be used around the area of rip-rap placement or during periods when project activities will disturb San Francisco Bay sediment.

4. Any existing wall material or other debris removed from the Bay shall be removed expeditiously and placed in a containment area. Removed material shall not be shaken, hosed-off, left hanging to drip, or result in any other action that would allow debris or sediment to enter Bay waters.

5. Impacts to eelgrass shall be avoided or, if avoidance is not feasible, minimized. Minimization measures may include actions to limit turbidity, light reduction, sediment loading, and circulation patterns by minimizing scouring velocities near eelgrass.

6. A spill response and prevention plan shall be prepared and personnel conducting project activities shall understand and be capable of responding to oil, gas, or other chemical spills to prevent contamination of the Bay and injury to personnel.

7. Fueling of equipment shall take place within existing paved roads, and not within or adjacent to drainages or bay waters. Contractor equipment shall be checked for leaks prior to operation and repaired as necessary. “No-fueling zones” shall be designated on construction maps and shall be situated a minimum distance of 50 feet from all drainages and bay waters.

8. An erosion control plan shall be prepared by the contractor for the purpose of minimizing erosion and siltation into off-site areas during construction. The County shall be responsible for ensuring that the erosion control plan is developed and implemented in accordance with NPDES requirements. The plan shall include the use of hay bales, silt fences, siltation basins, or other devices necessary to stabilize the soil in denuded or graded areas during the construction and revegetation phases of the project.

**Monitoring Measure BIO-2:**
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure BIO-2 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3:**
If brush and vegetation removal occurs between February 1 and September 1, preconstruction breeding bird surveys shall be conducted in the vicinity and within 14 days of ground disturbance to avoid disturbance to active nests, eggs, and/or young of Allen’s hummingbird, long-eared owl, Nuttall’s woodpecker, oak titmouse, olive-sided flycatcher, and non-special-status birds within the project site. If an active nest is located for a special-status species or species protected by the MBTA, construction activities shall not occur within 100 feet of the nest, or as determined by a qualified biologist, until chicks have fledged or the biologist determines the nest is no longer active. Potential adverse effects to nesting birds shall be avoided or minimized either by scheduling all work outside of the bird nesting season or by conducting a pre-construction survey and establishing appropriate protection buffers and monitoring around any active nest.

**Monitoring Measure BIO-3:**
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure BIO-3 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.
Mitigation Measure BIO-4:
A bat roost assessment shall be conducted to determine the potential for bat species to roost within buildings within the project site. If the bat assessment determines there is potential for bat roosting, pre-construction bat surveys shall be conducted prior to construction or demolition activities, especially during the maternity season from April 1 to August 31. Depending on bat species and roost type found during surveys, consultation with CDFW and habitat mitigation may be necessary and if so, would be implemented by the County Parks.

Monitoring Measure BIO-4:
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure BIO-4 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Sensitive natural communities that may be impacted include tidal waters and a natural, sandy beach. The following avoidance and mitigation measure would avoid significant impacts to these sensitive communities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5:
All necessary authorizations from the Corps, RWQCB, and BCDC shall be obtained for future development occurring within tidal waters or in beach habitat. Corps and RWQCB authorization shall be sought for all work occurring below the elevation of the HTL. BCDC authorization shall be sought for all work occurring within their Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction.

Monitoring Measure BIO-5:
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure BIO-5 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

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

No Impact. There are no wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act are present within the project site. Therefore, potential future development would not impact federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The project site is not a part of any terrestrial migratory corridor, and the oak woodland habitat is a part of a larger, continuous swath along the Tiburon Peninsula. Any impacts to this habitat would not compromise connectivity within the greater area of oak woodlands. Impacts to San Francisco Bay would temporarily impact a small area where migratory fish could pass, but it would not compromise overall migration through the Bay to upstream spawning habitat. The previously described mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 to BIO-5) would avoid substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Master Plan does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Furthermore, Section J. Land Use and Planning provides analysis for consistency with applicable Marin County Plan policies. The proposed project was found to be in compliance with Marin County Plans.

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.

No Impact. The project is not within an area covered by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Than Significant Impact.</strong> The proposed Master Plan does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Furthermore, Section J. Land Use and Planning provides analysis for consistency with applicable Marin County Plan policies. The proposed project was found to be in compliance with Marin County Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Impact.</strong> The project is not within an area covered by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

1. Background

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources survey for the Paradise Beach Park for the Site Inventory and Constraints Assessment, Appendix B. The study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, contact with the Native American Heritage Commission and local Native American representatives, and a field survey of the Park.

Cultural Setting

Archaeological evidence indicates that human occupation of California began at least 11,000 years ago (Erlandson et al. 2007:59). Early occupants had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on the extended family unit. Later, milling technology and an inferred acorn economy were introduced. This diversification of economy appears to be coeval with the development of sedentism, and population growth and expansion. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archaeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of
trade goods (e.g., shell beads, obsidian tool stone), which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems.

At the time of European settlement, the project site was included in the territory controlled by the Coast Miwok (Kelly 1978:414). The Coast Miwok were hunter-gatherers who lived in rich environments that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures (Barrett 1908; Kroeber 1925). Based on his study of mission records, Milliken (1995) describes the Richardson Bay vicinity as being controlled by the Huimens, a tribe of Coast Miwok speakers.

Historically, the project site is within the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, granted to John Reed in 1834 (Hoover et al. 1966:178). Reed died in 1843 leaving his wife, Hilaria, to manage his various enterprises, and in 1856 the U.S. Land Commission patented 4,469 acres of the rancho to Reed’s heirs (General Land Office [GLO] 1858).

As described in Section H, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, sources indicate that the project site was first developed in 1942 when the U.S. Navy constructed the Floating Drydock Training Center Annex at the project site to house and train officers for overseas ship repair. Use of the project site for this purpose reportedly continued through early 1958, when these uses ceased. The project site was then acquired by Marin County in 1959, and following removal of debris and structures formerly used by the Navy, was developed into Paradise Park beginning in approximately 1969. Use of the project site as Paradise Beach Park has continued to the present.

Prior to the project site’s first reported development in 1942, it may have partially been used for cattle grazing, consistent with regional historical uses on the Tiburon Peninsula. Prior to the project site’s purported use for livestock grazing as part of greater area-wide ranches, it was included within the boundaries of the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834.

Native American Contact

A request was sent to the State of California’s Native American Heritage Commission seeking information from the sacred lands files, which track Native American cultural resources, and the names of Native American individuals and groups that would be appropriate to contact regarding this project. The Native American Heritage Commission replied with a letter dated September 2, 2014, in which they indicated that the sacred land file has no information about the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project vicinity.

Letters were also sent to the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), and the Ya-Ka-Ama Indian Educational Center. FIGR responded on December 30, 2015 with a letter requesting formal consultation under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52). Upon receipt of the letter the County initiated consultation on tribal cultural resources. FIGR requested the following standard mitigation measures:

1. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3, including, but not limited to, planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria;

2. Treating the resources with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resources, including but not limited to the following:
a. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource;

b. Protecting the traditional use of the resource; and

c. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

3. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.

4. Protecting the resource.

Additionally the tribe requested to receive any cultural resource assessments or other assessments that have been completed on all or part of the project’s “area of potential effect” APE. (Personal Communication with Marin County Parks, 2015)

Archival Study Findings

Archival research for this study included lands within 0.5 miles of the study area. Research revealed that one of the first archaeological surveys to include this area was an inventory of San Francisco Bay shellmounds conducted by Nels Nelson circa 1907. Nelson’s notes were used to create archaeological site records, and locations for the sites were placed on the archaeological base maps held at the NWIC. The NWIC base maps show four Nelson shellmounds (46, 47, 48, and 49) within 0.5 miles of the Park. Most of Nelson's sites have not been relocated, in part because his notes gave vague information about their locations, and he often used ambiguous terms (for instance, "up" and "down" to mean both north and south in direction, and higher and lower in elevation). Also, with the passage of time the landscape has changed dramatically and many of his reference points are gone.

In 1989, a prehistoric archaeological site was identified in part of the study area. The site (CA-MRN-641) was documented by Richard Stradford and Sinead Norenius (1989), who noted that the site extended on to an adjacent parcel. In 1996, a group from the College of Marin examined the adjacent parcel and prepared documentation for that part of the site (Goerke et al. 1996). Stradford and Norenius thought the site to be Nelson's site 46, but that claim was questioned by Goerke et al. in 1996. Nelson describes site 46 as being east of Pt. Chauncey but his mapping places it to the west of the point, above Paradise Cove (1909).

Research also found that most of the study area had yet not been surveyed for the presence of cultural resources. A small portion (9 by 11 feet) was surveyed in 2009 for a bicycle parking project sponsored by the Marin Department of Public Works (Koenig 2009).

No ethnographic villages or camps are reported within or near the study area (Barrett 1908).

There are no other local, state, or federally recognized historic properties within or near the study area (OHP 2012; State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976). Review of historical maps found no buildings or other historical features within the study area prior to 1942 when the U.S. Army Corps map depicts two buildings (GLO 1856; USACE 1942; USCGS 1895, 1916, 1921; USGS 1899, 1942). As shown in Figure 3 of Attachment A, the property was heavily developed during the 1940s when the U.S. Navy built the Floating Drydock Training Facility.

Based on the results of the pre-field research, it was anticipated that prehistoric and historic cultural resources could be found within the study area. Prehistoric archaeological site
indicators expected to be found in the region include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements such as slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles; and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone, shellfish, and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

Field Survey Findings

Field survey found no new archaeological sites. The portion of site CA-MRN-641 that is located on Park property was found and a note was made of its current condition. Since the site was recorded in 1989, grading has occurred and a picnic table was placed on the site. Shell midden was observed at and downslope from the picnic area. The site is subject to disturbance from continued use by Park visitors and occasional maintenance. Supplemental documentation was completed and is included in this report as Appendix B.

There are no historical buildings or structures remaining in the study area. Surplus net weights from World War II are being used as a seawall but are not considered historical resources.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Cultural resources for the project site include a prehistorical archeological site and the possibility for prehistoric and historic period site indicators to be found. Construction of future development under the proposed Master Plan could have the potential to adversely affect the cultural resources discovered by the field survey. However, Marin Countywide Plan Policy HAR-1.d requires archaeological surveys to be conducted on site by a State-qualified and FIGR recommended archaeologist for new development proposed in areas identified as potential resource locations on the County sensitivity map. Countywide Plan HAR-1.e requires development at an archaeological site to, where feasible, avoid the resource and provide permanently deeded open space that incorporates the resource. Due to the presence of cultural resources within the project site and the possibility of accidental encounters, future development shall incorporate the following mitigation measures to ensure impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1:
The location of site CA-MRN-641 shall be excluded from future development. Historical photographs suggest that construction for the Navy's drydock school did not extend to the location of this site, and while the site has had some disturbance from Park activities, its ability to yield important data is not necessarily impaired. No further ground disturbing work shall occur in this area without having a treatment plan in place.

Monitoring Measure CULT-1:
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure CULT-1 complies with mitigation
standards and has been properly implemented.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-2:**
Prior to the start of construction requiring ground disturbance outside the existing development footprint or within 200 feet of a known cultural resource or tribal cultural resource, an agreement shall be executed between the County and a qualified archaeologist or cultural monitor to monitor all project construction activities.

In addition, the following note shall be included on the final site plans:

“If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and the County must be notified. A qualified archaeologist, or cultural monitor designated by the County in consultation with FIGR must evaluate the deposit. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the County.”

Prior to work proceeding the County will develop a tribal treatment plan in consultation with FIGR.

**Monitoring Measure CULT-2:**
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure CULT-2 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

**d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Any future development would be subject to the following actions promulgated in Public Resources Code 5097.98 and Health and Human Safety Code 7050.5, pertaining to the discovery of human remains. If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location must be halted in the vicinity of the find, and the County coroner contacted. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) 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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| iv) Landslides? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

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

1. **Background**

**Regional Geology and Seismicity**

The project site, like all properties in the San Francisco Bay area, is situated in a seismically active area. The regional seismic setting is dominated by stress associated with the oblique collision of the Pacific tectonic plate with the North American tectonic plate. The boundary between the two tectonic plates is the San Andreas fault system, which extends nearly 700 miles along a northwest trend from Mexico to offshore northern California. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the San Andreas fault system includes the San Andreas, Hayward, Calaveras, and other related faults in the San Francisco Bay area. According to the U.S. Geological Survey (Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities 2003), there is a 62% chance of at least a magnitude 6.7 (or greater) earthquake in the San Francisco Bay region between 2003 and 2032.

The study area is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone for active faulting and no active faults are mapped on the property. The nearest active faults are the Hayward Fault, San Andreas Fault and the Rodgers Creek Fault. The Hayward fault is 8.4 miles to the east, the San Andreas Fault is 12.1 miles to the northwest, and the Rodgers Creek Fault is 19 miles to the northeast.

According to the Soil Survey of Marin County, California (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2012), the predominant soil type on the property is Tocaloma-McMullin complex, 50 to 75 percent slope. The Tocaloma series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed in material weathered from sandstone and shale. The McMullin series consists of shallow, well and somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in material weathered from shale,
sandstone, basic igneous and metamorphic rocks. McMullin soils are on ridges and south-facing slopes in Oregon and on north-facing slopes in California.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Future development would require compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations associated with seismic hazards. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed below would ensure impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Active Faults

Since the site is not underlain or in immediate proximity to a known active fault, the probability of surface fault rupture is considered low and would not be a constraint to site development. However, the site will experience moderate to strong earthquakes during the lifetimes of the proposed structures. Marin County designs its projects to incorporate best available standards for the anticipated peak ground accelerations in accordance with the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC).

Slope Instability or Ground Failure, and Landslides or Mudslides

The term landslide includes a wide range of ground movement, such as rock falls, deep failure of slopes, and shallow debris flows. Gravity acting on an over-steepened slope is the primary reason for a landslide. Slope material that becomes saturated with water may develop a debris flow or mud flow. The resulting slurry of rock and mud may pick up trees, houses, and cars, thus blocking bridges and tributaries causing flooding along its path. Any area composed of very weak or fractured materials resting on a steep slope can and will likely experience landslides. Although the physical cause of many landslides cannot be removed, geologic investigations, good engineering practices, and effective enforcement of land-use management regulations can reduce landslide hazards. The project site is not located in an Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) designated earthquake-induced landslide area or within an existing rainfall-induced landslide or debris flow area. However, several relatively small landslides exist above the beach and the Master Plan includes provisions to improve the existing retaining wall to address this hazard, including framework for future improvements to the boardwalk below and native gardens above.
Expansive Soils

The potential for geologic and soil hazards from unstable or expansive soils in the study area is considered low based on the geologic units and soil types. However, occasional ground shaking is common in the Bay Area, and construction workers would take the necessary precautions to maintain worker safety in the event of an earthquake. Liquefaction associated with ground shaking is not likely to occur given ABAG’s hazard map. However, the construction phases of the proposed project would be temporary and operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions. Additionally, the proposed project would not create substantial risk to life or property.

Liquefaction

Soil liquefaction is a condition where saturated granular soils near the ground surface undergo a substantial loss of strength during seismic events. Loose, water-saturated soils are transformed from a solid to a liquid state during ground shaking. Liquefaction can result in significant deformations and ground rupture or sand boils. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are loose, uniformly graded, saturated, fine-grained sands that lie close to the ground surface. Lateral spreading is a type of ground failure related to liquefaction. It consists of the horizontal displacement of flat-lying alluvial material toward an open area, such as a steep bank of a stream channel. ABAG has created a map of the Bay Area, which classifies land according to five liquefaction-susceptibility levels: very low, low, moderate, high and very high. According to ABAG, the project site is located in a very low liquefaction hazard severity zone. The project is subject to all Federal, State, and local regulations and standards for seismic conditions including the CBC and would be designed to conform with all building requirements.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1:
Marin County Parks shall conduct a Geotechnical Report for any further design work. The report should address both Civil and Structural design considerations including: on-site landslides near the beach, soil infiltration rates, typical paving sections for vehicular and emergency vehicles, CBC seismic parameters, allowable active, passive and seismic soil bearing pressures, limits for temporary excavations, and recommended foundation types. With the implementation of CBC design standards coupled with required geotechnical studies, impacts related to potential geologic and soil hazards will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Monitoring Measure GEO-1:
County Parks staff shall verify that Mitigation Measure GEO-1 complies with mitigation standards and has been properly implemented.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, any future development improvements provided for by the Master Plan would be subject to water resource policies of the Marin Countywide Plan including:

WR-2.3: Avoid Erosion and Sedimentation. Minimize soil erosion and discharge of sediments into surface runoff, drainage systems, and water bodies. Continue to require grading plans that address avoidance of soil erosion and on-site sediment retention. Require developments to include on-site facilities for the retention of sediments, and, if
necessary, require continued monitoring and maintenance of these facilities upon project completion.

Standard measures to minimize erosion impacts are identified in Section I (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this Initial Study. These measures would ensure potential impacts from soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Construction of future development resulting from the proposed project may require earthwork activities that could potentially allow surface runoff and degrade downstream water quality. Such development may be required to implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under a Construction General Permit, which requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP would generally include a site map(s) showing the construction perimeter, existing and proposed buildings, stormwater collection and discharge points, general pre- and post-construction topography, drainage patterns across the site, and adjacent roadways.

The SWPPP must also include project construction features (i.e., BMPs) designed to prevent erosion and protect the quality of stormwater runoff. Construction BMPs may include but are not limited to stabilized construction entrances, straw wattles on embankments, and sediment filters on existing inlets. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program and a chemical monitoring program for “non-visible” pollutants, should the BMPs fail. The implementation of the SWPPP and BMPs would ensure construction related impacts would be less than significant.

Long term operational impacts from the proposed project include the addition of impervious surfaces as well as localized infiltration zones, bioretention swales, and landscaping. Overall, the project design for future development would curtail soil erosion and long term operational impacts would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Soil Survey of Marin County, California (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2012), the predominant soil type at the project site is Tocaloma-McMullin complex, 50 to 75 percent slope. The Tocaloma series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed in material weathered from sandstone and shale. The McMullin series consists of shallow, well and somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in material weathered from shale, sandstone, basic igneous and metamorphic rocks. McMullin soils are on ridges and southfacing slopes in Oregon and on north-facing slopes in California. Rocks of the Franciscan Complex comprise the geology of this area. The Franciscan Assemblage is primarily sandstone with mudstone, chert, limestone, conglomerate, serpentinite, and schist. These rocks are from the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods of 200 to 65 million years ago.

Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, future development resulting from the Master Plan would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The design-controllable aspects of protection
from seismic ground motion and soil or slope instability are governed by existing regulations of the State of California (California Building Code, California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 24, Part 2) or the County of Marin (Marin Countywide Plan Policy EH-2.a and EH-2.g). These regulations require a soils engineering report and engineering geology report that would identify potential geotechnical hazards and make recommendations to minimize hazards. These regulations also require geotechnical reports for projects on land underlain by compressible materials (such as fill, bay mud, and marsh or slough areas) to delineate locations where settlement will be greatest and subsidence may occur and to recommend risk reduction measures. Mandatory compliance with NPDES General Construction Permit requirements and Marin Countywide Plan Policy EH-2.b requiring any work or construction undertaken to correct slope instability or mitigate other geologic hazard conditions to be supervised and certified by a geotechnical engineer and/or an engineering geologist, would also minimize geologic hazards. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soil would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Any future development improvements resulting from the proposed Master Plan would be subject to all Federal, State, and local regulations and standards including the OWTS (Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems) Policy adopted by the California State Water Resources Control Board in 2012. Furthermore, any future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing an approximate 25 percent reduction in emissions).
State law requires local agencies to analyze the environmental impacts of GHG emissions under CEQA. The Natural Resources Agency adopted the CEQA Guidelines Amendments in December 2009. Marin County adopted the Marin County Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan in October 2006 for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The plan identifies a target to reduce GHG emissions: 15-20% below 2000 levels by the year 2020 for internal government and 15% countywide and a list of measures intended to add to Marin’s GHG reduction.

2. Discussion of Impacts

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and implementation would not have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions. Any future development resulting from the Master Plan would provide improvements to an existing park. Furthermore, any future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan would subject to project specific CEQA analysis for compliance with BAAQMD and County thresholds. A preliminary screening method is provided in BAAQMD’s 2010 Guidelines for operational greenhouse gases. The preliminary screening is used to indicate whether a project’s operational greenhouse gases could potentially exceed BAAQMD’s thresholds of significance of 1,100 MTCO$_2$e. Based on BAAQMD screening criteria, the operation of a city park use would result in a less than significant impact if the project size is less than 600 acres. The project would be less than the screening level of 600 acres as the project site is 19 acres. Therefore, long-term operational impacts associated with the generation of greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. The project would be consistent with the Marin County Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, as the project is below any screening threshold for GHGs. Future development resulting from the proposed project would remain subject to all applicable plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

1. Background

The following is a summary of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report prepared by Edd Clark and Associates, Inc. (EC&A) dated November 24, 2015, Appendix C. The purpose of the report is to provide information regarding Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) on or near the project site. In general, the ESA follows the guidelines established by the American Society for Testing and Materials' (ASTM's) Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process (E1527-13).

Standard and Additional Environmental Records Search

The project site was not listed on any of the databases searched by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The EDR records search only identified two facilities within the requested search radii, identified as 3150 Paradise Drive (Tiburon Navy Depot/Tiburon Marine Fishery Service). This facility is located over approximately 2,500 feet (ft) to the southeast of the project site. Due to its distance, groundwater flow-directions relative to the site, the nature of the reported release and/or information obtained from a review of available regulatory files, this facility does not represent a threat of adverse environmental impact to the project site.

A review of available regulatory files for the subject site did not reveal any information regarding historical underground storage tanks (USTs), aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), hazardous
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materials spills or leaks, improper disposal of hazardous materials and/or wastes used at the project site or adjoining parcels, or other significant environmental concerns associated with hazardous materials use which may have caused a significant environmental impact to the project site.

**Historical Use of Subject Property**

A review of available historical sources indicates that the project site was first developed in 1942 when the U.S. Navy constructed the Floating Drydock Training Center Annex at the project site to house and train officers for overseas ship repair. Use of the project site for this purpose reportedly continued through early 1958, when these uses ceased. The project site was then acquired by Marin County in 1959, and following removal of debris and structures formerly used by the Navy, was developed into Paradise Park beginning in approximately 1969. Use of the project site as Paradise Beach Park has continued to the present.

Prior to the project site’s first reported development in 1942, it may have partially been used for cattle grazing, consistent with regional historical uses on the Tiburon Peninsula. Prior to the project site’s purported use for livestock grazing as part of greater area-wide ranches, it was included within the boundaries of the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834.

**Records Review**

**Standard Environmental Records**

The standard environmental records sources for ESAs as identified by ASTM E1527-13 were searched and pertinent records obtained, by a computer database search company, EDR of Milford, Connecticut. The state, federal and tribal databases were searched by EDR for property with reported environmental issues that are within radii specified by ASTM Standard E 1527-13. They were searched using geocoding information that identified the coordinates of the properties in the databases, or by verifying the physical street addresses of practically reviewable, non-geocoded “orphan” properties within the same zip code as the site. It should be noted that computerized geocoding technology used in the database search is based on available census data and is only accurate to approximately +/- 300 ft. The EDR Radius Report provides a list of unmapped sites for which inadequate location information was provided. EC&A has reviewed the list of unmapped sites to determine if these sites are within the requested search radius for the databases searched. Based on EC&A’s review, none of the unmapped sites are within the requested search radius from the project site.

The results of the search performed for this site are reported in EDR’s Radius Map Report with GeoCheck (Radius Report) dated November 9, 2015, with Inquiry Number 4461650.2s. A comprehensive listing of federal, state and local government environmental databases searched are presented in the report, which is provided in Appendix E of the ESA. In some instances, to avoid an exhaustive discussion of the numerous sites identified by EDR, the facilities are discussed together and conclusions consolidated. The list of databases accessed and reviewed includes, but is not limited to, those listed below. Refer to the November 9, 2015 Radius Report for a complete list of databases searched and facilities identified within the requested search radius from the project site.

**U.S. Federal Standard Databases**

- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) National Priorities List (NPL, or Superfund) sites, Proposed NPL, Delisted NPL, and NPL Recovery (Superfund Liens).
• US EPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) and CERCLIS-NFRAP (No Further Remedial Action Planned).

• ERNS - Emergency Response Notification System.

• Resources Conservation and Recovery Act - Treatment Storage and Disposal Facilities (RCRA - TSDF) and RCRA large quantity and small quantity generators (LQG, SQG).

• CORRACTS - Corrective Action Report, identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.

• Federal institutional control/engineering control registries.

California State Standard Databases

• HIST CAL-SITES - California database of potential or confirmed hazardous substance release sites. This database has been replaced by Envirostor.

• ENVIROSTOR - California Environmental Protection Agency (CALEPA), Department of Toxic Substance Control, Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program, database of sites that have known contamination or sites with reason for further investigation.

• CHMIRS - California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (accidental releases or spills).

• SWF/LS - Solid Waste Information System, California Integrated Waste Management Board: This database consists of active, closed, and inactive Landfills and Disposal Sites.

• Toxic Pits - California State Water Resources Control Board: This database identifies pits and bodies of water suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed. This program is also known as TPCA.

• WMUDS/SWAT - California State Water Resources Control Board database for tracking and inventory of waste management units (solid waste disposal sites), including Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) program information.

• CORTESE - CALEPA, Office of Emergency Information: These sites are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board (LUST database), the Integrated Waste Management Board (SWF/LS database), and the Department of Toxic Substance Control (Cal-Sites database).

• LUST - California State Water Resources Control Board: The local RWQCB manages this database. It is an inventory of reported Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites.

• UST - Active UST Facilities gathered from the local regulatory agencies.

• CA FID UST - The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive UST locations from the State Water Resources Control Board. Refer to local/county source for current data.

• HIST UST - The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites.
California State Databases (ASTM Supplemental)

- Dry Cleaners - A list of dry cleaner-related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes: power laundries, family and commercial; garment pressing and cleaners' agents; linen supply; coin-operated laundries and cleaning; industrial launderers; laundry and garment services.

- SLIC - Local Regional Water Quality Control Board: This database is the Spills, Leaks Investigation and Cleanup (SLIC) and is classified as voluntarily cleanup status by the responsible party with RWQCB oversight.

Summary of Findings of EDR Database Search

Listed below are the relevant findings of the EDR database search within the minimum radius search distances of the project site as specified by ASTM E1527-13, Section 8.2.1.

Project Site

According to the EDR report, the project site is not listed on any of the databases searched by EDR.

Offsite Properties

The EDR records search only identified two offsite facilities within the requested search radius, both of which are located at 3150 Paradise Drive (Tiburon Navy Net Depot Building and Tiburon Marine Fishery Service).

The EDR records search only identified two LUST facilities, both of which have been closed by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB), within the requested search radius. A closed LUST facility indicates that site investigation and/or cleanup has been conducted to the satisfaction of the pertinent regulatory oversight agency(s), that the unauthorized release from this facility has been stopped, the original source material removed to the extent practicable, the extent of the soil and/or groundwater impact defined and an evaluation of the potential for the release from this facility to impact any nearby sensitive receptors has been conducted to the satisfaction of the State Water Board.

LUST Database

A discussion of relevant information regarding the identified LUST facility at 3150 Paradise Drive is presented below.

Tiburon Marine Fishery Service/Tiburon Navy Net Depot, 3150 Paradise Drive (Closed)

Based on a review of available information, EC&A understands that one 650-gallon UST for heating oil, one 10,000-gallon UST for diesel/heating oil, and two 6000-gallon USTs for gasoline were removed from this property on November 26, 1991 (SFBRWQCB, 1995a). Soil and groundwater samples collected at the time of UST removal activities reported elevated concentrations of fuel hydrocarbons (FHCs). FHC-impacted soils were reportedly over-excavated and FHC-impacted groundwater pumped from the USTs excavation. Confirmation soil samples collected following over-excavation activities were well below regulatory screening levels. However, EC&A understands that FHC-impacted soils which were inaccessible for removal, were left in-place beneath a concrete slab. Groundwater monitoring wells were subsequently installed and monitored over the course of approximately 18 months. The
SFBRWQCB subsequently issued a no further action letter with respect to these USTs dated December 1, 1995 (SFBRWQCB, 1995b). Based on a review of available information, the historical release from these USTs does not represent a threat of adverse environmental impact to the project site.

Based on topographic considerations, information obtained from a review of pertinent information on GeoTracker and/or the MCOWM, distance from the site and/or regulatory status and land use in the site vicinity, the historical release from the property identified above at 3150 Paradise Drive does not pose a threat of significant impact to the subject site.

**Additional Environmental Record Sources**

To enhance and supplement the EDR reports, data base searches for active sites, local records and/or additional state and tribal records were independently searched through their various websites. These records are reasonably ascertainable, and sufficiently useful, accurate and complete for the objective of the records review. Other environmental records sources contacted for information pertaining to the subject property were as follows:

- U.S. EPA (http://www.epa.gov/region09)
- California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (http://www.calepa.gov/) and (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/)
- County of Marin – all departments (http://co.marin.ca.us/)
- California State Water Resources Control Board (http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/).

**Unified Program**

*County of Marin Office of Waste Management (MCOWM)*

The Unified Program is the consolidation of six state environmental programs into one, under the authority of a Certified Unified Protection Agency (CUPA). These can be a county, city or JPA (Joint Powers Authority). This program was established under the amendments to the California Health and Safety Code made by SB 1082 in 1994.


A CUPA is a local agency that has been certified by CAL EPA to implement the six state environmental programs within the local agency’s jurisdiction. The MCOWM is the designated local agency for the project site. The MCOWM did not possess any records pertaining to hazardous materials releases, emergency response events or other issues which would indicate an environmental risk at any of the subject or immediately adjacent properties.

**San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board**

The SFBRWQCB no longer stores physical files at their facility; all information generated after 2005 is available on GeoTracker, which EC&A did review for LUST facilities in the site vicinity. The SFBRWQCB did not possess any files for the subject property. Due to the age of the case for the adjacent LUST facility at 3150 Paradise Drive, information was not available on
GeoTracker. As such, EC&A reviewed available information at the MCOWM, discussed above in Section 5.1.1.

**Recognized Environmental Conditions**

Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) are defined by ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to a release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. In the course of performing the ESA, EC&A did not identify any Recognized Environmental Conditions associated with the project site or any of the adjoining parcels.

**De Minimis Conditions, Data Gaps and Vapor Encroachment Concerns**

During the preparation of the Phase I ESA, EC&A did not encounter any data gaps that would diminish EC&A’s ability to provide an opinion on a release or potential release of hazardous substances at the project site.

No de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the project site.

EC&A conducted an evaluation for vapor encroachment concerns (VECs) using methodology established in ASTM Standard of Practice E2600-10. Based on a review of available information, EC&A did not identify any VECs at the project site.

EC&A has performed this ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 of the property known as Paradise Beach Park, with the primary physical address of 3450 Paradise Drive, designated as Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, located in the unincorporated community of Tiburon, California. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.4 and 2.5 of the report. The assessment revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the project site. No additional action appears to be warranted.

2. **Discussion of Impacts**

   a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

   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?**

   c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public through the transport, use, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials. Future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan may potentially require small amounts of hazardous materials during construction activities for equipment maintenance (e.g., fuel and solvents) and potential re-paving of roads. Use of hazardous materials would be limited to the construction phase and would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling
and storage of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials would not be stored or used for purposes such as equipment maintenance, where they could affect nearby land uses. Any future operational use of the project site would be similar to existing conditions and would not emit or handle hazardous emissions or materials that could affect an existing or proposed school, as there are no existing or proposed schools within or near the project vicinity. Therefore, spills or accidents would not affect people at schools and any spills would be cleaned up immediately and all wastes and used spill control materials would be properly disposed of at approved disposal facilities.

**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?

**No Impact.** According to the Phase I ESA, there is no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the project site. Based on a review of available information, the historical release from these USTs does not represent a threat of adverse environmental impact to the project site. Based on topographic considerations, information obtained from a review of pertinent information on GeoTracker and/or the MCOWM, distance from the site and/or regulatory status and land use in the site vicinity, the historical release from the property identified above at 3150 Paradise Drive does not pose a threat of significant impact to the subject site. According to the Phase I ESA, no additional action appears to be warranted, and therefore the proposed project and associated future development would have no impact.

**e)** For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The project site is not within an airport land use plan (Marin County, Airport Land Use Plan, 1991) and the proposed project is a Park Master Plan that would not result in any new structures or other features that could potentially pose an airport safety hazard. Any future development resulting from the proposed plan would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding airport safety. The project site is not located near a private airstrip (Countywide Plan, 2007).

**g)** Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Primarily, emergency response for the area is carried out by the County Office of Emergency Services, in coordination with the Tiburon Fire Protection District, Sheriff, and other key agencies. The local area is susceptible to natural disasters such as wildfires and earthquakes, and human-caused disasters such as structural fires. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant entitlements for development. First responders would not be hindered by future development improvements resulting from the proposed Master Plan because any closures required for construction would be short-term and alternative routes would be provided as necessary. Furthermore, all future development improvements would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts.

**h)** Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Fire Threat map, the project site is subject to a moderate threat of wildland fires. However, the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development. Future development would consist of Park improvements subject to Fire Department requirements and would be similar to existing conditions. All future development improvements would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts. Therefore, the proposed project and future development improvements would not increase the risk of wildfires near an urban area.

I. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? □ □ ☒ □

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? □ □ ☒ □

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? □ □ ☒ □

1. Background

The proposed project is located on the Tiburon Peninsula in southeastern Marin County. Elevations on the peninsula range from sea level to about 650 feet, and it is drained by multiple small watersheds on the north and south sides. Raccoon Strait is present to the southeast of the peninsula (separating it from Angel Island), Richardson Bay lies to the west and southwest, Belvedere Lagoon and Cove to the south, and San Francisco Bay to the northeast. The Tiburon Peninsula is located in the Mediterranean-type climate zone typical of coastal central California. This zone is characterized by cool, wet winters and warm, dry summers, with almost all rain falling between the months of October and April. The mean annual precipitation (MAP) in the region ranges from up to 50 inches at the highest points of Mount Tamalpais, with an average value of about 23 inches near the Town of Tiburon.

Domestic water to the Park is supplied from a public water distribution system. Earthwork resulting from the project would not intersect an aquifer on the site or substantially affect groundwater because no aquifers are present and groundwater is not utilized.

A portion of the existing Park is inside the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone associated with San Francisco Bay, with a base flood elevation of 9 feet NAVD88. FEMA has designated the flood zone as Zone VE, which is a coastal flood zone with velocity hazard associated with wave action.

According to the Soil Survey of Marin County, California (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2012), the predominant soil type at the project site is Tocaloma-McMullin complex, 50 to 75 percent slope. The Tocaloma series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed in material weathered from sandstone and shale. The McMullin series consists of shallow, well and somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in material weathered from shale, sandstone, basic igneous and metamorphic rocks. McMullin soils are on ridges and southfacing slopes in Oregon and on north-facing slopes in California. Rocks of the Franciscan Complex comprise the geology of this area. The Franciscan Assemblage is primarily sandstone with mudstone, chert, limestone, conglomerate, serpentine, and schist. These rocks are from the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods of 200 to 65 million years ago.

Regulatory Setting

The Marin Countywide Plan (CWP) includes policies related to water resources including pathogen, sediment, and nutrient management. See Section J (Land Use and Planning) for a full discussion of CWP policies.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it does not include any site specific designs for development projects, or grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade water quality or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Future development that may result from the proposed Master Plan would include ground disturbing activities such as grading for construction. Ground disturbing activities have the potential to result in erosion and discharge of pollutants to nearby water bodies. Construction activities would be required to comply with the NPDES general permit for construction activities for projects that disturb one or more acres, pursuant to which BMPs would be implemented to control stormwater during construction. As part of the permit application process, projects would require a SWPPP, which would include a list of BMPs (e.g., hyroseeding, silt fencing, sediment basins, etc.) to be implemented on the site both during and after construction to minimize erosion and sedimentation.

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)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it does not include any site specific designs for development projects, or grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Any future development resulting from the proposed plan would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding groundwater. Future development would include renovations and improvements to existing Park facilities but would not substantially increase impermeable surfaces at the Park; therefore, implementation of the Master Plan is not anticipated to interfere with groundwater recharge.

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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

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?

e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it is conceptual in nature and does not include any site specific designs for development projects or grant any entitlements for development. Any future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan would be required to be designed to comply with NPDES and SWPPP regulations including measures addressing erosion, siltation, flooding, alteration of drainage patterns, and pollutants. Future development would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis.
f) **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** All potential water quality degradations are covered in the above responses.

g) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

**No Impact.** A portion of the existing Park is inside the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone associated with San Francisco Bay, with a base flood elevation of 9 feet NAVD88. FEMA has designated the flood zone as Zone VE, which is a coastal flood zone with velocity hazard associated with wave action. However, no housing is proposed within these areas, and therefore, there would be no flooding impact from the project.

h) **Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it does not include any site specific designs for development projects, or grant any entitlements for development, future development projects could include structures. According to the ABAG FEMA Flood Zone Map, portions of the project site are located within the 100-year coastal flood zone. Because specific improvement projects are not planned at this time, the precise location of these improvements cannot be determined. Any potential future development in the 100-year zone would be designed to avoid flooding and be subject to County flood control regulations. Therefore, future impacts related to impeding or redirecting flood flows would be less than significant.

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?**

j) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan provides for future development improvements, it does not include any site specific designs for development projects, or grant any entitlements for development, future development projects could include structures. According to the ABAG FEMA Flood Zone Map, portions of the project site are located within the tsunami evacuation zone and are subject to risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow. Because specific improvement projects are not planned at this time, the precise location of these improvements cannot be determined. All future development improvements would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts. However, the proposed Master Plan would not directly or indirectly result in construction of housing or habitable structures that would result in population growth. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflows.
J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The determinations of policy consistency, as discussed in this Initial Study section, represent County staff interpretation of policies. However, this Initial Study does not determine a final policy consistency. The formal policy consistency determinations are made by the County decision-makers.

Policy inconsistencies may not necessarily indicate significant environmental effects. Section 15358(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change in the environment.” Therefore, only those policy inconsistencies that would lead to a significant effect on the physical environment are considered significant impacts pursuant to CEQA. Where potentially significant environmental impacts are raised in the discussion below, they have been mitigated to a less-than-significant impact and, therefore, project activities are determined to be consistent with the relevant policies cited. Mitigations are addressed further in the topical impact sections following plan policy analyses.

The proposed project is subject to the environmental protection policies of the CWP. The proposed project would not alter Paradise Drive, and therefore; policies in the Paradise Drive Visioning Plan and the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan would not be applicable. The CWP serves as the general plan for the unincorporated areas of the County and contains goals, policies, and programs that govern existing and future development. Determinations regarding consistency are made assuming all mitigation measures are adequately implemented.
Countywide Plan

The major CWP environmental policy issues that pertain to the proposed project include the following: (1) biological resources; (2) wetlands; (3) stream conservation areas; (4) erosion and water quality; (5) environmental hazards; (6) atmosphere and climate; (7) community development; (8) visual resources; (9) noise; (10) cultural resources, and (11) parks and recreation. The pertinent policies are summarized below followed by policy analysis.

2. Discussion of Impacts:

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** The project would be consistent with the Open Area zoning and Open Space land use designation and standards contained in the CWP and Marin County Code. Further, the project would not entail the construction of roads or other improvements that would disrupt or divide a community or the demolition of housing affordable to families with a moderate income. The project would maintain an existing recreational use and would not alter the physical arrangement and development patterns in the area. Therefore, it would not physically divide an established community.

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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A proposed project would have a significant impact if it were to 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. The proposed project is subject to several local policies, plans, and regulations, as described above. The proposed Master Plan does not propose any amendments to applicable plans and would not conflict with the Marin Countywide Plan or any other applicable plans or policies.

**CWP Biological Resources Policies**

**BIO-1.1 Protect Wetlands, Habitat for Special-Status Species, Sensitive Natural Communities, and Important Wildlife Nursery Areas and Movement Corridors.** Protect sensitive biological resources, wetlands, migratory species of the Pacific flyway, and wildlife movement corridors through careful environmental review of proposed development applications, including consideration of cumulative impacts, participation in comprehensive habitat management programs with other local and resource agencies, and continued acquisition and management of open space lands that provide for permanent protection of important natural habitats.

**BIO-1.3 Protect Woodlands, Forests, and Tree Resources.** Protect large native trees, trees with historical importance; oak woodlands; healthy and safe eucalyptus groves that support colonies of monarch butterflies, colonial nesting birds, or known raptor sites; and forest habitats. Prevent the untimely removal of trees through implementation of standards in the Development Code and the Native Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. Encourage other local agencies to adopt tree preservation ordinances to protect native trees and woodlands, regardless of whether they are located in urban or undeveloped areas.
BIO-1.5 Promote Use of Native Plant Species. Encourage use of a variety of native or compatible nonnative, non-invasive plant species indigenous to the site vicinity as part of project landscaping to improve wildlife habitat values.

BIO-1.6 Control Spread of Invasive Exotic Plants. Prohibit use of invasive species in required landscaping as part of the discretionary review of proposed development. Work with landowners, landscapers, the Marin County Open Space District, nurseries, and the multi-agency Weed Management Area to remove and prevent the spread of highly invasive and noxious weeds. Invasive plants are those plants listed in the State’s Noxious Weed List, the California Invasive Plant Council’s list of “Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California,” and other priority species identified by the agricultural commissioner and California Department of Agriculture. Species of particular concern are included in the CWP.

BIO-1.8 Restrict Use of Herbicides, Insecticides, and Similar Materials. Encourage the use of integrated pest management and organic practices to manage pests with the least possible hazard to the environment. Restrict the use of insecticides, herbicides, or any toxic chemical substance in sensitive habitats, except when an emergency has been declared; the habitat itself is threatened; a substantial risk to public health and safety exists, including maintenance for flood control; or such use is authorized pursuant to a permit issued by the agricultural commissioner. Encourage nontoxic strategies for pest control, as an alternative to chemical treatment, and allow use of toxic chemical substances only after other approaches have been tried and determined unsuccessful. Continue to implement the Integrated Pest Management ordinance for county-related operations.

BIO-1.9 Control Spread of Non-Native Invasive Animal Species. Work with landowners, Marin County Parks, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the National Invasive Species Council, Point Reyes National Seashore, and other agencies and organizations to control and prevent the spread of non-native, invasive animal species. Species of particular concern are included in the CWP.

BIO-2.1 Include Resource Preservation in Environmental Review. Require environmental review pursuant to CEQA of development applications to assess the impact of proposed development on native species and habitat diversity, particularly special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and important wildlife nursery areas and movement corridors. Require adequate mitigation measures for ensuring the protection of any sensitive resources and achieving “no net loss” of sensitive habitat acreage, values, and function.

BIO-2.2 Limit Development Impacts. Restrict or modify proposed development in areas that contain essential habitat for special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, baylands and coastal habitat, and riparian habitats, as necessary to ensure the continued health and survival of these species and sensitive areas. Development projects should preferably be modified to avoid impacts on sensitive resources, or to adequately mitigate impacts by providing on-site or (as a lowest priority) off-site replacement at a higher ratio.

BIO-2.4 Protect Wildlife Nursery Areas and Movement Corridors. Ensure that important corridors for wildlife movement and dispersal are protected as a condition of discretionary permits, including consideration of cumulative impacts. Features of particular importance to wildlife for movement may include riparian corridors, shorelines of the coast and Bay, and ridgelines. Linkages and corridors shall be provided that connect sensitive habitat areas such as woodlands, forests, wetlands, and essential habitat for special-status species, including an assessment of cumulative impacts.
BIO-2.5 Restrict Disturbance in Sensitive Habitat During Nesting Season. Limit construction and other sources of potential disturbance in sensitive riparian corridors, wetlands, and baylands to protect bird nesting activities. Disturbance should generally be set back from sensitive habitat during the nesting season from March 1 through August 1 to protect bird nesting, rearing, and fledging activities. Preconstruction surveys should be conducted by a qualified professional where development is proposed in sensitive habitat areas during the nesting season, and appropriate restrictions should be defined to protect nests in active use and ensure that any young have fledged before construction proceeds.

BIO-2.8 Coordinate with Trustee Agencies. Consult with trustee agencies (the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Bay Conservation and Development Commission) during environmental review when special-status species, sensitive natural communities, or wetlands may be adversely affected.

BIO-2.9 Promote Early Consultation with Other Agencies. Require applicants to consult with all agencies with review authority for projects in areas supporting wetlands and special-status species at the outset of project planning.

Consistent. The proposed project is for an existing developed park. As discussed below in Section D (Biological Resources), the proposed project would not adversely affect native habitats and woodlands. As proposed, the project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources and any potential impacts identified associated with future development can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with the imposition of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6.

Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, the proposed project does provide for future development and Park improvements. Future construction activities have the potential to adversely affect special-status species and sensitive natural communities within the project site. These project activities may include ground disturbance within the San Francisco Bay or within 100 feet of San Francisco Bay tidal marshes and shoreline band, and thus would require a permit from BCDC. A permit may be an administrative (minor) or major development permit, depending on what work is being done at the site.

In addition, permits or consultation may also be required from CDFW, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, Corps, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and RWQCB. If applicable, these permits may also specify additional mitigation that must be adhered to. Many of the mitigations likely to be required are included in Section D (Biological Resources), above.

The BCDC has regulatory jurisdiction, as defined by the McAteer-Petris Act, over the Bay and its shoreline, which generally consists of the area between the shoreline and a line 100 feet landward of and parallel to the shoreline. Within the project site, BCDC has two areas of jurisdiction: San Francisco Bay and the shoreline band.

Most of the project site is located within BCDC jurisdiction, and therefore, future development would be subject to BCDC requirements. Permits or consultations with the other agencies listed above may also be required. Construction activities, including ground disturbance for all development within the San Francisco Bay or within 100 feet of San Francisco Bay tidal marshes and shoreline band, requires a permit from the BCDC. A permit may be an administrative (minor) or major development permit, depending on what work would be done at the site.
Marin County Parks will consult with BCDC and the other agencies listed above for a determination of whether the project requires each of these permits to complete all work. If a permit is required, the project shall strictly adhere to any protective avoidance and mitigation measures listed in the permits once issued.

Therefore, the project has been mitigated to achieve consistency with the above policies.

Erosion and Water Quality

BIO-4.15 Reduce Wet Weather Impacts. Ensure that development work adjacent to and potentially affecting Stream Conservation Areas (SCAs) is not done during the wet weather or when water is flowing through streams, except for emergency repairs, and that disturbed soils are stabilized and replanted, and areas where woody vegetation has been removed are replaced with suitable species before the beginning of the rainy season.

BIO-4.18 Promote the Use of Permeable Surfaces When Hardscapes Are Unavoidable in the SCA and WCA. Permeable surfaces rather than impermeable surfaces shall be required wherever feasible in the SCA and Wetland Conservation Area (WCA).

BIO-4.20 Minimize Runoff. In order to decrease stormwater runoff, the feasibility of developing a peak stormwater management program shall be evaluated to provide mitigation opportunities such as removal of impervious surface or increased stormwater detention in the watershed.

BIO-5.1 Protect the Baylands Corridor. Ensure that baylands and large, adjacent essential uplands are protected, and encourage enhancement efforts for baylands, including those in the Baylands Corridor. The following criteria shall be used to evaluate proposed development projects that may impact the Baylands Corridor:

- For large parcels (over 2 acres in size), adhere to development setback standards for areas qualifying for protection under the WCA and SCA, but increase setback distances as necessary to ensure that hydrologically isolated features such as seasonal wetlands and freshwater marshes are adequately linked to permanently protected habitat. These additional development setbacks shall serve to prevent fragmentation and preserve essential upland buffers in the Baylands Corridor.

- For small parcels (2 acres or less in size), encourage property owners where suitable habitat exists to preserve up to 10 feet landward of mean high tide as a species refuge area for high water events. Site constraints, opportunities for avoidance of sensitive biological resources, and options for alternative mitigation, may also be considered.

- Minor redevelopment involving less than 25% of a structure on a residential or industrial parcel that is already filled and at least 50% developed may be exempted from the requirements for a site assessment, provided that no additional filling or modification to wetlands occurs. (See BIO-5.2.)

BIO-5.2 Limit Development and Access. Ensure that development does not encroach into sensitive vegetation and wildlife habitats, damage fisheries or aquatic habitats, limit normal wildlife range, or create barriers that cut off access to food, water, or shelter for wildlife. Require an environmental assessment where development is proposed within the Baylands Corridor.

BIO-5.3 Leave Tidelands in Their Natural State. Require that all tidelands be left in their natural state to respect their biological importance to the estuarine ecosystem. Any
modifications should be limited to habitat restoration or enhancement plans approved by regulatory agencies.

**BIO-5.5 Protect Freshwater Habitats.** Preserve and, where possible, expand habitats associated with freshwater streams, seasonal wetlands, and small former marshes to facilitate the circulation, distribution, and flow of fresh water, and to enhance associated habitat values.

**BIO-5.8 Control Shoreline Modification.** Ensure that any modifications to the shoreline do not result in a loss of biodiversity or opportunities for wildlife movement. Possible modifications may include construction of revetments, sea walls, and groins, as permitted by State and federal agencies.

**BIO-5.d Enforce Tidelands Restrictions.** Ensure that the Development Code prohibits diking, filling, or dredging in tidelands, unless the area is already developed and currently being dredged. Current dredging operations for maintenance purposes may continue, subject to environmental review, if necessary. In some cases, exceptions may be made for areas that are isolated or limited in productivity. In tidal areas, only land uses that are water dependent shall be permitted, as consistent with federal, State, and regional policy. These include, but are not limited to the following:

- ports
- water-dependent industry and utilities
- essential water conveyance
- wildlife refuge and habitat restoration
- water-oriented recreation

Exemptions may be granted for emergency or precautionary measures taken in the public interest, such as protection from flooding or other natural hazards. Removal of native vegetation shall be discouraged, and secondary effects evaluated, such as potential reduction in available surface water and water quality degradation due to nonpoint discharge. Alteration of hydrology should only be allowed when it can be demonstrated that the impact will be beneficial or insignificant.

**BIO-5.f Control Public Access.** Design public use areas to be clearly marked, to minimize possible conflicts between public and private uses, to provide continuous walkways from the nearest roads to the shoreline and along the shoreline, to be set back from any proposed structure, and to be buffered from wetlands. Restrict access to environmentally sensitive marshland and adjacent habitat, especially during spawning and nesting seasons.

**WR-2.1 Reduce Toxic Runoff.** Reduce the volume of urban runoff from pollutants - such as pesticides from homes, golf courses, cleaning agents, swimming pool chemicals, and road oil - and of excess sediments and nutrients from agricultural operations.

**WR-2.2 Reduce Pathogen, Sediment, and Nutrient Levels.** Support programs to maintain pathogen and nutrient levels at or below target levels set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, including the efforts of ranchers, dairies, agencies, and community groups to address pathogen, sediment, and nutrient management in urban and rural watersheds.
WR-2.3 Avoid Erosion and Sedimentation. Minimize soil erosion and discharge of sediments into surface runoff, drainage systems, and water bodies. Continue to require grading plans that address avoidance of soil erosion and on-site sediment retention. Require developments to include on-site facilities for the retention of sediments, and, if necessary, require continued monitoring and maintenance of these facilities upon project completion.

WR-2.4 Design County Facilities to Minimize Pollutant Input. Design, construct, and maintain County buildings, landscaped areas, roads, bridges, drainages, and other facilities to minimize the volume of toxics, nutrients, sediment, and other pollutants in stormwater flows, and continue to improve road maintenance methods to reduce erosion and sedimentation potential.

Consistent. As discussed below in Sections F (Geology and Soils) and I (Hydrology and Water Quality), the project would not significantly affect storm water runoff or cause significant erosion or sedimentation impacts. Landscaping proposed for future development on the site may require the application of pesticides and herbicides, consistent with the County’s Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Ordinance. The County currently maintains the existing Park landscaping consistent with all applicable local and federal laws and would continue to do so under the proposed project and future development. Therefore, the project has been mitigated to achieve consistency with the above policies.

Environmental Hazards

EH-2.1 Avoid Hazard Areas. Require development to avoid or minimize potential hazards from earthquakes and unstable ground conditions.

EH-2.3 Ensure Seismic Safety of New Structures. Design and construct all new buildings to be earthquake resistant. The minimum level of design necessary would be in accordance with seismic provisions and criteria contained in the most recent version of the State and County Codes. Construction would require effective oversight and enforcement to ensure adherence to the earthquake design criteria.

EH-2.4 Protect Coastal Areas from Tsunamis. When inundation maps become available, address tsunami wave run-up and inundation when reviewing proposed development along coastal areas of Marin County.

EH-2.a Require Geotechnical Reports. Continue to require any applicant for land division, master plan, development approval, or new construction in a geologic hazard area to submit a geotechnical report prepared by a State-certified Engineering Geologist or a Registered Geotechnical Engineer that:

- evaluates soil, slope, and other geologic hazard conditions;
- commits to appropriate and comprehensive mitigation measures sufficient to reduce risks to acceptable levels, including post-construction site monitoring, if applicable;
- addresses the impact of the project on adjacent lands, and potential impacts of off-site conditions; and
- meets the requirements of other agency regulations with jurisdiction in the hazard area, such as BCDC requirements for the safety of fills consistent with the Bay Plan.
EH-2.k **Address Tsunami Potential.** Review tsunami wave run-up and inundation maps, when available, along with other applicable information to be considered in coastal planning and development.

EH-3.l **Limit Seawall Barriers.** Limit repair, replacement, or construction of coastal sea walls and erosion barriers consistent with Local Coastal Program requirements, and as demonstrated to be necessary to protect persons and properties from rising sea level.

**Consistent.** As discussed above in Section F (Geology and Soils), the proposed project would minimize environmental hazards by replacing dilapidated infrastructure with modern systemically sound structures. No dwelling structures are planned for development and any future development would be subject to all applicable policies and project specific CEQA analysis. Therefore, the project has been mitigated to achieve consistency with the above policies.

**Atmosphere and Climate**

AIR-1.g **Require Control Measures for Construction and Agricultural Activity.** Require reasonable and feasible measures to control particulate emissions (PM-10 and PM-2.5) at construction sites and during agricultural tilling activity, pursuant to the recommendations in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, which may include the following:

- Watering active construction or agricultural tilling areas.
- Covering hauled materials.
- Paving or watering vehicle access roads.
- Sweeping paved and staging areas.

**Consistent.** As discussed below in Section C (Air Quality), the project would not result in significant air emissions and would comply with the significance criteria established by the EPA and the Bay Area Quality Management District. In addition, the project shall comply with best management practices to reduce fugitive dust for all future development. Therefore, the project is consistent with the above policy.

**Community Development**

CD-2.8 **Limit Development in Resource or Hazard Areas.** Discourage development in areas with high natural resource value or threats to life or property, and restrict development in such areas to minimize adverse impacts.

**Consistent.** As discussed below in Section M (Population and Housing), the project would not result in additional housing. The project would include renovations to an existing park. Implementation of the Master Plan would maintain the Park’s recreational use. Therefore, the project is consistent with the above policy.

**Visual Resources**

DES-3.2 **Promote Green Spaces.** Encourage the creation of high-quality community plazas, squares, greens, commons, community and neighborhood parks, and rooftop gardens.
**DES-4.1 Preserve Visual Quality.** Protect scenic quality and views of the natural environment - including ridgelines and upland greenbelts, hillsides, water, and trees - from adverse impacts related to development.

**DES-4.c Regulate Mass and Scale.** Ensure that the mass and scale of new structures respect environmental site constraints and character of the surrounding neighborhood (see Program DES-3.b), are compatible with ridge protection policies (see Program DES-4.e), and avoid tree-cutting (especially on wooded hillsides) and grading wherever possible. Community plans should consider regulations concerning home size.

**Consistent.** As discussed below in Section A (Aesthetic), the proposed project would provide for future development and designs to improve the Park’s existing aesthetics. All future development would be subject to applicable design policies and project specific CEQA analysis. Therefore, the project is consistent with the above policies.

**Noise**

**NO-1.i Regulate Noise Sources.** Sections 6.70.030(5) and 6.70.040 of the Marin County Code establish allowable hours of operation for construction-related activities. As a condition of permit approval for projects generating significant construction noise impacts during the construction phase, construction management for any project shall develop a construction noise reduction plan and designate a disturbance coordinator at the construction site to implement the provisions of the plan.

**Consistent.** As discussed below in Section L (Noise), the proposed project would result in short term, intermittent increased noise levels during future development construction, however, in accordance with the Marin County Noise Ordinance, the project limits construction activity days and hours to occur between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday and Saturday between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and exclude Sundays and holidays. Operation of loud, noise-generating construction-related equipment (e.g., backhoes, generators, jackhammers) would be maintained, operated, or serviced from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday only. Special permission would be required for any work outside the previously described days or times. Therefore, the project is consistent with the above policy.

**Cultural, Historical and Archaeological Resources**

**HAR-1.1 Preserve Historical and Archaeological Resources.** Identify archaeological and historical resource sites.

**HAR-1.3 Avoid Impacts to Historical and Archaeological Resources.** Ensure that human activity avoids damaging cultural resources.

**Consistent.** As discussed above in Section E (Cultural Resources), due to the presence of cultural resources and the project’s proximity to the Bay, the area is considered sensitive for archaeological deposits. Ground disturbance associated with future development resulting from the proposed project could affect subsurface archaeological deposits. Implementation of the cultural resources mitigation measures listed above would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Any future development resulting in ground disturbance would be subject to applicable cultural resource policies as well as project specific CEQA analysis. Therefore, the project has been mitigated to achieve consistency with the above policies.
Parks and Recreation

PK-1.t Continue Ongoing Park Maintenance Programs. Continue ongoing management and maintenance programs to ensure the long-term protection of existing Park resources and Park infrastructure. Explore opportunities for cost savings and innovation that meet the objectives of protecting Marin County parks.

Consistent. The project’s goal is to develop a Master Plan document that integrates physical design recommendations for organizational improvements, renovations and new facilities with programmatic, operational and management strategies for diversifying park use and expanding revenue potential. The project will ensure the long-term protection of the existing Park resources and infrastructure. Therefore, the project is consistent with the above policy.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that apply to the project site.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The project site is not located in the vicinity of any area designated by the California State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, as having sufficient mineral resources that are suitable as marketable commodities. Therefore, no adverse effect to the environment would result relating to the loss of mineral resource sites.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. No mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state are known to occur within the project site (Countywide Plan, 2007).
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?

No Impact. No locally important mineral resources recovery area is designated for the area in the Countywide Plan (2007).

L. NOISE

Would the project:

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

1. Background

Marin County Standards

The County of Marin has an adopted noise regulation in the County’s Code of Ordinances, Title 6 Public Peace, Safety, and Morals, Chapter 6.70 Loud and Unnecessary Noises (Marin County 2010). Per 6.70.030 – Enumerated Noises (5) Construction Activities and Related Noise, hours for construction activities shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Loud noise generating construction related equipment (backhoes, generators, jackhammers) can be maintained, operated, or serviced at a construction site for permits administered by the
community development agency from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday only. Special exceptions to these limitations may occur for construction projects of city, county, state, other public agency, or other public utility.

2. Existing Conditions

Noise sensitive receptors (land uses associated with indoor and/or outdoor activities that may be subject to stress and/or significant interference from noise) typically include residential dwellings, hotels, motels, hospitals, nursing homes, educational facilities, and libraries. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site include residential areas in the Paradise Beach area. Table 1 summarizes typical ambient noise levels for the project site. The vicinity of the project site is most similar to that of “quiet rural, suburban nighttime” setting with an expected typical noise level of 20-40 dBA. Table 1 identifies decibel levels for common sounds heard in the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Level decibels (dBA)</th>
<th>Outdoor Activity</th>
<th>Indoor Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>Gas lawn mower at 3 feet, jet flyover at 1,000 feet</td>
<td>Rock Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–90</td>
<td>Diesel truck at 50 feet</td>
<td>Loud television at 3 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–80</td>
<td>Gas lawn mower at 100 feet, noisy urban area</td>
<td>Garbage disposal at 3 feet, vacuum cleaner at 10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–70</td>
<td>Commercial area</td>
<td>Normal speech at 3 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–60</td>
<td>Quiet urban daytime, traffic at 300 feet</td>
<td>Large business office, dishwasher next room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–40</td>
<td>Quiet rural, suburban nighttime</td>
<td>Concert hall (background), library, bedroom at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcast/recording studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lowest threshold of human hearing</td>
<td>Lowest threshold of human hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (modified from Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement, 1998)

3. Discussion of Impacts

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?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
Less Than Significant Impact. The County establishes 70-80dBA Lmax as the maximum allowable noise level during the daytime period of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for future development improvement. All future development would be guided by the applicable County noise regulations, including construction related noise and groundborne vibration. Future development would include renovations of existing Park facilities and the land use will remain as parks and open space. Therefore, operation of the Park, including potential future development, would not significantly exceed existing ambient noise conditions. Existing conditions of the Park include large events and other activities associated with a regional park. Future projects would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above in section (a), the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels. Future development resulting from the proposed project may result in a minimal increase in temporary noise levels due to the short-term construction activities. All future development would be subject to the applicable County noise regulations. County regulations and requirements, as well as be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts, if applicable. These regulations would include construction equipment being staged within the existing Park. In compliance with County Code, project construction would be confined to between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday and Saturday between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and exclude Sundays and holidays. Operation of loud, noise-generating construction-related equipment (e.g., backhoes, generators, jackhammers) would be maintained, operated, or serviced from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday only. Furthermore, future projects would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport land use plan area. No impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project would not increase onsite exposure to aircraft noise and thus, no impact would occur.
M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The proposed project site project would be consistent with the Open Area zoning and Open Space land use designation and standards contained in the CWP and Marin County Code.

2. Discussion of Impacts

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)?**

**No Impact.** The proposed Master Plan does not include any change or extension of infrastructure to accommodate growth outside of Paradise Beach Park. The proposed project does not include any residential development, and thus would not increase existing residential population.

b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** As the proposed project would involve improvements within an existing park that is designated open space, neither housing nor people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing.
N. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities? (Vector Control Services)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The site currently requires minimal public services. The Tiburon Fire Protection District and the Marin County Sheriff’s Department provide fire and police services to the project area. In addition, on-site park rangers assist with police protection. Road and utility maintenance in the Paradise Beach area is carried out by the Marin County Department of Public Works, Pacific Gas and Electric, and other private entities. Parks and recreational areas at and near the site are provided by the County of Marin, Town of Tiburon, and State of California (Angel Island).

2. Discussion of Impacts

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

i) Fire protection

ii) Police protection

iii) Schools

iv) Parks

v) Other public services
The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for
development that would have the potential to adversely affect public services within the County.
Given the proposed project would not result in population growth, the project would not increase
permanent residential demand for public services. While implementation of the various Master
Plan improvements could attract more visitors during the weekdays and weekends which could
increase demands for public services, such demands would not require construction of new
governmental facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a need for new or
physically altered governmental facilities, where the construction of which could cause
significant environmental impacts.

Fire Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. Fire protection for the Paradise Drive area is carried out by the
Tiburon Fire Protection District. Fire fighters would not be hindered by future development
resulting from the proposed project because the access to the site is adequate and fire
prevention measures, such as brush clearance and park maintenance, would continue to be
implemented in compliance with existing building and fire codes. No additional fire protection
facilities would need to be improved or constructed for adequate fire protection to be provided to
the Park.

Police Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. Primarily, police protection for the Paradise Drive area is
carried out by the Marin County Sheriff’s Department and Tiburon Police Department. No
additional police protection facilities would need to be improved or constructed for adequate
police protection to be provided to the Park.

Schools

No Impact. Future construction of Park improvements would not result in the generation of
new students or additional use of schools. Future development resulting from the proposed
project would not affect school capacity or enrollment in the area.

Parks

Less Than Significant Impact. Future development resulting from the proposed project
would include the renovation and maintenance of an existing public park and associated Park
facilities. This development would not require the expansion of other Park facilities which could
cause significant environmental impacts.

Other Public Services

Less Than Significant Impact. Since future development resulting from the proposed project
would temporarily close a portion of the Park, use of other recreational facilities in the vicinity
may increase temporarily. However, other government services are not expected to be
significantly impacted. The construction of Park improvements would not require considerable
additional government services.
O. RECREATION

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

1. Background

Marin County Parks currently owns and manages over 15,500 acres of land. The existing Park features include a fishing pier, walking/hiking/jogging paths, outdoor teaching and environmental interpretation settings, wildlife viewpoints, sites for group events, various group picnic areas, informal lawn areas, a kayak launch, horseshoe court, modern restroom facilities, and a small beach with public access.

2. Discussion of Impacts

a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

   **Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development resulting from implementation of the Master Plan would not result in a substantial increase in the demand for parks or recreation area because the construction of Park improvements would require only a temporary closure of a portion of the Park allowing other portions of the Park to be used during the construction phase of the project. Additionally, as indicated in the CWP and the Town of Tiburon General Plan, there are additional parklands, including Blackie’s Pasture and Angel Island State Park, which provide many opportunities for recreation. The temporary closure of portions of the Park would not result in substantial physical deterioration to the Park or other neighborhood or regional parks or recreational facilities, and therefore would have a less than significant impact.

b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

   **Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. As the proposed Master Plan is a programmatic document, it provides conceptual plans and suggestions for future development and would not result in the physical construction of recreational facilities, or require the expansion of
recreational facilities. All future development resulting from the ideas proposed in the Master Plan would be subject to the applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations. Future projects would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts.

P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on applicable measures of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures and other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The primary access to the project site is from Paradise Drive. Paradise Drive is a winding, two-lane collector road that serves the northern part of the Tiburon Peninsula. It extends between Tiburon Boulevard / SR 131 in the Town of Tiburon and US 101 in Corte Madera and varies in width from 18 to 24 feet. The roadway has narrow shoulders varying in width from 0 to 8 feet with intermittent, unsurfaced turnouts and no provisions for bicycle or pedestrian traffic. The existing site access driveway intersects Paradise Drive just outside of a minor curve when heading east along Paradise Drive and west of a sharp horizontal curve when heading west.
The intersection is uncontrolled (i.e., there is no stop sign on the site access driveway approach to Paradise Drive) and there are no turn lanes on the Paradise Drive approaches to the intersection. At this location, the paved surface of Paradise Drive is approximately 19.5 feet wide with little to no shoulder area on the eastbound side. A variable width shoulder, approximately six to 15 feet wide, exists on the east side. The greatest shoulder width, approximately 15 feet wide, fronts the Park entrance. The posted speed in both directions on Paradise Drive is 25 miles per hour (mph), slowing to 15 mph through some curves. There are no airports or rail lines near the site.

2. Discussion of Impacts

   a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on applicable measures of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

   Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to adversely affect local transportation capacity. Proposed Master Plan implementation would not significantly impact the existing circulation system because the project would not increase the Park’s existing parking capacity. As indicated in the Master Plan, there are currently 96 spaces between the two parking lots. The proposed Master Plan would reconfigure the main parking lots without adding spaces. A small ADA parking lot will be added allowing a fully accessible path of travel to the waterfront. As such, the site would not increase the capability for additional vehicles to enter beyond existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan would have less than significant impacts on circulation, roadway capacities, intersection operations, bicycle paths, or mass transit.

   b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures and other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

   Less Than Significant Impact. As described under (a) above, the project would not result in a significant increase in traffic; thus, it would not conflict with Marin County’s Congestion Management Program.

   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?

   No Impact. The proposed project would not result in increased air travel or otherwise affect air travel. Future development resulting from the proposed project would have no impact air travel, as well.

   d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

   Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for on-site circulation improvements in the future to improve on-site vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation. Any future development would be subject to the applicable federal, state, and local regulations,
including County review of new roadway design. Future development would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts.

**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although some on-site roadways are relatively steep, existing on-site circulation provides adequate emergency vehicle access. The proposed project would not affect existing compliance with standard County requirements regarding emergency access. While the Master Plan is conceptual in nature, it provides recommendations to improve internal emergency access circulation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

**f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**No Impact.** According to the Marin Countywide Plan, Paradise Drive is designated as a proposed bike route (Class III). Additionally, the Marin County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan designates Paradise Drive as a proposed Bay Trail route and lists the road as a road needing improvement under the Rural Roads Program. Rural roads typically are located outside developed areas and have no (or limited) curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. However, this Rural Roads Improvement Program has yet to be fully developed or implemented. Paradise Beach County Park is not listed as a transit route for the local public transportation provider, Golden Gate Transit. The proposed project would not alter the existing use of Paradise Drive and as such, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. No negative impacts on alternative transportation policies would occur.

**Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Background**

The proposed project is a Master Plan, which is a conceptual document and does not grant any entitlements for development. However, the proposed project site is a County Park and is served by several utility providers, power and natural gas in the Tiburon area are provided by PG&E. Water treatment and distribution services in the Tiburon Area are provided by the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD). As of 2015, Sanitary District No. 5, which services the project area, installed a sewer main along Paradise Drive. While the treatment facility and sewer main are fully operational, few property owners along Paradise Drive have decommissioned their septic tanks to connect to the new forced main. Septic systems in this area of Paradise Drive are regulated by the Community Development Agency Environmental Health Services Division (EHS). According to the Marin Countywide Plan, there are two permitted landfills operate in the county. The Redwood Landfill would most likely to service the project's solid waste disposal needs.

2. **Discussion of Impacts**

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. Future development resulting from the proposed project would continue to rely on water from the MMWD. The few proposed restroom and shower facilities would generate a nominal increase in wastewater. Relocation of the ranger office would not create an increase in need, as the existing station would be removed. Therefore, the treatment facility would have adequate capacity and thus, impacts from future development associated with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB would be less than significant.

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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As addressed in Impact Q2.a, future development resulting from the proposed project may include new restroom, shower facilities, and ranger's residence move would generate a nominal increase in wastewater. The MMWD wastewater treatment plant has the capacity to accommodate such an increase.
c) **Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan may increase impervious surface cover of the Park, but would implement strategically placed treatment zones to treat runoff closest to its source. If site improvements exceed 5,000 square feet of impervious areas, then post construction storm water treatment facilities will be required per Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (MCSTOPPP) guidelines. The existing storm water system will be upgraded to accommodate proposed water flows and bioretention facilities. If the impervious area of the Park is being increased by less than 50%, then post construction measures apply only to the addition. Bioretention facilities will be planned for a minimum of 4% of the proposed impervious area. Therefore, future impacts would be less than significant.

**d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. Future development resulting from the proposed project would implement water conservation measures that would ensure water demand is not significantly increased. These conservation measures may include, but are not limited to:

- Use recycled water (if available) or a rainwater catchment tank system to conserve potable water.
- Install purple pipe where old pipe will be replaced. Recycled water will not be used in restrooms, kitchens, or irrigation that can hit picnic tables or drinking fountains.
- Replace sprinkler heads and rotors that do not have check valves with sprinkler heads and rotors with integral check valves to prevent low head drainage.
- Replace any spray heads that do not have pressure regulation with spray heads that have integral pressure regulating devices in the head to prevent misting.
- Change all shrub spray heads to drip irrigation.

Fire and domestic water supplies are anticipated to connect to the existing water system. Any future development would be subject to the applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Future development would also be subject to project specific CEQA analysis of project-level impacts.

**e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Primarily, water treatment and distribution services in the Tiburon Area are provided by MMWD. The project’s potential improvements, such as, restrooms, would merely replace or minimally increase existing wastewater flow rates. Furthermore, any future development would be subject to the applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.
f) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Solid waste disposal needs would increase from future development resulting from the proposed project, but only nominally from existing conditions. The Redwood Landfill and Recycling Center currently has adequate capacity to accommodate Marin County’s solid waste disposal needs, including those of the proposed project. As of 2008, the landfill had a remaining capacity of approximately 19.1 million cubic yards of waste and an estimated closure date of 2024. Other Bay Area landfills would also be expected to be able to accommodate the proposed project’s solid waste volume. Because only a small volume of waste would be generated by project construction, existing landfill facilities would be able to accommodate the project’s solid waste needs. Impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

g) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** Solid waste disposal services must follow all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to the collection of solid waste. Therefore, no impact would result from solid waste in regard to compliance with federal, state and local regulations.

VI. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
1. Discussion of Impacts

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. As noted throughout the Initial Study, although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. The project site contains some sensitive biological resources that could be affected by future development resulting from the proposed project. All potentially significant impacts to biological resources would be avoided with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, measures already incorporated into the project, and mitigation measures identified in the future development’s project specific CEQA analysis. Potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT 1-2. County Parks staff shall verify that all Mitigation Measures comply with mitigation standards and have been properly implemented.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed Master Plan is conceptual in nature and does not grant any entitlements for development, it does provide for development improvements to the Park in the future. Future projects suggested in the Master Plan would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and impacts associated with potential future development are addressed in this Initial Study as well. Future development resulting from the proposed Master Plan will be subject to project specific CEQA analysis, including cumulative impacts for past, present, and future projects at that time. This Initial Study analysis has led to the determination that the Master Plan would not result in any impacts that cannot be completely mitigated. Therefore, the Master Plan would not result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact. As noted above in the Initial Study, neither the proposed project nor potential future development would have any unavoidable significant environmental effects. All mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study shall be incorporated into the project and shall be implemented by Marin County Parks. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan will be developed prior to project implementation. All future development shall be subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations as well as project specific CEQA analysis to ensure there would be no direct or indirect substantial adverse effect on human beings.
VII. REFERENCES


California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, 2012


County of Marin. 2003. Marin County Code, Development Code, Title 22, CDA - Planning Division. Website: http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16476&stateId=5&statename=California


Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2009 Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 489 of 531; Map Number 06041C0489D. Website: https://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/info?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&content=firmetteHelp_A&title=FIRMettes

Marin County, Airport Land Use Plan, 1991,


Marin County, Marin County Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, October 2006.

Marin County, website: http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/CD/Main/comdev/CURRENT/notices/public_notices.htm

State Water Resources Control Board. 2013. GEOtracker. Website: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/


VIII. REPORT PREPARERS

Marin County Parks

Steve Petterle  Principal Landscape Architect
Nancy Peake  Senior Landscape Architect
Tara McIntire  Landscape Architect
Sarah Richards  Landscape Architect
Craig Richardson  Open Space Planner

SWA

Cinda Gilliland  Principal
Sergio Lima  Landscape Designer
Ayaka Hosogaki Matthews  Landscape Designer

WRA, Inc. - CEQA Consulting

Justin Semion  Principal
Geoff Reilly  Project Manager
Jonathan Hidalgo  Associate Environmental Planner
Sean Avent  Associate Biologist
Ellie Knecht  Biologist
Derek Chan  Senior GIS Technician
Christina Hirt  Assistant Environmental Planner

Tom Origer & Associates – Cultural Resources Consultant

Vicki Beard  Senior Associate
APPENDIX A: PARADISE BEACH PARK MASTER PLAN
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I - INTRODUCTION.........................................................................................................3

II - CONTEXT MAP AND SITE PHOTOS.......................................................................5
  Regional Context
  Aerial Plan and Site Photos
  Site Photos

II - PARK HISTORY......................................................................................................11
  Historic Photos
  Historic Timeline

III - SITE ANALYSIS....................................................................................................15
  Circulation
  Topography
  Vegetation
  Site Amenities
  Site Constraints

IV - COMMUNITY OUTREACH.....................................................................................21
  Outreach Strategy
  Focus Group Meetings
  Community Meetings and Outreach Result

V - MASTERPLAN.......................................................................................................25
  Preliminary Designs
  Master Plan Program
  Master Plan
  Master Plan Goals
  Circulation and Accessible Routes
  Hierarchy of Spaces and Views
  View at Arrival Plaza
  Landscape Infrastructure Restoration and Enhancement of Native Habitats
  Educational/Interpretive Experience of the Park
  Play Areas/Activities
  Nature Play Images

VI - PLAZAS AND MAIN GATHERING SPACES.........................................................37
  Proposed Picnic and Event Areas
  View of Central Lawn/Main Event Space
  Central Gathering Plaza and Main Picnic Area
  Pier Improvements
  Waterfront Improvements
  View of Waterfront

VII - PLANTING STRATEGY.........................................................................................45
  Planting Strategy
  Plant List
  Trees
  Existing and Proposed Trees
  Existing and Proposed Trees

VIII - SITE FURNITURE, ART AND PAVING MATERIALS..........................................51
  Site Furniture
  Site Furniture
  Site Furniture
  Art
  Paving Materials

IX - SITE GRADING AND UTILITIES..........................................................................57
  Grading and Cut and Fill Balance
  Site Drainage
  Site Utilities

X - PHASING AND OPINION OF PROBABLE COST....................................................61
  Revenue Opportunities
  Construction Phasing
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 1 and 2
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 3
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 4
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 5
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 6 and 7
  Opinion of Probable Cost - Phase 8 and Total

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS...............................................................................................70
Paradise Beach Park is a wonderful 19-acre oasis tucked in the hills of the Tiburon peninsula, offering sweeping views of the San Francisco Bay, plenty of room for outdoor recreation and one of the best fishing spots in the Bay Area.

Despite the remarkable qualities of the site the park receives very few visitors during the week, with occasional crowds filling the large lawns and picnic areas during weekends. It is not unusual on a warm, sunny midweek afternoon, to find oneself being the sole visitor.

Paradise Beach Park has lost the quality of a ‘destination’ park for several reasons. No significant renovations have occurred since the 1970’s and today much of the park’s infrastructure is beginning to fail. Parking is limited and there are no wheelchair accessible paths connecting the parking areas to the waterfront.

The goal of this master plan is to define Paradise Beach Park’s distinct identity while creating a fun and exciting destination for people of all ages. The park should be fully accessible, open to all, a place where passive and active recreation opportunities are inspired by the natural qualities of the site.
I - CONTEXT MAP AND SITE PHOTOS
Paradise Beach Park is located in an unincorporated area of Marin County, 3.3 miles north of downtown Tiburon. The park sits on the north shore of the Tiburon peninsula, facing the San Francisco Bay.

Access to the park is from Paradise Drive via Trestle Glen Boulevard and Tiburon Boulevard (State Route 131). Paradise Drive is a local street that provides access for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians to and from the east and west. The site is located at 3450 Paradise Drive.

The park is near the Old Saint Hilary’s Open Space Preserve and the Tiburon Uplands Nature Preserve; however there are no direct trail connections linking the park to these sites.
4 - ACCESS TO PARK FROM PARKING LOT

5 - CENTRAL PICNIC AREA

6 - LAWN AT NORTHWEST SLOPES

7 - PICNIC AREA AT NORTHWEST EDGE OF PARK

8 - CONCRETE BLOCKS

9 - VIEW OF THE PARK FROM THE PIER

10 - PICNIC AREA AT WATERFRONT

11 - VIEW OF MAIN PATH FROM THE WATERFRONT

12 - MAIN LAWN AT LOWER AREA
VIEW OF THE PARK FROM THE PIER
Prior to 1817, the area surrounding Paradise Beach Park hosted a Coast Miwok Native American village inhabited by the Huimens Tribe.

In 1834 the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio was established, a large property that included within its boundaries the site of the park. The owner, John Reed, an early settler of the area, used the land mostly for a cattle ranch. The property, which at the time also included the current site of the Romberg Center and Tiburon Uplands, was later purchased by John A. Roebling’s Sons Company and used for a cod fishery (1877-1904). In 1904, the U.S. Navy acquired the property for use as a coaling station and President Theodore Roosevelt visited the site with the Great White Fleet in 1908. By 1909, the Navy built large U-shaped piers, three movable platforms with coal chutes, and supporting buildings.
Eventually, coal fuel for Navy ships was replaced by oil. From 1933 to 1937 John A. Roebling’s Sons Company used the site to reel cables for the Golden Gate Bridge. From 1931 to 1940 the Navy also loaned part of the property to the State of California to establish the first nautical training school.

In 1940, with the outbreak of World War II, the base was reacquired by the Navy and used as an anti-submarine net supply depot. Navy personnel constructed over 100,000 tons of anti-submarine nets during the war and trained the sailors in the installation and handling of these nets, which protected the harbors along the Pacific Coast. The facility was reactivated during the Korean War, and finally decommissioned in 1958. At that time, part of the property was transferred to the Department of Commerce and then acquired, in 1959, by Marin County for the establishment of two new parks: Tiburon Uplands and Paradise Beach Park.
PARADISE BEACH PARK
TIMELINE

MAJOR WORLD HISTORY
- Spanish Trail
- Industrial Revolution
- Spanish in the Bay Area
- WWI
- WWII
- Korean War
- Cold War

REGIONAL HISTORY
- Inhabited by Miwok Indians
- Tiburon's industrial era
- San Francisco Earthquake
- Railroad
- Tiburon
- European Settlers Arrival
- John Reed
- Reed's Property
- Cod Factory
- Floating Dry Dock Training Center

PARADISE BEACH PARK AREA
- Native American (Miwok) lived in this region for thousands of years
- Cattle Ranch
- Roebeling's Property
- Naval Net Depot
- A wooden pier, first built by the Navy in WWII was renovated and turned into a recreational pier to be used by Marin County in 1963
- Paradise Beach Park
- Dry Dock Built
- Pier Renovation
- Naval Net Depot

RELATED PHOTOS
The park is accessed from Paradise Drive by way of a steep entry that is partially obscured by vegetation and lacks a visible and inviting sign. A gatehouse beyond the entry greets visitors after which cars can choose between two parking lots totaling 99 parking spaces (including four park staff parking spaces and five ADA spaces). Beyond the north end of the upper parking lot is a utility yard, currently used by park maintenance staff.

An asphalt path connects the upper and the lower sections of the park, and functions as the main circulation spine. The path is not ADA accessible and currently there are no ADA accessible paths from the parking lots to any part of the park.

Pedestrian circulation paths follow the perimeter of the main open lawn areas and provide access to the peripheral, more natural, areas of the park.

The beach is accessible only through a steep stepped trail, while the existing stairs reaching the southeast section of the beach are currently closed due to structural damage caused by a landslide.
TOPOGRAPHY

The park slopes dramatically from Paradise Drive towards the waterfront with average slopes between 10% and 50%. The only relatively flat areas of the site are found at the two parking lots, the two large open lawn areas and the waterfront. Currently, there are no accessible paths of travel from the parking lots, thus there is no ADA accessible connection to the waterfront. The steep landscape area adjacent to the waterfront, to the northwest side of the pier, has been subject to several landslides and is in urgent need of repairs.
VEGETATION

Dense vegetation is concentrated mostly along the park’s perimeter. The eastern edge and the western slopes are densely covered with native oaks, bay laurel, and buckeyes. The entry road from Paradise Drive passes through a grove of redwood trees, which provide a tall, green backdrop for the upper lawn area of the park.

The remainder of the trees are concentrated along a main east-west spine at the main picnic area and include sweetgums, alders, buckeyes and some pines. At the time this report was prepared the pines were suffering from the extended drought that has been affecting the West Coast.

Scattered across the site, clusters of Lombardy poplars punctuate the edge of the lawn areas and provide vertical accent. Some of the poplars obstruct the view to the Bay and are in poor conditions.
SITE AMENITIES

Most visitors come to Paradise Beach Park for passive activities including picnicking, outdoor events at the large lawn areas and fishing from the pier. Though named Paradise Beach Park, few people are drawn to the beach which has slowly disappeared over time, possibly due to the increased ferry traffic and resulting erosive wave action. The two significant lawn areas are often used for large events such as birthdays, small corporate parties, quinceañeras and weddings.

The park offers several opportunities for picnicking, concentrated in three areas: along the east-west pedestrian spine, at the waterfront and below the redwood grove. There is also a small, but popular, picnic area above the beach. There is only one bathroom structure in the park located near the rangers’ station. This facility is not serviced by municipal sewer and is, instead, connected to a leach field and septic tank (see the ‘Site Utilities’ page).

Signage at the park is limited to park hours and rules, and a few interpretive signs. The interpretive signs are scattered across the park, providing information on native plants (at the woods in the southeast corner), on the species of fish found in the bay (at the entrance of the pier), and on the overall history of the park (at the lower parking lot). Overall, the interpretive signage lacks a cohesive intent and explanation of the diverse history and natural habitats of the park.

SIGNS
- PICNIC AREA
- SIGNAGE
- TRASH RECEPTACLES
- HISTORIC STEEL BALL

BBQ GRILL: L: LARGE M: MEDIUM S: SMALL

III - SITE ANALYSIS
SITE CHALLENGES

Many of the constraints at the park are due to physical and topographical characteristics of the site:

1 - NON-ADA COMPLIANT PATHS - Most of the paths in the park are not ADA compliant and there is no accessible route linking the parking lots to the waterfront or any other portion of the park.

2 - LACK OF ACCESS TO THE WATER - Other than the beach, it is difficult to access the water or explore the shore anywhere else along the park’s waterfront.

3 - LACK OF KAYAK LAUNCH - There is no safe water access for kayaks, and the current lack of accessible paths for kayakers has kept the park from the list of destinations on the Bay Water Kayak Trail.

4 - LACK OF BOAT DOCKING - The inability for boats to dock at the pier limits the availability of the park to boaters.

5 - EROSION OF BEACH - Waves caused by increased bay boat and ferry traffic have contributed to washing out a large part of Paradise Beach.

6 - EROSION OF SLOPE - The steeply sloped terrain above the beach is subject to erosion and landslides have occurred at several locations to date.

7 - SINGLE BATHROOM - The park offers only one, unisex, bathroom near the Rangers’ station. This has proven inconvenient, especially during weekends when the park often hosts larger groups for private events.

8 - NO SENSE OF ARRIVAL - The arrival at the parking areas is anti-climatic (especially considering the park’s expansive views of the bay) and there is no true sense of arrival or vista point giving an overview of the park.

9 - POOR VISIBILITY OF ENTRANCE - Access from Paradise Drive is not clearly marked or announced. Additionally the gate house, does not create an inviting experience for visitors.

10 - LIMITED PARKING CAPACITY - There is limited parking, especially on busy weekends and for large events. It is also very challenging for busses and large vehicles to turn around due to lack of space. The entry road meets Paradise Drive at such a tight angle that large vehicles are prevented from making a right turn to head north.

11 - EXPOSED PIER/LACK OF SHELTER - The pier is exposed to intense winds, and there are no seating areas providing shelter.
IV - COMMUNITY OUTREACH
OUTREACH STRATEGY

The community outreach effort carried out by the design team and the County staff focused on multiple goals:

- Raise interest in the park within the local community and increase awareness of its assets.
- Discuss stakeholder priorities for the park.
- Develop a network of contacts and connections between the County and other organizations to generate future cooperation on educational and scientific programs for the park.

A survey was distributed to local organizations and institutions with specific questions regarding their potential interest in the park and outdoor activities and types and sizes of venues they typically organize. The team focused on specific community outreach efforts to include the local Latino community and other underserved populations.

List of the meetings held:

- Town of Tiburon: Nov. 20, 2014
- Romberg Tiburon Center: Nov. 14, 2014
- Ranger at Paradise Beach Park: Mar. 31, 2015
- Bayside Martin Luther King Jr. Academy: Feb. 5, 2015
- Public Meeting at Mill Valley Community Center: Feb. 11, 2015
FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

Four focus group meetings were organized with local organizations and institutions.

ROMBERG TIBURON CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES - The RTC is San Francisco State University’s marine and estuarine research facility. The Center, located southeast of Paradise Beach Park, is a close knit community of scientists and students working together to fulfill RTC’s mission of education and research. Opportunities for future synergetic partnership between the park and the RTC were explored, including creating specific areas for outdoor classes and using RTC parking as overflow parking for large private events at the park. Despite the extensive amount of research the RTC conducts with local marine life, the center currently does not have direct access to the shore at its facility. Opportunities to allow shore use and water access at Paradise Beach Park for research and educational projects were also discussed.

POINT BLUE CONSERVATION SCIENCE - Point Blue is an organization that focuses on the conservation and protection of wildlife and ecosystems through science, partnerships, outreach, and strategies to reduce the impacts of habitat loss, climate change, and other environmental threats. The team discussed measures to protect the erosion of the beach and potential areas for habitat creation, restoration and for scientific and educational projects along the waterfront. Since Point Blue conducts studies on the effects of global warming and sea level rise on natural habitats, repercussions of these items on the habitat of the park were also discussed, especially as far as bird migrations/habitat. Point Blue will be available as a resource for additional information/coordination as the master plan is implemented.

TOWN OF TIBURON – The Town of Tiburon was instrumental in expanding our network of contacts for the overall outreach effort.

PARK RANGERS - The meeting with the rangers provided a more detailed picture on the current type, frequency and number of users of the park. The rangers additionally provided vital information about park maintenance and the current state of the park’s vegetation and infrastructure.

Overall, the focus group meetings created a base for future programming and increased use of the park. This dialogue, initiated through the master plan, will need to be ongoing in order to continue the integration and enhancement of community science and education programs and opportunities at Paradise Beach Park.
COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND OUTREACH

RESULT

A public workshop was held at the Mill Valley Community Center on February 11, 2015. The design team summarized the suggestions and input collected through the community outreach process into eight specific goals.

Goals:

- **Improve accessibility:**
  Provide ADA accessible paths of travel throughout the park.

- **Increase visibility/park character:**
  Celebrate and highlight the park and its views with improved visibility from the road (including signage) and increased vista opportunities within the park.

- **Provide access to the Bay:**
  Provide safe and expanded opportunities for water access, including, but not limited to, boaters, kayakers and pedestrians.

- **Improve gathering areas:**
  Provide varied seating and increased gathering opportunities throughout the park. Highlight views of the Bay by creating ‘cozy’ places that offer shelter during windy conditions.

- **Protect the beach:**
  Preserve the beach and mitigate against further site and shore erosion.

- **Increase educational opportunities:**
  Integrate historic, scientific and interpretive opportunities throughout the park.

- **Provide food concessions:**
  Provide opportunities for food concessions to increase visitor use, revenue generation and improve the overall user experience.

- **Create opportunities for art and play:**
  Provide opportunities for the inclusion of art in the park as possible iconic features and to expand potential use. Provide non-traditional play opportunities that are aligned with the passive nature of the park.
PRELIMINARY DESIGNS

Starting from the items highlighted through the outreach process (accessibility, comfort, diversity of uses, identity improved waterfront facilities/access to the water) the design team explored several design possibilities to integrate the proposed improvements into the existing landscape.

The issue of the lack of accessible routes clearly led the design effort from the start. In re-organizing pedestrian circulation around the site, the design team considered the benefits and constraints of keeping the existing asphalt path that connects the parking lots to the waterfront (see the existing service/main circulation path shown on page 16). While keeping the existing path would minimize the impact of the new design, its layout cuts through the main slope of the site (dividing the park in two), it limits the flow of east-west pedestrian circulation and compromises the possibility of creating a distinct arrival space/plaza adjacent to the lower parking. After exploring several design options and consulting with the County, the design team opted in favor of a complete re-organization of the circulation patterns, removing the existing path.

The new design also emphasizes the existing north-south visual axis, created by the alignment of the fishing pier and the stairs, descending from the main picnic area. All design explorations reinforce this axis in favor of a main, central gathering space, functioning as a main plaza, in the heart of the park. This design element is carried through in the final proposed design.

The sketches and diagrams shown at right are a few of the many preliminary studies produced, including the analysis of the hierarchy of spaces, a circulation study and sea form inspirational sketches for the re-design of the paths.
DESIGN INSPIRATION

Sea life forms were a significant inspiration source for the new design of the park. The circulation patterns were re-arranged following graceful, softer lines that adhere, harmoniously, to the contours of the steep site. The proposed sinuous network of paths integrates the proposed program into the site creating a fluid sequence of activities and spaces.
MASTER PLAN

1 - PARK ENTRY SIGN
2 - ENTRANCE SCULPTURE
3 - PARKING
4 - ARRIVAL PLAZA
5 - MAINTENANCE YARD
6 - RANGERS' STATION
7 - ADA PARKING
8 - GRAND STAIRS
9 - SCULPTED LANDFORM
10 - CENTRAL GATHERING PLAZA
11 - PICNIC "ROOMS" (SMALL PICNIC AREAS)
12 - PAVILIONS
13 - PERGOLA
14 - GREAT LAWN
15 - OUTDOOR EVENT AREA
16 - NATIVE GARDENS
17 - WATERFRONT
18 - CONCESSION
19 - KAYAK RENTAL/BATHROOMS
20 - PIER
21 - BOAT DOCK
22 - KAYAK LAUNCH
23 - BEACH
24 - REEF BALLS / EEL GRASS RESTORATION
MASTER PLAN VISION

Responding to the programmatic needs revealed through the community meetings and the site analysis, the new design focused on the following items:

- **Improved accessibility throughout the site:** A new network of accessible paths allows free and fluid movement to and between all areas of the park, with four handicap parking spaces in a more central location.

- **Developed a hierarchy of spaces for various outdoor activities:** Three main gathering areas are clearly defined - waterfront, large lawn and central picnic area - while additional picnic areas and seating pods are scattered throughout the park and integrated into the landscape. Additional small plazas reinforce the hierarchy of spaces and create a sense of ‘place.’

- **Created a sense of arrival:** New signage and sculptural elements are installed at the entry of the park and along the entry road, enhancing the sense of arrival from Paradise Drive. A new arrival plaza marks the pedestrian entry to the park and provides a dramatic, open view to the Bay and the pier.

- **Restored landscape infrastructure and enhanced native habitats:** The primary areas of the proposed infrastructure restoration are the seawall, the retaining wall and slopes north of the pier (currently subject to landslides) and the beach. Native gardens are proposed at the restored slopes and other areas of the park with potential for tidal pools to be incorporated into the new sea wall.

- **Increased educational/interpretive opportunities:** Interpretive signage both highlights the natural habitats of the park and creates a nature-focused and cultural itinerary throughout the park. The physical remnants of the park’s history, including concrete blocks and steel balls for submarine nets, are also integrated into the design as accent features.

- **Increased weekday usership with nature-themed integrated play elements:** Play elements are integrated into the park’s physical design, diffusing play activities throughout the site. Sculpted landforms, stair slides, and various play elements allow users to explore the different spaces of the park, providing play and learning experiences that are unique to Paradise Beach Park.

- **Improved park facilities for large gatherings:** Pavilions and shade structures provide more comfortable opportunities for large private gatherings. Indoor and outdoor kitchen facilities are also envisioned at the pavilions.

- **Improved use of the waterfront:** The waterfront is expanded and its use enhanced with additional facilities, such as concession and kayak rental. A large boardwalk and pier improvements expand the accessible waterfront, while providing additional choices of ways to occupy the transitional zone between land and water.
CIRCULATION AND ACCESSIBLE ROUTES

Pedestrian circulation is integrated into the topography of the site, creating a network of accessible paths that follow the curves of the site and define and shape its new configuration.

An additional ADA accessible parking lot below the existing lots allows all users access to the network of accessible paths and main activity areas.

Service vehicles access the park through a continuous 12' wide path that extends to the waterfront area. The new boardwalk at the waterfront enhances the use of the area, facilitates access to the water and provides a primary accessible route to the beach.

Existing informal trails are maintained and enhanced, including the stepped trail to the beach on the north-west side, allowing for the exploration of the peripheral areas of the park.
HIERARCHY OF SPACES AND VIEWS

The proposed design delineates a precise hierarchy of spaces that enhances the natural and man-made features of the park. The new layout integrates sweeping views of the Bay into the circulation pattern, accentuating specific visual corridors and opening up views at key points.

Access from Paradise Drive, currently understated and somewhat hidden, is enhanced with new signage and accent sculptures replacing the gate house.

The new arrival/overlook plaza provides a celebratory threshold for visitors entering the park, opening views to the Bay. The experience of entering the park is further enhanced by a grand staircase providing a direct connection between the arrival plaza above and the central gathering plaza, below.

The existing visual axis established by the fishing pier/central stairway is further enhanced by the additional proposed main gathering areas (the Central Gathering Space and the new Waterfront Plaza), creating a continuous visual corridor that bisects the park. The Central Gathering Space, intersecting the two main circulation and visual axes (north-south and east-west), becomes the heart of the park.
LANDSCAPE INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF NATIVE HABITATS

The master plan highlights three specific priorities for future restoration work on the landscape infrastructure:

- Replace the existing seawall, south of the pier;
- Restore the retaining wall north of the pier, currently affected by several landslides;
- Explore and implement strategies to stop the erosion of the existing beach.

The master plan does not provide specific directions as far as the methodology to be implemented to restore and protect further erosion of the beach. The definition of this strategy is deferred to future coordination with experts. The design team met with representatives of the Romberg Tiburon Center for Environmental Studies, and discussed some potential strategies, including the use of underwater reef balls (see photo) and beds of eel grass.

A potential partnership between the neighboring Romberg Tiburon Center and Marin County Parks has been established and could lead to future scientific and educational collaborations at Paradise Beach Park as well as to potential funding resources.

The restoration of the retaining wall (north of the pier) and the restoration of the sea wall (to the south) open new opportunities to establish native habitats at the proposed gardens and at the proposed tidal pools.
The Master Plan indicates several sites for nature exploration and interpretive signage. The proposed signage creates a nature and history focused itinerary throughout the park, highlighting specific natural characteristics and historic events that have occurred at the site:

- Interpretive signage at the viewpoint area provides information on the habitats of the San Francisco Bay.

- A small classroom at the new waterfront creates a space for outdoor lectures and direct observation of the Bay. A ‘rose of the winds’, embedded in the classroom paving, identifies the prevailing winds of the area.

- A section of new retaining wall, north of the pier, displays information on the history of the site. The physical remnants of the history of the park (concrete blocks and steel floats for submarine nets) are also integrated in the design of the park and used as accent features.

- A section of the proposed floating pier and a section of the existing pier are specifically devoted to the observation of marine life. Opportunities for educational cooperation with the Romberg Tiburon Center will be explored.

- Additional interpretive signage on native plants is located along the paths that meander through the existing wooded areas along the perimeter of the park.

Cooperation with the Romberg Tiburon Center and Point Blue will be key in the coordination of this educational and interpretive program.
PLAY AREAS/ACTIVITIES

Play structures and play opportunities are located throughout the park and integrated in the landscape and built features.

The design turns the overall experience of the park into a playful event. The play areas encourage children and adults to explore the park, learn about the nature and the history of the site, and engage in active and passive recreation in different spaces. Nature play becomes one of the main themes for Paradise Beach Park, and provides opportunities to increase weekday usership.

Stairs are paired with slides at several locations, creating a ‘shoots and ladders’ theme. The upper lawn and its adjacent redwood grove include sculpted landforms, grass slides, and, potentially, suspended walks at the larger existing redwood trees. Two separate areas, adjacent to the Great Lawn, are identified for additional sculptural play elements and nature craft activities. The existing trail leading to the beach is punctuated with outdoor sound making installations.
sculpted landforms

logs and rocks

log climbing

log tunnels

mounds

wooden play system
VI - PLAZAS AND MAIN GATHERING SPACES
PROPOSED PICNIC AND EVENT AREAS

Paradise Beach Park is often used for large private events, such as weddings, birthdays and corporate parties. As a result, the master plan identifies two main event areas, one along the east-west central spine and the second one centered on the Great Lawn. The large existing picnic area, following the east-west axis that cuts through the park, is maintained and enhanced.

A small plaza is created along the north-south axis of the pier and centered around a pavilion that will function both as shelter and as common cooking area/outdoor kitchen.

The area at the southeast corner of the Great Lawn is dedicated to private events and includes a large pavilion/shelter and a ‘grand table’ for banquets and large outdoor events. The existing smaller picnic areas at the waterfront and at the redwood grove are maintained and enhanced. More intimate areas for seating and resting are identified among the habitat gardens.

Specific seating ‘pods’ are provided with different seating arrangements, including hammocks, Adirondack chairs and fire pits, allowing visitors to gather in more intimate spaces and enjoy the views of the Bay.
The master plan rearranges the existing picnic area providing additional facilities and creating a plaza that identifies the center of the park.

The overall design intent focuses on providing a more ‘urban’ and structured experience of this space. A more formal and diversified layout of the picnic tables, framed by low hedges or other partitions and planting beds, are separated from the main pedestrian circulation, creating a series of outdoor rooms.

Seating pods and fire pits are interspersed with the picnic tables, and a bocce court is provided at the west end.

The pavilion at the center of the area, on axis with the existing fishing pier, provides outdoor cooking facilities and bathrooms, and functions as a connecting element between the Central Gathering Space and the seating areas above. Enhanced paving at the plaza further highlights this central space.
PIER IMPROVEMENTS

The proposed improvements for the pier at Paradise Beach Park provide several additional recreational and educational opportunities.

A new boat dock is added on the east side of the pier, allowing small boats to dock for a visit to the park. New seating is added at the end of the pier, including bleachers, wind sheltered benches, and new railings.

Marine life observation stations are proposed on the existing pier and at the boat dock. Specific floating structures will be kept under and on the sides of the pier and dock to facilitate the growth and settlement of marine life. Removable floor panels will allow visitors, under the guide of a docent, to look through (and under) the pier and dock and observe sea life and its seasonal changes.

A new kayak rental/bathrooms and concession facilities frame the waterfront plaza and activate the area with additional seating areas.
WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENTS

The proposed renovated waterfront opens up the shoreline of the park, enhancing access to the water and to the beach, and providing opportunities for new activities and interpretative uses of the area. A long boardwalk follows the shoreline, linking together the different areas of activities and functioning as the circulation spine along the waterfront. To the west of the pier, the boardwalk slopes down to the beach, allowing access to the water for swimmers, providing kayak ramps and outdoor seating and sun bathing areas. A new retaining wall resolves the current landslide issues and provides opportunities for historic interpretive signage.

To the east of the pier, accessible paths lead to a small outdoor classroom, tidal pools and seating areas directly facing the bay. Interpretive information on the winds of the Bay is incorporated in the paving of the classroom while additional signage at a small viewpoint provides information on the ecosystems of the Bay. Additional picnic areas can be found on the south side of the boardwalk.

The historic concrete blocks used to anchor the submarine nets are relocated around the picnic area and function as retaining walls.

**LEGEND**

1. BOAT DOCK
2. EXISTING, IMPROVED PIER
3. TIDAL POOLS
4. ROSE OF THE WINDS
5. OUTDOOR CLASSROOM
6. VIEWPOINT/INTERPRETIVE SIGNAGE
7. PICNIC AREA
8. CONCRETE BLOCKS RETAINING WALL
9. CONCESSION BUILDING
10. KAYAK RENTAL/STORAGE AND RESTROOMS
11. BOARDWALK
12. SEATING PODS/FIRE PLACE
13. HISTORIC INTERPRETIVE DISPLAY AT RETAINING WALL
14. OUTDOOR SEATING AREA
15. KAYAK LAUNCH
16. BEACH CHAIRS
17. KAYAK PULLEY/STAIRS
18. SWIMMING AREA/Docks
19. REEF BALLS OR OTHER BEACH EROSION PROTECTION
20. BEACH
PLANTING STRATEGY

The large extent of planting of Paradise Beach Park, the proximity to the Bay and the varied topography, provide wonderful opportunities to enhance native habitats and create a haven for birds and butterflies.

The planting list provided in this report focuses on the use of native species, although other species may also be found suitable. Native species will not only enhance habitats, but will also substantially reduce the irrigation needs of the park.

Overall the planting design will respond to the educational and interpretive goals highlighted by the master plan, making the park a destination for those interested in learning about native species and habitats. The proposed native garden areas at the northwest section of the park, above the beach, are a perfect environment for native grasses and perennials. This area will stay clear of canopy trees, allowing for sweeping views of the bay.

A large extent of the park will remain covered by lawn. While large lawn areas are one of the major assets of the park, drought tolerant, less maintenance intense species of turf will need to be specified for these areas. The use of mixes of warm and cool season Dwarf Fescue is highly advised. Dwarf varieties grow at a much slower pace than standard fescue, thus requiring much less maintenance. A mix of warm and cool season varieties also guarantees a green carpet year round, while the deep rooted nature of these species allows them to thrive with less intensive irrigation.

Many areas of the park will be best served with the use of tough, low maintenance, deer and drought resistant trees, shrubs and groundcovers. Native gardens and habitat creation are strongly encouraged, especially in dedicated areas indentified in this master plan. However it is understood that in heavily used active zones, durability and maintenance requirements, as well as water use, are important factors to consider in plant selection.
### SUGGESTED CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANTING MATERIAL

#### Grasses, Annuals and Perennials

- *Agrostis pallens* - Diego bent grass
- *Allium unifolium* - California native onion
- *Aristida Purpurea* - Purple three awn
- *Carex divulsa* - Berkeley sedge
- *Deschampsia caespitosa* - Pacific hairgrass
- *Distichlis spicata* - Salt grass
- *Eschscholzia californica* - California poppy
- *Festuca californica* - California Fescue
- *Festuca rubra ‘Patrick’s Point’* - Creeping Red Fescue
- *Festuca rubra* - Red fescue
- *Heuchera maxima* - Island Alum Root
- *Iris douglasiana* - Douglas iris
- *Leymus condensatus* - Giant Wild Rye
- *Leymus triticoides* - Creeping wild rye
- *Lupinus albilorns* - Silver Bush Lupine
- *Melica imperfecta* - Coast Range Melic
- *Muhlenbergia rigens* - Deergrass
- *Nassella pulchra* - Purple needle grass
- *Romneya Coulteri* - Matilija poppy
- *Polystichum munitum* - Sword fern
- *Salvia spathacea* - Hummingbird Sage
- *Sisyrinchium bellum* - Blue-eyed grass
- *Zauschneria californica* - California Fuchsia

#### Shrubs

- *Arctostaphylos* - Manzanita
- *Artemisia californica* - California Sagebrush
- *Asclepias fascicularis* - California Narrowleaf Milkweed
- *Atriplex lentiformis* Breweri - Brewers Salt Bush
- *Baccharis pilularis consanguinea* - Coyote Brush
- *Carpenteria californica* - Bush anemone
- *Ceanothus* - California lilac
- *Cercocarpus alnifolius* - Island Mountain Mahogany
- *Eriogonum arborescens* - Santa Cruz Buckwheat
- *Fremontodendron ‘California glory’* - Flannel bush
- *Garrya elliptica ‘James Roof’* - Silk Tassel
- *Keckiella cordifolia* - Heart Leaved Penstemon
- *Lavatera assurgentiflora* - Tree mallow
- *Mahonia pinnata* - California holly grape
- *Myrica californica* - Pacific Wax Myrtle
- *Philadelphus lewisii* - Wild Mock Orange
- *Rhamnus californica* - Coffeeberry
- *Rhododendron occidentale* - Western azalea
- *Ribes aureum gracillimum* - Golden Currant
- *Ribes sanguineum glutinosum* - Pink-Flowered Currant
- *Rosa californica* - California wild rose
- *Spiraea douglasii* - Hardhack
- *Vaccinium ovatum* - California huckleberry

#### Trees

- *Acer circinatum* - Vine maple
- *Aesculus californica* - California Buckeye
- *Arbutus marina* - Madrone
- *Ceanothus velutinus* - Tobacco brush
- *Cephalanthus occidentalis californica* - Buttonwillow
- *Corylus cornuta californica* - Western Hazelnut
- *Crataegus douglasii* - Western Thorn Apple
- *Fraxinus latifolia* - Oregon ash
- *Heteromeles arbutifolia* - Toyon
- *Juglans hindsii* - Northern California walnut
- *Quercus agrifolia* - Coast live oak
- *Quercus lobata* - Valley oak
- *Quercus tomentella* - Island Oak
- *Pinus contorta* - Shore pine
- *Pinus muricata* - Bishop pine
- *Populus fremontii* - Western Cottonwood
- *Populus trichocarpa* - Black Cottonwood
- *Sequoia sempervirens* - Coast redwood
- *Torreya californica* - Torreya
- *Umbellularia californica* - California bay laurel
The proposed trees will accent the different activity areas, frame visual corridors and thicken the existing dense belt of tree canopies surrounding the park.

The proposed trees will also strengthen the east-west axis intersecting the central gathering plaza (following the main picnic areas) and the visual perspective of the main stairs, departing from the arrival plaza.

The sloped landscape above the beach on the north side of the site, will display native gardens and coastal grasses with very few canopy trees added, maintaining its current open character and its sweeping views of the bay.

Scattered trees will be added along the perimeter of the main lawn, particularly around the picnic areas surrounding the new pavilion. Additional scattered trees will punctuate the upper lawn/sculpted land form area, leaving visual corridors open towards the Bay.
EXISTING TREES LIKELY TO REMAIN

PROPOSED TREES

NOTE: Actual tree preservation to be considered on a case by case basis.
VIII - SITE FURNITURE AND PAVING MATERIALS
CENTRAL GATHERING AREA

BENITO: (ADA COMPLIANT ALSO AVAILABLE)  
CALZOLARI

DAPHNE  
RECLAIMED WOOD RECLINERS  
CUSTOM

EVENT AREA

ADA COMPLIANT GRAND TABLE  
DAPHNE
WATERFRONT

SEATING PODS

PICNIC AREAS
PLAY AREAS

TRASH CANS, DRINKING FOUNTAINS, BICYCLE RACKS, BOLLARDS

BENITO (OPTION AVAILABLE WITH "SWING FLAPS")

METALCO STREETLIFE

MCITE'

METALCO

METALCO

STREETLIFE

LANDSCAPE FORMS

ALL FURNITURE ITEMS SHOWN ARE INTENDED FOR DESIGN AND MATERIAL INSPIRATION ONLY AND ARE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FINAL SELECTIONS FOR THE PARK.
ART

KINETIC SCULPTURES

SUDELEY BENCH

MUSIC SCULPTURES
IX - SITE GRADING, DRAINAGE AND UTILITIES
The proposed grading design allows the accessible circulation routes to flow smoothly along the existing and proposed contours of the site, gradually descending from the higher elevations to the waterfront.

The removal of the existing road, connecting the parking lots to the waterfront, and the overall re-organization of pedestrian circulation, will imply a significant re-arrangement of the existing grades and a substantial amount of cut and fill.

For the entire Master Plan design, balance between cut and fill shows a predominance of fill (8,600 cubic yards of fill) versus the quantity of soil removed (about 4,000 cubic yards).
SITE DRAINAGE

Stormwater treatment for the project shall conform with the requirements of MCSTOPPP and the BASMAA Post-Construction Manual. Stormwater treatment will be managed through some of the following treatment applications:

Pervious concrete pavement and pavers, bioretention facilities to treat roof runoff.

Bioswales with check dams adjacent to impervious paths/roads incorporated into the native gardens and landscape design.
SITE UTILITIES

The master plan envisions the removal of the existing buildings (bathroom and ranger station) and the construction of new facilities. Utility relocations will be done so as to minimize interruptions to services to other facilities. The wastewater system will either be abandoned or removed via a permit through Marin County Environmental Health Services (EHS).

The existing bathroom is connected to an old septic tank, at the edge of the main lawn area, which will need to be removed. The current utility diagram assumes the use of holding tanks for the new buildings, however, connection to the existing sewer main for the new bathrooms is a preferred. If the new sewer lines will connect to a holding tank, Marin County EHS current regulations will be applicable. If the sewer lines will be connecting to the Tiburon Sanitary District No. 5, either an agreement with the District or annexation will be required. Connecting to the existing sewer main in Paradise Drive will require a lift station and a pressurized sewer lateral. Sewer lines will meet local code requirements: minimum pipe size for the connection to the new building will be a 4” pipe at 2% slope.

Fire and domestic water connections are anticipated to connect to the existing water system. The existing backflow preventer and fire department connection shall be inspected for reuse. A new backflow preventer shall be approved by the local Fire Marshal. The size of the connection, domestic water size and point of connection will need to be coordinated with the Plumbing Engineer.
X - REVENUE AND COST ANALYSIS
REVENUE OPPORTUNITIES

Several of the facilities proposed by the master plan have potential to generate revenue for the park:

1 - OUTDOOR KITCHEN/PAVILION - The kitchen facility would provide several independent cooking stoves that could be used both by individuals and large groups of people. Additionally the pavilion and its adjacent grounds could be rented for events.

2 - EVENT PAVILION - The pavilion and its surrounding picnic grounds could be rented for small and large scale outdoor events. The rental could potentially include the entire main lawn area.

3 - KAYAK RENTAL/STORAGE

4 - FOOD CONCESSION

5 - BOAT DOCK - Visitors accessing the park from the Bay could be charged an additional fee to dock their boat at the floating pier.
CONSTRUCTION PHASING

In order to fundraise and for planning and design purposes, the proposed improvements have been organized into the following phases:

PHASE 1 - PIER: The improvements include the installation of new railing, the proposed boat dock and all the additional furniture.

PHASE 2 - RETAINING WALL (northwest of the pier): The design of the retaining wall will need to address the current landslide problem and will set the framework for the future improvements (boardwalk below, slope stabilization and native gardens above).

PHASE 3 - WATERFRONT AT SEA WALL: The design of the waterfront will affect the area from the edge of the seawall to the landscape area behind the existing picnic grounds. In this phase the existing rangers station and bathroom buildings will be kept in place, and a temporary ADA parking lot will be added allowing an accessible path of travel.

PHASE 4 - WATERFRONT NORTHWEST OF PIER (boardwalk): These improvements include the entire length of the boardwalk, the swim docks and the two buildings (kayak rental/bathroom and concession) at the waterfront.

PHASE 5 - PARK GROUNDS: This phase includes the bulk of the landscape renovations. It will include the removal of the existing asphalt road, the construction of the arrival plaza and the new ADA parking, the stairs, the nature play areas and gardens and all the new paths of the park.

PHASE 6 - PAVILIONS AND GRAND STAIRS: This phase is limited to the construction of the two pavilions and the grand stairs.

PHASE 7 - UPPER PARK AREAS: These improvements include the sculpted landforms, and the nature play areas near at the redwood grove.

PHASE 8 - PARK ENTRY: This phase completes the park renovation and it includes the new entry sculptures and signage and adjustment of the landscape along the entry road.

Please refer to the opinion of probable cost on the subsequent pages which represents probable costs based on current construction figures and dollars. Actual costs may be higher or lower than figures shown within. Estimates are provided for planning purposes only. For a more accurate estimate a specific cost analysis will need to be provided by a professional estimator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Site Improvements</td>
<td>Demo existing Railing</td>
<td>995 LF</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6,418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patching of concrete at removed railing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>993 SF</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$14,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Site Amenity</td>
<td>Floating boat dock</td>
<td>1,826 SF</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$127,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps</td>
<td>160 LF</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Railing</td>
<td>964 LF</td>
<td>$460.00</td>
<td>$397,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Galvanized Steel posts, steel cables, wood top rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Site Furnishing</td>
<td>Raised Wrencher Seating</td>
<td>279 LF</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$166,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Custom design, wood stacked benches (2 levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wind Shelter Benches</td>
<td>48 LF</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 custom design wood benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiberglass Shelter</td>
<td>72 LF</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$4,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiberglass structure, 4' tall, along 3 sides for 6 benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$737,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Staining wall (north of pier)</td>
<td>Demo of the existing steps</td>
<td>57 LF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Site Amenity</td>
<td>Demolition of existing wall</td>
<td>438 LF</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation of existing concrete block</td>
<td>20 EA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete blocks, 4’ x 4’ x 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining wall (Cast in Place Concrete Wall - 7’high)</td>
<td>589 CY</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Custom design, board-finish concrete wall, with Intermountain signage incorporated (279 CY of concrete for the footings and 302 CY for the wall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,249,980.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Item Total</td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Waterfront at Seawall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demo Existing Asphalt</td>
<td>4879 SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4,879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete blocks, 4&quot; x 8&quot; x 2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retalocation of existing concrete blocks</td>
<td>30 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Cut, Excavate and Recompact On-Site</td>
<td>1,500 CY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>21,660 SF</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$12,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities removal and re-connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(assumes non-hazardous pipe materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water- and- electricity connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ejector Pump and grease interceptor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seawall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of existing wall</td>
<td>200 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$215.00</td>
<td>$43,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Sea Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Concrete Paving at water edge</td>
<td>1,103 SF</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$55,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; deep, marine resistant, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Concrete Paving at water edge (top of stairs)</td>
<td>106 SF</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot; deep, marine resistant, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete at Wind Rose</td>
<td>304 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; deep, marine resistant, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle colored concrete</td>
<td>2,867 SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$71,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot; deep, colored concrete, broom finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asphalt (temporary)</td>
<td>4,619 SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Paving at Picnic area</td>
<td>1,155 SF</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$51,975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstone paving w/s specialty resin binder (4&quot; depth w/ base, compaction and form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decomposed Granite (specialty resin binder)</td>
<td>2,488 SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$62,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>2358 SF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$701,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine Redwood, pressure treated sleepers, 1&quot; concrete base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8' Flush concrete curb</td>
<td>443 LF</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$8,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8' x 24&quot;, broom finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tidal path</td>
<td>560 SF</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special, 1&quot; deep, marine resistant, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive Signage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive signage (history, ecosystem, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>View point, arrival plaza - Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Amenity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining wall at stairs</td>
<td>98 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$19,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast In Place Concrete Wall - 4&quot; High, board finish, natural gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Seat Walls at Sea Wall</td>
<td>64 CY</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; High, marine concrete, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Steps at Sea Wall</td>
<td>9 CY</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$4,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine concrete, aggregate finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete stairs at waterfront plaza</td>
<td>34 CY</td>
<td>$461.00</td>
<td>$16,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colored Concrete, Broom Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Handrails</td>
<td>24 LF</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stainless steel, floor mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Handrails</td>
<td>77 LF</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
<td>$25,610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stainless steel, wall mounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete retaining wall at existing tree</td>
<td>56 LF</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete blocks, 4&quot; x 8&quot; x 2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lumber, steel, and relocated, concrete blocks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$137,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete blocks, 4&quot; x 8&quot; x 2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder (24&quot; x 48&quot;) (dim.)</td>
<td>143,055 LB</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$71,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Granite Boulders, 887 CF, 300 lb per CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rip rap (12&quot;) x (2&quot;)</td>
<td>223,410 LB</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>$38,386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Granite Boulders, 1354 CF, 156.8 lb per CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sculptural play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Classroom and view point, Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail at outdoor classroom and view point</td>
<td>30 LF</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galvanized posts, steel cables, wood top rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Furniture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trash receptacles</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>$685.00</td>
<td>$2,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape forms™ FGP 5881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire pit</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel Base, Boulders at perimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>$4,230.00</td>
<td>$12,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Life - X-PI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planting &amp; Irrigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees 24&quot; Box</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees 15 Gal</td>
<td>4 EA</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two thirds of the total trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting shrubs and grasses</td>
<td>11,394 EA</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$90,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 gallon plants, 18&quot; O.C. (32,660 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td>917 SF</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydroseeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top Soil</td>
<td>36 CY</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mulch</td>
<td>6,000 SF</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment Period</td>
<td>26,660 SF</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$16,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>21,660 SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$108,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,828,154.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - PHASE 3

IX - REVENUE AND COST ANALYSIS 65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Waterfront west of piers, Kayak rental, Bathrooms and Concession Building</td>
<td>1. Site Demo, Site Prep, Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>Earthwork, allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion Control, allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Utilities</td>
<td>Water and electricity connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewage connection and Ejector Pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Building</td>
<td>Kayak Rental and Bathrooms</td>
<td>1024 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$716,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>499 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Paving</td>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>5,278 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$1,583,400</td>
<td>Marine Redwood, pressure treated sleepers, 6&quot; concrete base at water edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopped boardwalk</td>
<td>694 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$277,600</td>
<td>Marine Redwood, pressure treated sleepers, 6&quot; concrete base, concrete risers at water edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Signage and Striping</td>
<td>Concrete paving at Kayak Rental/Bathrooms</td>
<td>320 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>Natural grey, Broome finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive signage (history, ecosystem, etc) at retaining wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Site Amenity</td>
<td>Railing</td>
<td>122 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$42,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floating piers (for swimmers)</td>
<td>333 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$19,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Site Furnishing</td>
<td>Tall &amp; Short urns</td>
<td>15 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood counter at railing</td>
<td>43 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$6,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stools</td>
<td>15 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice lounge chairs</td>
<td>9 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>Custom design, attached to railing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,192,840.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX - REVENUE AND COST ANALYSIS

OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - PHASE 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Main Park Grounds (Including ADA parking and pedestrian areas)</td>
<td>1.Site Demo, Site Prep, Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>Demo Excaviting Asphalt</td>
<td>17451 SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$214,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Cut, Excavate and Recompact On-Site</td>
<td>2,000 CY</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Import Fill, Recompress On-Site</td>
<td>5,500 CY</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>126,744 SF</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$75,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>126,744 SF</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$75,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>1,195 SF</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bathroom and Ranger station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water, Electricity lines (for future buildings and Ranger's station)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Ranger Station</td>
<td>425 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$979,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Concrete Paving</td>
<td>8,905 SF</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$120,705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4&quot;, Broom Finish, Colored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Concrete Paving</td>
<td>23,000 SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot;, Broom Finish, Colored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstone at Main Plaza</td>
<td>6,338 SF</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$272,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilized Decomposed Granite</td>
<td>17,662 SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$441,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grass/Turf at waiting area</td>
<td>1,914 SF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$19,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&quot; deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage and Striping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive signage for native garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At Native gardens in Arrival Area - Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayfinding signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Amenity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining wall for ADA parking (Cast in Place Concrete Wall - 7' High)</td>
<td>102 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$213.00</td>
<td>$21,936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board formed, natural gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete Wall</td>
<td>275 LF</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$30,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>2300.5 SF</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$164,154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colored Concrete, Broom finish, 1&quot; wide tread, 6&quot; nosing, includes stair railing and glass risers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Handrails</td>
<td>654 LF</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$98,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floor Mountain, Stainless steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pathway</td>
<td>464 LF</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,625</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.playgroundrock.com/clipart_rails.html">http://www.playgroundrock.com/clipart_rails.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature Play equipment - outdoor music sculptures</td>
<td>5 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ref: Medium Boulder 6' x 6' x 4' H, $9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- climbing wall</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- hammock stand</td>
<td>5 EA</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- wood stumps</td>
<td>40 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinetic Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire pit</td>
<td>6 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>44 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,230.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adirondack chairs</td>
<td>41 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$393.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chalet lounge chairs</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete sculptural Benches</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,137.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large dining table</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$688.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>2 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees 24&quot; Box</td>
<td>45 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees 15 Gal</td>
<td>90 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrubs &amp; Grasses</td>
<td>50,729 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$405,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td>32,983 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$183,302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top Soil</td>
<td>245 CY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mulch</td>
<td>50,729 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment Period</td>
<td>126,744 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>126,744 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$633,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,529,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX - REVENUE AND COST ANALYSIS

#### OPINION OF PROBABLE COST - PHASE 6 AND 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 6: Pavilions and Grandstands</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>Water, Electricity lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Covered in Area S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>Pavilion on Lower area</td>
<td>1777 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$1,421,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavilion on upper area</td>
<td>1630 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$1,304,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes perimeter walls and bathrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Steps</td>
<td>950 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>Colored Concrete, broom finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Handrails</td>
<td>96 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>Stainless Steel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,846,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 7: Upper Park Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,750</td>
<td>$11,750</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>230 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$28,250</td>
<td>Steel and wood structure, no walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Pedestrian-Colored Concrete Paving</td>
<td>2,876 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$57,520</td>
<td>Broom Finish 4&quot;, Colored Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Signage and Striping</strong></td>
<td>Interpretive signage (history, ecosystems, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Sculptural climbing/wall/climb/compound structure (height variable)</td>
<td>198 LF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$54,150</td>
<td>Ref: Bocce courts, <a href="http://www.boccenom.com/">http://www.boccenom.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bocce court</td>
<td>2 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- nature site equipment</td>
<td>4EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- wood stumps</td>
<td>5 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- tree climber</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,802</td>
<td>$8,802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- log tunnel</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,895</td>
<td>$11,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- wooden combination play system</td>
<td>2 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,755.27</td>
<td>$53,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Furnishings</strong></td>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>6 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,230</td>
<td>$25,380</td>
<td>Street Life - XPN model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moveable tables &amp; chairs</td>
<td>7 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>For Ref. Form, table $200 4chairs $400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planting &amp; Irrigation</strong></td>
<td>Trees 24&quot; Box</td>
<td>11 EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>$5,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shrubs &amp; Grass</td>
<td>5,500 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$44,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td>23,234 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$58,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top Soil</td>
<td>88 CY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mulch</td>
<td>3,599 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment Period</td>
<td>30,310 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$22,728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>30,310 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$151,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$448,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 8: Park Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Site Demo, Site Prep, Grading and Drainage</td>
<td>Demo Existing Asphalt</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove gate house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Cut, Excavate and Recompact On-Site</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erosion Control, allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Paving</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Signage</td>
<td>Entry signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Site Amenity</td>
<td>Arrival art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>Lump sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Site Furnishing</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$154,960</strong></td>
<td>$154,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARK TOTAL**

| Subtotal Park Cost               | $16,879,442          |
| Design Contingency               | 10% $1,687,944.20    |
| Soft Cost Contingency            | 20% $3,375,988.42    |
| TOTAL                            | $19,940,414          |

Opinion of Cost does not include Beach Restoration. All furniture products are listed for reference only.
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Sergio Lima
SWA Group
2200 Bridgeway Boulevard
Sausalito, CA 94965

Re: Inventory and Site Analysis, Paradise Beach County Park, Marin County, California

Dear Mr. Lima:

The purpose of this Inventory and Site Analysis is to provide a Biological and Cultural Resources Constraints Map of the site ecology, vegetation, species diversity, soils, drainage patterns, and sensitive cultural resources that are present at Paradise Beach County Park. This information is intended to help guide the planning process for the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan that is currently being prepared for Marin County Parks and will also be used in the environmental analysis for the Master Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Based on our review of existing information available for the park, as well as preliminary Master Plan design input, this assessment also identifies the potential need for additional technical studies and surveys that may be required in order to implement the Master Plan.

Existing Conditions of Project Area

Paradise Beach County Park is a 19-acre regional park located on the side of the Tiburon peninsula adjacent to the San Francisco Bay (Figure 1, Project Site Location Map). Having spectacular views of the Bay and with direct water access, the park is a popular destination for Marin County residents. The existing park features include a fishing pier, walking/hiking/jogging paths, outdoor teaching and environmental interpretation settings, wildlife viewpoints, sites for group events, various group picnic areas, informal lawn areas, a kayak launch, horseshoe court, modern restroom facilities, and a small beach with public access (Figure 2, Aerial of the Project Site). The park's peak use is generally during daylight hours on Saturdays and Sundays with sporadic use during the weekdays. The main activities at Paradise Beach County Park include group gatherings at the picnic areas and fishing off the pier. Special events, such as weddings, corporate functions, school outings, summer camps and filming, are also held on occasion.

The park is located in the unincorporated area of Marin County and within the Town of Tiburon's sphere of influence. The Town of Tiburon is a predominantly built out, low-density residential community.

Access to the park is from Paradise Drive via Trestle Glen Boulevard and Tiburon Boulevard (State Route 131). Paradise Drive is a local street that provides access for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians to and from the east and west. The site entrance is located at 3450 Paradise Drive.
Figure 1. Project Site Location Map
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**Regulatory Background**

**Local Plans, Policies, and Regulations**

The Master Plan is subject to the environmental protection policies of the Marin Countywide Plan. The Countywide Plan serves as the general plan for the unincorporated areas of the County and contains goals, policies, and programs that govern existing and future development. Land use designations and development of the project site is further governed by the Marin County Code, including Title 22 (Zoning), Title 23 (Natural Resources) and Title 24 (Development Standards).

**MARIN COUNTY CODE**

**TITLE 22- DEVELOPMENT CODE; Chapter 22.27- Native Tree Protection and Preservation**

Section 22.27.040 (k) - Exemption to the Prohibition of Removal of a Protected Tree states that the project proponent must demonstrate that the tree removal is by a public agency to provide for the routine management and maintenance of public land.

**TITLE 23- NATURAL RESOURCES**

The provisions of Title 23 are enacted to protect and promote the public health, safety and general welfare, to preserve environmental qualities, and to protect the value, worth and enjoyment of the use of real property to the fullest extent possible, through the regulation of the uses or activities of the property in a manner which will prevent serious public injury.

**MARIN COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

**Water Resources Policies**

WR-2.2: Reduce Pathogen, Sediment, and Nutrient Levels. Support programs to maintain pathogen and nutrient levels at or below target levels set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, including the efforts of ranchers, dairies, agencies, and community groups to address pathogen, sediment, and nutrient management in urban and rural watersheds.

WR-2.3: Avoid Erosion and Sedimentation. Minimize soil erosion and discharge of sediments into surface runoff, drainage systems, and water bodies. Continue to require grading plans that address avoidance of soil erosion and on-site sediment retention. Require developments to include on-site facilities for the retention of sediments, and, if necessary, require continued monitoring and maintenance of these facilities upon project completion.

WR-2.4: Design County Facilities to Minimize Pollutant Input. Design, construct, and maintain County buildings, landscaped areas, roads, bridges, drainages, and other facilities to minimize the volume of toxics, nutrients, sediment, and other pollutants in stormwater flows, and continue to improve road maintenance methods to reduce erosion and sedimentation potential.

**Noise Polices**

NO-1.1: Limit Noise from New Development. Direct the siting, design, and insulation of new development to ensure that acceptable noise levels are not exceeded.

**Hazards Polices**

EH-3.2: Retain Natural Conditions. Ensure that flow capacity is maintained in stream channels and floodplains, and achieve flood control using biotechnical techniques instead of storm drains, culverts, riprap, and other forms of structural stabilization.
**Aesthetics Polices**

**DES-4.1:** Preserve Visual Quality. Protect scenic quality and views of the natural environment — including ridgelines and upland greenbelts, hillsides, water, and trees — from adverse impacts related to development.

**Biological Resources Polices**

**BIO-2.7:** Protect Sensitive Coastal Habitat. Protect coastal dunes, streams, and wetlands, and sensitive wildlife habitat from development in accordance with coastal resource management standards in the development code.

**BIO-1.3:** Protect Woodlands, Forests, and Tree Resources. Protect large native trees, trees with historical importance; oak woodlands; healthy and safe eucalyptus groves that support colonies of monarch butterflies, colonial nesting birds, or known raptor sites; and forest habitats. Prevent the untimely removal of trees through implementation of standards in the Development Code and the Native Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. Encourage other local agencies to adopt tree preservation ordinances to protect native trees and woodlands, regardless of whether they are located in urban or undeveloped areas.

**San Francisco Bay and Shoreline Band**

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has regulatory jurisdiction, as defined by the McAteer-Petris Act, over San Francisco Bay (Bay), including San Pablo Bay, and its shoreline (the Shoreline Band), which generally consists of the area between the Bay shoreline and a line 100 feet landward of and parallel to the shoreline. In the northern end of the project site, natural, sandy beach is present. Any part of this beach that is below the mean high water line would be considered part of the Bay. The remaining eastern boundary of the project site is primarily unvegetated, riprapped shoreline, and anything landward of this boundary is not considered part of the Bay. However, the fishing pier extends into the Bay from the riprap shoreline and is thus potentially jurisdictional by BCDC. The eastern part of the park is part of the Shoreline Band. Though this 100-foot-wide zone is primarily composed of what would otherwise be considered non-sensitive biological communities, everything in it is potentially within BCDC jurisdiction. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) also has jurisdiction below the high tide line, which in this case includes parts of the beaches and riprap shoreline, as well as the fishing pier.

**County of Marin Protected and Heritage Trees**

Under the County of Marin Native Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (NTPPO), certain tree species with diameters ranging from a minimum of 6 to 10 inches at breast height, depending on the species, are considered Protected or Heritage trees and may require a permit for removal. A certified arborist survey is recommended if project activity will involve the removal of or impacts to potential protected or heritage trees.

**Environmental Constraints Map**

Figure 3 represents a constraints map of the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan project site. It includes the following layers: topographic survey of the project site, existing facilities, vegetation communities, soils, streams, culverts, and sensitive cultural resources. This map is to be treated confidentially and shall be reviewed only by qualified individuals unless the cultural resources layer is removed from the map.
Figure 3. Environmental Constraints Map

This figure has been removed as it contains Confidential Cultural Resource Information.
**Biological Site Inventory and Constraints Assessment**

As a part of the biological site inventory and constraints assessment prepared for the project site, the site was assessed for existing conditions and sensitive biological resources, including sensitive habitats and special-status species.

**Plants**

Eighty-six special-status plants have been documented in the vicinity of the project site. Two species, Brewer’s calandrinia (*Calandrinia breweri*) coastal triquetrella (*Triquetrella californica*), have moderate potential to occur, primarily due to the presence of disturbed coastal scrub habitat. Suitable habitat for the remaining 84 special-status plant species is not present in the project site, primarily due to a lack of serpentine substrate, marshy habitat, non-landscaped grassland, and various wooded habitats. No rare plants were documented at the project site during a site visit on November 8, 2012 and September 3, 2014.

Brewer’s calandrinia is known to occur in sandy or loamy disturbed sites or burns in coastal scrub and chaparral. At the project site, there are approximately 0.52 acres of coyote brush scrub and ruderal coastal scrub that have the potential to support this species.

Coastal triquetrella is known to occur on thin, gravelly, rocky, or sandy soil in coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland. It grows within 10 miles of the coastline and has been reported from trails, roadsides, picnic areas, playgrounds, and rock outcrops. The project site contains suitable rocky and sandy soils in coastal scrub and disturbed areas. Though this species is known from a small number of occurrences, its general habitat requirements make it difficult to rule out.

Under the NTPPO, certain tree species with diameters ranging from a minimum of 6 to 10 inches at breast height, depending on the species, are considered Protected or Heritage trees and may require a permit for removal. During the September 3, 2014, site visit, several trees were observed at the project site that may meet the size requirements of the NTPPO. However, measurements were not recorded. A certified arborist survey is recommended if project activity will involve the removal of or impacts to potential protected or heritage trees.

**Wildlife**

Eighty-four special-status wildlife species, four bird and one insect species with breeding sites/roosts protected by CDFW, and one commercially important fish have been documented to occur within the vicinity of the project site. Eighteen species have moderate or high potential to occur, primarily due to the presence of San Francisco Bay waters and oak woodland habitat on the site. Suitable habitat for the remaining 76 special-status wildlife species is not present in the project site, primarily due to a lack of tidal marsh, non-landscaped grassland, and freshwater wetland habitats. No special-status wildlife species were observed at the project site during a site visit on November 5, 2012 and September 3, 2014. Species with moderate or high potential to occur on the project site are discussed in more detail below.

**Fish**

Green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*), Federal Threatened Species, CDFW Species of Special Concern Green sturgeon is considered an anadromous species and utilizes both freshwater and saltwater habitats. Adults live in oceanic waters, bays, and estuaries, and
migrate to freshwater to spawn in deep pools in large, turbulent river mainstems. The study area does not contain spawning habitat for the species; however, green sturgeon have a moderate potential to occur in the study area as it is located within NMFS designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and provides marginal foraging habitat for the species. Additionally, the study area is within a migration corridor for the species and individuals may occur in the area during migration to suitable freshwater habitats.

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), Sacramento winter run ESU (Federal Endangered, State Endangered, NMFS jurisdiction), Central Valley spring run ESU (Federal Threatened, State Threatened, NMFS jurisdiction), and Central Valley Fall/Late Fall run ESU (CDFW Species of Special Concern). Moderate Potential. Chinook salmon are anadromous (adults migrate from a marine environment into the fresh water streams and rivers of their birth) and semelparous (spawn only once and then die). They are fairly faithful to the home streams in which they were spawned, using visual and chemical cues to locate these streams. Eggs are laid in large depressions (redds) hollowed out in gravel beds. Large pools with cold water are essential over-summering habitat for this species. These three ESUs of this species are anadromous and have a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Central California Coast DPS and Central Valley DPS, (Federal Threatened, NMFS jurisdiction). Moderate Potential. Steelhead are anadromous (sea-run) forms of rainbow trout that exhibit highly variable life histories. Within California, steelhead can occupy freshwater streams, estuaries or coastal marine waters, depending on their developmental stage. Steelhead utilize the San Francisco Bay as adults during migration and as smolts for migration, foraging, and rearing. The project site is within the range of the Central California Coast DPS and the Central Valley DPS for steelhead and within NMFS designated critical habitat for the species. The project site does not provide spawning habitat for the species; however, there is a moderate potential for this species to occur within the study area during migration. Additionally, the study area provides marginal rearing and foraging habitat for outmigrating smolts. These two DPSs of this species are anadromous and have a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

Longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*), Federal Candidate, State Threatened, CDFW Species of Special Concern. Longfin smelt is an anadromous smelt found in California’s bays, estuaries, and nearshore coastal environments, including San Francisco Bay. Adult longfin smelt are mostly found in mid-water or near the bottom of estuaries and bays, and migrate to freshwater or low salinity areas to spawn. In April and May, juveniles are believed to migrate downstream to San Pablo Bay. Juveniles tend to inhabit the middle and lower portions of the water column. Longfin smelt tend to be abundant near freshwater outflow, where higher-quality nursery habitat occurs and potential feeding opportunities are greater. This species is anadromous and has a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

River lamprey (*Lampetra ayresi*), CDFW Species of Special Concern. River lamprey prey on a variety of fishes in the 10-30 cm TL size range, but the most common prey seem to be herring and salmon. Unlike other species of lamprey in California, river lamprey typically attach to the back of the host fish, above the lateral line, where they feed on muscle tissue. Little is known about habitat requirements in California, but presumably, the adults need clean, gravelly riffles in permanent streams for spawning, while the ammocoetes require sandy backwaters or stream edges in which to bury themselves, where water quality is continuously high and temperatures do not exceed 25°C. Adults migrate back into fresh water in the fall and spawn during the
winter or spring months in small tributary streams. This species is anadromous and has a moderate potential to occur in San Francisco Bay waters within the project site en-route to spawning grounds in fresher waters further upstream.

**Pacific herring (Clupea pallasii).** Pacific herring is a coastal marine fish that uses large estuaries for spawning and early rearing habitat. Though this species is not listed as a sensitive species, it is of note because it is an important commercial fishery species in San Francisco Bay. On the basis of spawning biomass (i.e., an estimate of the number of spawning fish), the San Francisco Bay estuary is the most important spawning area for eastern Pacific populations of the species (CDFG, 2002). Pacific herring supports a commercial fishery, primarily for roe (herring eggs) but also for fresh fish, bait and pet food. In the Bay, the Pacific herring fishery is the last remaining commercial finfish fishery (BEIS 2003). The peak spawning period in San Francisco Bay and Tomales Bay is from January to March (Miller and Schmidtke 1956). Herring will typically spawn in rocky intertidal areas or areas with marine vegetation but may also spawn on boats, pilings, tires, and other debris. The species typically avoids spawning in sand and mud. Pacific herring have a high potential to occur in the study area as it contains pilings that provide suitable spawning structure for the species.

**Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)**

The project site is also located within designated as EFH for various life stages of fish species. Fishery Management Plans (FMP) for species with EFH within the Study Area include Pacific Groundfish FMP (e.g., English sole, brown rockfish, starry flounder, leopard shark etc.), Coastal Pelagic FMP (e.g., northern anchovy, Pacific sardine), and Pacific Coast Salmon FMP.

**Birds**

**Oak titmouse (Baeolophus inornatus), USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. High Potential.** The oak titmouse occurs in open woodlands oak woodland, open broad-leaved evergreen forests containing oaks, and riparian woodlands. The nest is built in woodpecker holes and natural cavities; titmice sometimes partially excavate their own cavity. There is a high potential for the bird to occur within the project site due to the presence of suitable oak woodland habitat, and it may forage within the landscape trees on the rest of the site.

**Nuttall’s woodpecker (Picoides nuttallii), USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. High Potential.** Nuttall’s Woodpecker, common in much of its range, is a year-round resident throughout most of California west of the Sierra Nevada. Typical habitat is oak or mixed woodland, and riparian areas (Lowther 2000). Nesting occurs in tree cavities, principally those of oaks and larger riparian trees. This species forages on a variety of arboreal invertebrates. The project site contains highly suitable woodland habitat for the species, and it may forage within the landscape trees on the rest of the site. Nuttall’s woodpecker has a high potential to occur in the study area.

**Allen’s hummingbird (Selasphorus sasin), USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Moderate Potential.** Allen’s Hummingbird, common in many portions of its range, is a summer resident along the majority of California’s coast and a year-round resident in portions of coastal southern California and the Channel Islands. Breeding occurs in association with the coastal fog belt, and typical habitats used include coastal scrub, riparian, woodland and forest edges, and eucalyptus and cypress groves (Mitchell 2000). This species feeds on nectar, as well as insects and spiders. Areas most likely to be utilized for breeding include riparian corridors interfacing with scrub habitats and planted tree groves. There is a moderate potential for Allen’s
hummingbird to occur in the project site, which contains some nectar-producing flowers and marginal breeding habitat for the species.

Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*), CDFW Species of Special Concern, USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Primarily a year-round resident in open habitats including woodland, grassland, savannah and agricultural areas. Prefers areas with sparse shrubs, trees, posts, and other suitable perches for foraging. Preys upon large insects and small vertebrates. Nests are well-concealed in a densely-foliaged shrub or tree. The project site contains woodland habitat that could support breeding in this species, and the mix of human-influenced and more natural habitats could support foraging.

Long-eared owl (*Asio otus*), CDFW Species of Special Concern. The long-eared owl is a resident in open woodlands, forest edges, riparian strips along rivers, and wooded ravines and gullies. Breeding habitat includes thickly wooded areas for nesting and roosting with nearby open spaces for foraging. There is a moderate potential for long-eared owl to occur in the woodland portions of the project site as trees may provide suboptimal oak-woodland edge habitat for nesting and individuals may occasionally use the area for foraging.

California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*), Federal Delisted, State Delisted, CDFW Fully Protected Species. The California brown pelican nests in colonies on offshore islands, from the Channel Islands southward, that are free of mammalian predators and human disturbance. This pelican is found throughout the San Francisco Estuary and nests and roosts on rocky or low brushy slopes of undisturbed islands. The species is a winter/non-breeding visitor to estuarine, marine subtidal, and marine pelagic waters along the California coast. Individuals use breakwaters, jetties, sand spits and offshore sand bars for loafing and night roosts. In the project area, there is a moderate potential for individuals to use the pier for daily loafing and may occasionally forage in the surrounding water. Nesting habitat is not supported in the study area as California brown pelicans do not nest in the San Francisco Bay area. Limited potential noise disturbance to loafing and foraging birds may occur; however, any disturbance associated with the project would be temporary and therefore not anticipated to impact the species.

American white pelican (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*); CDFW Species of Special Concern. This pelican is primarily an inland species, occurring in the San Francisco Bay region as a migrant and winter visitor (though it is found nearly year-round here). The nearest breeding locations are in northeastern California. Prey consists primarily of small, schooling fishes; foraging typically occurs in shallow waters, often cooperatively. On the project site, there is a moderate potential for individuals to use the pier for daily loafing and may occasionally forage in the surrounding water. Nesting habitat is not supported in the study area as American white pelicans do not nest in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mammals

Townsend's Western Big-Eared Bat, (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*), State Candidate (Threatened), CDFW Species of Special Concern, WBWG High Priority. Moderate Potential. This species ranges throughout western North America, from British Columbia to the central Mexico. They are typically associated with caves, but are also found in man-made structures, including mines and buildings. While many bats wedge themselves into tight cracks and crevices, big-eared bats hang from walls and ceilings in the open. Males roost singly during the spring and summer months while females aggregate in the spring at maternity roosts to give birth. Females roost with their young until late summer or early fall, until young become independent, flying and foraging on their own. Hibernation roosts tend to be made up of small
aggregations of individuals in central and southern California. Foraging occurs in open forest habitats where they glean moths from vegetation. This species may use accessible buildings on the project site for roosting and may forage in the area.

**Pallid bat** (*Antrozous pallidus*), CDFW Species of Special Concern, WBWG High Priority, Moderate Potential. The pallid bat is found in a variety of low elevation habitats throughout California. It selects a variety of day roosts including rock outcrops, mines, caves, hollow trees, buildings, and bridges. Night roosts are usually found under bridges, but also in caves, mines, and buildings. Pallid bats are sensitive to roost disturbance. Unlike most bats, pallid bats primarily feed on large ground-dwelling arthropods, and many prey are taken on the ground (Zeiner, et al. 1990). CNDDB records show maternity colonies found in residential buildings in the vicinity of the project site. (CDFW 2014). Suitable roost habitat is present throughout the site in tree cavities and accessible buildings. This species may also forage in the project site. Presence of this species may also indicate suitable habitat for other sensitive bats including such species as Townsend's big-eared bat and others.

**Soils**

According to the Soil Survey of Marin County, California (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2012), the predominant soil type at the project site is Tocaloma-McMullin complex, 50 to 75 percent slope. The Tocaloma series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed in material weathered from sandstone and shale. The McMullin series consists of shallow, well and somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in material weathered from shale, sandstone, basic igneous and metamorphic rocks. McMullin soils are on ridges and south-facing slopes in Oregon and on north-facing slopes in California.

Rocks of the Franciscan Complex comprise the geology of this area. The Franciscan Assemblage is primarily sandstone with mudstone, chert, limestone, conglomerate, serpentine, and schist. These rocks are from the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods of 200 to 65 million years ago.

**Cultural Resources**

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources survey for the Paradise Beach Park for the Inventory and Site Analysis (see Attachment A). The study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, contact with the Native American Heritage Commission and local Native American representatives, and field survey of the park. The report and portions of the summary provided below contains information regarding locations of archaeological resources. These resources are vulnerable to vandalism, and are protected by law. To safeguard these resources, this report should not be circulated publicly.

**Archival Study Findings**

Archival research for this study included lands within 0.5 miles of the study area. Research revealed that one of the first archaeological surveys to include this area was an inventory of San Francisco Bay shellmounds conducted by Nels Nelson circa 1907. Nelson's notes were used to create archaeological site records, and locations for the sites were placed on the archaeological base maps held at the NWIC. The NWIC base maps show four Nelson shellmounds (46, 47, 48, 49) within 0.5 miles of the park. Most of Nelson's sites have not been relocated, in part because his notes gave vague information about their locations, and he often used ambiguous terms (for instance, "up" and "down" to mean both north and south in direction, and higher and
lower in elevation). Also, with the passage of time the landscape has changed dramatically and many of his reference points are gone.

In 1989, a prehistoric archaeological site was identified. The site (CA-MRN-641) was documented by Richard Stradford and Sinead Norenius (1989). In 1996, a group from the College of Marin examined and prepared documentation for that part of the site (Goerke et al. 1996). Stradford and Norenius thought the site to be but that claim was questioned by Goerke et al. in 1996.

Research also found that most of the study area had yet not been surveyed for the presence of cultural resources. A small portion (9 by 11 feet) was surveyed in 2009 for a bicycle parking project sponsored by the Marin Department of Public Works (Koenig 2009).

No ethnographic villages or camps are reported within or near the study area (Barrett 1908).

There are no other local, state, or federally recognized historic properties within or near the study area (OHP 2012; State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976). Review of historical maps found no buildings, or other historical features within the study area prior to 1942 when the U.S. Army Corps map depicts two buildings (GLO 1856; USACE 1942; USCGS 1895, 1916, 1921; USGS 1899, 1942). As shown in Figure 3 of Attachment A, the property was heavily developed during the 1940s when the U.S. Navy built the Floating Drydock Training Facility.

Based on the results of the pre-field research, it was anticipated that prehistoric and historic cultural resources could be found within the study area. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected to be found in the region include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements such as slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles; and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone, shellfish, and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

Field Survey Findings

Archaeology

Field survey found no new archaeological sites. The portion of site CA-MRN-641 that is located on park property was found and note made of its current condition. Since the site was recorded in 1989, grading has occurred. Shell midden was observed. The site is subject to disturbance from continued use by park visitors and occasional maintenance. Supplemental documentation was completed and is included in this report as Appendix B.

Built Environment

There are no historical buildings or structures remaining in the study area. Surplus net weights from World War II are being used as a seawall but are not considered historical resources.
**Recommendations for Known Resources**

**Archaeology**

The location of site CA-MRN-641 should be excluded from future development. Historical photographs suggest that construction for the Navy's drydock school did not extend to the location of this site, and while the site has had some disturbance from park activities, its ability to yield important data is not necessarily impaired. No further ground disturbing work should occur in this area without having a treatment plan in place.

**Built Environment**

No historical buildings or structures are within the study area and no resource-specific recommendation are needed.

**Recommendations for Accidental Discovery**

There is the possibility that buried archaeological materials could be found. If buried materials are encountered, all soil disturbing work should be halted at the location of any discovery until a qualified archaeologist completes a significance evaluation of the find(s) pursuant to Section §15064.5 [f] of the CEQA guidelines. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected within the general area include: chipped chert and obsidian tools and tool manufacture waste flakes; grinding and hammering implements that look like fist-size river tumbled stones; and for some rare sites, locally darkened soil that generally contains abundant archaeological specimens. Historic remains expected in the general area commonly include items of ceramic, glass, and metal. Features that might be present include structure remains (e.g., cabins or their foundations) and pits containing historic artifacts.

The following actions are promulgated in Public Resources Code 5097.98 and Health and Human Safety Code 7050.5, and pertain to the discovery of human remains. If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location must be halted in the vicinity of the find, and the county coroner contacted. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity.

**Environmental Review**

Under the assumption that the Master Plan will qualify for a CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Declaration, WRA reviewed project information including the California Natural Diversity Data Base, existing stream and wetland data, aerial photography and a site visit. Based on this information as well as preliminary Master Plan design input, it is possible that additional studies, surveys and/or permits may be required by the County and/or regulatory agencies in order to implement the Master Plan. These efforts include but may not be limited to:

- Traffic Report (if proposed Master Plan improvements significantly increase the existing use of the park during weekdays and weekends).
- A certified arborist survey is recommended if project activity would involve the removal of or impacts to potential protected or heritage trees.
• Biological Surveys and Consultation (dependent upon final proposed Master Plan improvements and work windows)
  o Special Status Plant Species
    ▪ Brewer’s Calandrinia
    ▪ Coastal Triquetrella
  o Nesting Birds
  o Roosting Bats
  o Special-Status Fish, Critical Habitat, and Essential Fish Habitat consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service
• Phase II Cultural Resources Analysis (if Master Plan improvements are proposed within areas identified as being culturally sensitive).
• Consultation with BCDC may be necessary if work is to be done within the shoreline.
• Construction within the sandy beach and tidal waters may require permits from the Corps, and/or the RWQCB.
• In-water work would require consultation with NMFS for Special-Status Fish, Critical Habitat, and Essential Fish Habitat and surveys for may be recommended, depending on the location and extent of in-water work.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Geoff Reilly
WRA, Inc.

Attachments:
A. Cultural Resources Survey
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ABSTRACT

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources survey for the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan, Tiburon, Marin County, California. The study area included 19 acres, located in southern Marin County, about 1.25 miles north of Tiburon, on the east side of Paradise Drive. Geoff Reilly of WRA, Inc. requested the study, which was conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

This study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University (NWIC File No. 14-0230), examination of the library and files of Tom Origer & Associates, contact with the Native American Heritage Commission, and field inspection of the subject parcel. Field survey found that the previously known site, CA-MRNH-641 extends into the study area. No important historical-era resources were found. Documentation pertaining to this study is on file at the offices of Tom Origer & Associates (File No. 14-108).

Confidentiality Statement: This report contains information regarding locations of archaeological resources. These resources are vulnerable to vandalism, and are protected by law. To safeguard these resources, this report should not be circulated publicly.

Synopsis

Location: Tiburon, Marin County, California
Quadrangle: San Quentin 7.5’ series
Study Type: Intensive survey
APN: 058-041-03, 058-021-03, 058-021-02
Scope: 19 acres
Finds: A portion of prehistoric site CA-MRN-641
Project Personnel

This report was prepared by Vicki R. Beard, who has been with Tom Origer & Associates since 1990. Ms. Beard holds a Master of Arts in cultural resources management with an emphasis in historical resources, and meets the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for archaeology, history, and architectural history. Graduate coursework and applied studies included building and structure evaluation, and historical research. Post-graduate work has been completed in historical architecture through the Architecture Department at the University of California Berkeley; heritage resource management at the University of Nevada, Reno; and architectural history and historic landscapes through the National Preservation Institute, Alexandria, Virginia. Professional affiliations include the Society of California Archaeologists, Society of Architectural Historians, Northern California Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, and Vernacular Architecture Forum. She is also listed on the Register of Professional Archaeologists.

Fieldwork was completed by Nelson (Scotty) Thompson and Julia Franco. Mr. Thompson has been with Tom Origer & Associates since 1983. He has a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology from Sonoma State University, and has been working in California for over 30 years. Ms. Franco holds a Bachelor of Science in Anthropology from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. She is currently pursuing a Master of Arts in Cultural Resources Management at Sonoma State University.
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INTRODUCTION

This report describes a cultural resources survey for the Paradise Beach Park Master Plan, Tiburon, Marin County, California. Geoff Reilly of WRA, Inc. requested the study, which was conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. Documentation pertaining to this study is on file at Tom Origer & Associates (File No. 14-108).

Paradise Beach Park (study area) is located in southern Marin County, near the southeast end of the Tiburon Peninsula (Figure 1). The park consists of about 19 acres situated between Paradise Drive and San Francisco Bay. The Master Plan will address potential park improvements and recommendations for future use.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that cultural resources be considered during the environmental review process. This is accomplished by an inventory of resources within a study area and by assessing the potential that cultural resources could be affected by development.

This cultural resources survey was designed to satisfy environmental issues specified in the CEQA and its guidelines (Title 14 CCR §15064.5) by: (1) identifying all cultural resources within the project area; (2) offering a preliminary significance evaluation of the identified cultural resources; (3) assessing resource vulnerability to effects that could arise from project activities; and (4) offering suggestions designed to protect resource integrity, as warranted.

Figure 1. Project vicinity (adapted from the USGS 1970 San Francisco 1:250,000-scale map).
Resource Definitions

Cultural resources are classified by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) as sites, buildings, structures, objects and districts, and each is described by OHP (1995) as follows.

**Site.** A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

**Building.** A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. "Building" may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and jail, or a house and barn.

**Structure.** The term "structure" is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter.

**Object.** The term "object" is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment.

**District.** A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Significance Criteria

When a project might affect a cultural resource, the project proponent is required to conduct an assessment to determine whether the effect may be one that is significant. Consequently, it is necessary to determine the importance of resources that could be affected. The importance of a resource is measured in terms of criteria for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14 CCR, §4852) as listed below. A resource may be important if it meets any one of the criteria below, or if it is already listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register of historical resources.

An important historical resource is one which:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.

4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the pre-history or history of the local area, California, or the nation.
In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, eligibility for the California Register requires that a resource retains sufficient integrity to convey a sense of its significance or importance. Seven elements are considered key in considering a property’s integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The OHP advocates that all historical resources over 45 years old be recorded for inclusion in the OHP filing system (OHP 1995:2), although the use of professional judgment is urged in determining whether a resource warrants documentation.

**PROJECT SETTING**

**Study Area Location and Description**

The 19-acre study area is located in southern Marin County, on the southeast side of the Tiburon Peninsula, between Paradise Drive and San Francisco Bay, as shown on the San Quentin 7.5' USGS topographic quadrangle (Figure 2). A seasonal stream marks the southeastern boundary of the property, and a second seasonal stream runs through the study area to join the first near San Francisco Bay.

Soils of the study area are of the Tocaloma-McMullin complex, consisting of moderately deep and well-drained loam and gravelly loam (Kashagawi 1985:Sheet 13, 64-65). These soils derived from sandstone or shale and are found on uplands with slopes of from 50 to 75 degrees. Native vegetation supported by these soils consists primarily of hardwoods and brush.

Rocks of the Franciscan Complex comprise the geology of this area. The Franciscan Assemblage is primarily sandstone with mudstone, chert, limestone, conglomerate, serpentine, and schist. These rocks are from the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods of 200 to 65 million year ago.

**Cultural Setting**

Archaeological evidence indicates that human occupation of California began at least 11,000 years ago (Erlandson et al. 2007:59). Early occupants had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on the extended family unit. Later, milling technology and an inferred acorn economy were introduced. This diversification of economy appears to be coeval with the development of sedentism, and population growth and expansion. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archaeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of trade goods (e.g., shell beads, obsidian tool stone), which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems.

At the time of European settlement, the study area was included in the territory controlled by the Coast Miwok (Kelly 1978:414). The Coast Miwok were hunter-gatherers who lived in rich environments that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures (Barrett 1908; Kroeber 1925). Based on his study of mission records, Milliken (1995) describes the Richardson Bay vicinity as being controlled by the Huimens, a tribe of Coast Miwok speakers.

Historically, the study area is within the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, granted to John Reed in 1834 (Hoover et al. 1966:178). Reed died in 1843 leaving his wife, Hilaria, to manage his various enterprises, and in 1856 the U.S. Land Commission patented 4,469 acres of the rancho to Reed’s heirs (General Land Office [GLO] 1858).
Figure 2. Study area location (adapted from the 1980 USGS San Quentin 7.5’ map).
Prior to 1942, the Navy used this location for storing net weights and floats for the anti-submarine and anti-torpedo nets manufactured at the Navy Net Depot, located about 0.5 miles southeast of Paradise Cove Park. In November of 1942, the Navy began construction of the Floating Drydock Training Facility, Tiburon, which included "barracks, subsistence and administration buildings, a ship pier, and utility services" (Naval History & Heritage Command 1947). The Navy used floating drydocks extensively during World War II because often ship repairs were needed in remote areas. The drydocks followed the fleets, ready to provide support to crippled ships so that they would not need to return to port. At the Tiburon facility, specialized training was given to the officers and enlisted men needed to work the floating drydocks. Mid-20th century photographs and topographic maps (Figure 3) show the development that encompassed most of today's Paradise Cove Park (Fanning 2006; USACE 1948).

**STUDY PROCEDURES**

**Native American Contact**

A request was sent to the State of California’s Native American Heritage Commission seeking information from the sacred lands files, which track Native American cultural resources, and the names of Native American individuals and groups that would be appropriate to contact regarding this project. The Native American Heritage Commission replied with a letter dated September 2, 2014, in which they indicated that the sacred land file has no information about the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area.

Letters were also sent to the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, and the Ya-Ka-Ama Indian Educational Center.

Nick Tipon responded on behalf of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, seeking information regarding the lead agency so that the Tribe could contact them directly. No other responses have been received as of the date of this report. A log of contact efforts is appended to this report, along with copies of correspondence (see Appendix A).

**Archival Study Procedures**

Archival research included examination of the library and project files at Tom Origer & Associates. A review was completed of the archaeological site base maps and records, survey reports, and other materials on file at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park (NWIC File No. 14-0230). Sources of information included but were not limited to the current listings of properties on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and California Points of Historical Interest as listed in the Office of Historic Preservation’s *Historic Property Directory* (OHP 2012).

The Office of Historic Preservation has determined that structures older than 45 years should be considered potentially important historical resources, and former building and structure locations could be potentially important historic archaeological sites. Archival research included an examination of historical maps to gain insight into the nature and extent of historical development in the general vicinity, and especially within the study area. Maps ranged from hand-drawn maps of the 1800s to topographic quadrangles issued by the United States Geological Survey (USGS).
In addition, ethnographic literature that describes appropriate Native American groups, county histories, and other primary and secondary sources were reviewed. Sources reviewed are listed in the "Materials Consulted" section of this report.

Archival Study Findings

Archival research for this study included lands within 0.5 miles of the study area. Research revealed that one of the first archaeological surveys to include this area was an inventory of San Francisco Bay shellmounds conducted by Nels Nelson circa 1907. Nelson's notes were used to create archaeological site records, and locations for the sites were placed on the archaeological base maps held at the NWIC. The NWIC base maps show four Nelson shellmounds (46, 47, 48, 49) within 0.5 miles of the park. Most of Nelson's sites have not been relocated, in part because his notes gave vague information about their locations, and he often used ambiguous terms (for instance, "up" and "down" to mean both north and south in direction, and higher and lower in elevation). Also, with the passage of time the landscape has changed dramatically and many of his reference points are gone.

In 1989, a prehistoric archaeological site was identified [CA-MRN-641]. The site was documented by Richard Stradford and Sinead Norenius (1989). In 1996, a group from the College of Marin examined the adjacent parcel and prepared documentation for that part of the site (Goerke et al. 1996). Stradford and Norenius thought the site to be [CA-MRN-641], but that claim was questioned by Goerke et al. in 1996.

Research also found that most of the study area had yet not been surveyed for the presence of cultural resources. A small portion (9 by 11 feet) was surveyed in 2009 for a bicycle parking project sponsored by the Marin Department of Public Works (Koenig 2009).

No ethnographic villages or camps are reported within or near the study area (Barrett 1908).

There are no other local, state, or federally recognized historic properties within or near the study area (OHP 2012; State of California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976).

Review of historical maps found no buildings, or other historical features within the study area prior to 1942 when the U.S. Army Corps map depicts two buildings (GLO 1856; USACE 1942; USCGS 1895, 1916, 1921; USGS 1899, 1942). As shown in Figure 3, the property was heavily developed during the 1940s when the U.S. Navy built the Floating Drydock Training Facility.

Based on the results of the prefield research, it was anticipated that prehistoric and historic cultural resources could be found within the study area. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected to be found in the region include: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements such as slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles; and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of bone, shellfish, and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).
Field Survey Procedures

An intensive field survey was completed on October 1, 2014, by Nelson Thompson and Julia Franco of Tom Origer & Associates. Visibility was fair, with vegetation being the chief hindrance. As needed, hoes were used to clear vegetation so that the ground surface could be inspected, and cut banks and the perimeters of buildings and paving were inspected.

Field Survey Findings

Archaeology

Field survey found no new archaeological sites. The portion of site CA-MRN-641 that is located on park property was found and note made of its current condition. Since the site was recorded in 1989, grading has occurred. Shell midden was observed. The site is subject to disturbance from continued use by park visitors and occasional maintenance. Supplemental documentation was completed and is included in this report as Appendix B.

Built Environment

There are no historical buildings or structures remaining in the study area. Surplus net weights from World War II are being used as a seawall but are not considered historical resources.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Known Resources

Archaeology
The location of site CA-MRN-641 should be excluded from future development. Historical photographs suggest that construction for the Navy's drydock school did not extend to the location of this site, and while the site has had some disturbance from park activities, its ability to yield important data is not necessarily impaired. No further ground disturbing work should occur in this area without having a treatment plan in place.

Built Environment
No historical buildings or structures are within the study area and no resource-specific recommendation are needed.

Accidental Discovery
There is the possibility that buried archaeological materials could be found. If buried materials are encountered, all soil disturbing work should be halted at the location of any discovery until a qualified archaeologist completes a significance evaluation of the find(s) pursuant to Section §15064.5 [f] of the CEQA guidelines. Prehistoric archaeological site indicators expected within the general area include: chipped chert and obsidian tools and tool manufacture waste flakes; grinding and hammering implements that look like fist-size river tumbled stones; and for some rare sites, locally darkened soil that generally contains abundant archaeological specimens. Historic remains expected in the general area commonly include items of ceramic, glass, and metal. Features that might be present include structure remains (e.g., cabins or their foundations) and pits containing historic artifacts.

The following actions are promulgated in Public Resources Code 5097.98 and Health and Human Safety Code 7050.5, and pertain to the discovery of human remains. If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location must be halted in the vicinity of the find, and the county coroner contacted. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity.

SUMMARY

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources survey of the 19-acre Paradise Beach County Park on the Tiburon Peninsula, Marin County. This report contributes to a Master Plan being prepared for the park. The study was requested by Geoff Reilly of WRA, Inc. A portion of prehistoric archaeological site CA-MRN-641 was found within the study. Recommendations were made for its preservation.
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APPENDIX A

Native American Consultation
# Native American Contact Efforts

**Paradise Beach Park Master Plan**  
*Tiburon, Marin County*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Native American Heritage Commission               | Form sent    | 08/25/14  | Letter received 09/02/14  
No known resources in the vicinity.                                                                                                     |
| Debbie Pilas-Treadway                             |              |           |                                                                                                                                         |
| Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria             | Letters sent | 09/02/14  | Nick Tipon called on behalf of the Tribe and was provided information about the lead agency so that he could contact them directly.       |
| Gene Buvelot                                      |              |           |                                                                                                                                         |
| Greg Sarris                                       |              |           |                                                                                                                                         |
| Ya-Ka-Ama                                         | Letter sent  | 09/02/14  | No comments have been received as of the date of this report. Ya-Ka-Ama has asked us not to call them. They will call us if they have comments. |
| Board of Directors                                |              |           |                                                                                                                                         |
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
915 Capitol Mall, RM 364
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@pacbell.net

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project: Paradise Beach
County: Marin

USGS Quadrangles

Name: San Quentin
Township T1N Range R5W Section(s) Corte de Madera del Presidio MDBM

Date: August 25, 2014
Company/Firm/Agency: Tom Origer & Associates
Contact Person: Vicki Beard

Street Address: PO Box 1531
City: Rohnert Park Zip: 94927
Phone: (707) 584-8200 Fax: (707) 584-8300
Email: origer@origer.com

Project Description:

The project proponent is preparing an initial study for the Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan.
September 2, 2014

Vicki Beard
Tom Origer & Associates
P.O. Box 1531
Rohnert Park, CA 94927

Sent by Fax: (707) 584-8300
Number of Pages: 2

Re: Paradise Beach, Marin County.

Dear Ms. Beard,

A record search of the sacred land file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3712.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Katy Sanchez
Associate Government Program Analyst
Native American Contact List
Marin County
August 29, 2014

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Gene Buvelot
6400 Redwood Drive, Ste 300 Rohnert Park, CA 94928
coastmiwok@aol.com
(415) 279-4844 Cell
(707) 566-2288 ext 103
Coast Miwok
Southern Pomo

Ya-Ka-Ama
7465 Steve Olson Lane Forestville, CA 95436
cbeau@yakaama.org or (707) 887-1541
Pomo
Coast Miwok
Wappo

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Greg Sarris, Chairperson
6400 Redwood Drive, Ste 300 Rohnert Park, CA 94928
coastmiwok@aol.com
(707) 566-2288 Office
(707) 566-2291 Fax
Coast Miwok
Southern Pomo

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5587.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5997.95 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Paradise Beach Project, Marin County.
September 2, 2014

Gene Buvelot  
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria  
6400 Redwood Drive, Suite 300  
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Re: Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan, Marin County

Dear Mr. Buvelot:

I write to notify you of a proposed project in Marin County, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. We are part of a team preparing an Initial Study/MND for the Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan. The Master Plan is being completed for Marin County Parks.

The park includes about 19 acres off of Paradise Drive on the Tiburon Peninsula. Enclosed is a portion of the San Quentin 7.5’ USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,

Vicki Beard  
Senior Associate
September 2, 2014

Greg Sarris
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
6400 Redwood Drive, Suite 300
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Re: Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan, Marin County

Dear Mr. Sarris:

I write to notify you of a proposed project in Marin County, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. We are part of a team preparing an Initial Study/MND for the Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan. The Master Plan is being completed for Marin County Parks.

The park includes about 19 acres off of Paradise Drive on the Tiburon Peninsula. Enclosed is a portion of the San Quentin 7.5’ USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,

Vicki Beard
Senior Associate
September 2, 2014

Ya-Ka-Ama
7465 Steve Olson Lane
Forestville, CA 95436

Re: Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan, Marin County

To Whom it May Concern:

I write to notify you of a proposed project in Marin County, for which our firm is conducting a cultural resources study. We are part of a team preparing an Initial Study/MND for the Paradise Beach County Park Master Plan. The Master Plan is being completed for Marin County Parks.

The park includes about 19 acres off of Paradise Drive on the Tiburon Peninsula. Enclosed is a portion of the San Quentin 7.5’ USGS topographic quadrangle showing the project location.

Sincerely,

Vicki Beard
Senior Associate
Study location (adapted from the 1980 USGS San Quentin 7.5' map).
Appendix B

Resource Documentation
CA-MRN-641

This Appendix has been removed as it contains Confidential Cultural Resource Information.
PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

Paradise Beach Park
3450 Paradise Drive
Tiburon, California 94920
Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 & 058-021-04

Project No. 0794,001.15

Prepared for:

Marin County Parks
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite #260
San Rafael, California 94903

Prepared by:

EDD CLARK & ASSOCIATES, INC.
P.O. Box 3039
Rohnert Park, California 94927
Phone: (707) 792-9500
Fax: (707) 792-9504

[Signature]
Kevin L. Coker
Environmental Professional

November 24, 2015
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following is the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report on the property known as Paradise Beach Park, with the physical address of 3450 Paradise Drive in Tiburon, California. The property known as Paradise Beach Park consists of three contiguous parcels of land with Marin County Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, totaling approximately 13.96-acres of land. Figures with various views of the site and area including topography and parcel boundaries are presented in Appendix A. This ESA was performed by Edd Clark and Associates, Inc. (EC&A) at the request of the Marin County Open Space District to identify Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) in connection with the properties described above. Hereafter in this report, the properties described above will be referred to as the subject site or subject property.

The purpose of this report is to provide information regarding Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) on or near the subject site. In general, this ESA follows the guidelines established by the American Society for Testing and Materials’ (ASTM’s) Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process (E1527-13). This ESA is intended to permit a user to satisfy one of the requirements to qualify for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser protection as described in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the California Health and Safety Code; that is the “all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice as defined at 42 U.S.C. 9601(35)(B)”.

The Scope of Services for this ESA consisted of four tasks:

- Task 1: Research and review of regulatory information
- Task 2: A site reconnaissance of subject and nearby properties
- Task 3: Interviews of persons with knowledge of subject and surrounding property
- Task 4: Preparation of this ESA report

1.1 Site Description and Current Use

The subject property, known as Paradise Beach Park, consists of three contiguous parcels of land with Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, totaling approximately 13.96-acres of land, located in the incorporated community of Tiburon, California. APN 058-021-04 is an approximately 11.93-acre parcel of land which comprises a majority of Paradise Beach Park; APN 058-021-03 is an approximately 1.7-acre parcel of sub-tidal land which contains an 302 foot (ft) long concrete pier with a t-shaped 194-ft long end; and APN 058-021-04 is a narrow rectangular-shaped sliver consisting of approximately 0.33-acres of land containing part of the concrete pier and some sub-tidal land. The primary physical address associated with the subject site is 3450 Paradise Drive. The subject site contains asphalt paved parking areas and walking paths, large lawn areas, public boat launch, picnic facilities, a park maintenance shed, staff kiosk, staff office building, restrooms, a public access beach and a T-shaped concrete pier. Site
photographs depicting current site conditions and views of adjacent lands are presented in Appendix B.

1.2 Standard and Additional Environmental Records Search
The subject property was not listed on any of the databases searched by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). The EDR records search only identified two facilities within the requested search radii, identified as 3150 Paradise Drive (Tiburon Navy Depot/Tiburon Marine Fishery Service). This facility is located over approximately 2500 feet (ft) to the southeast of the subject site. Due to its distance, groundwater flow-directions relative to the site, the nature of the reported release and/or information obtained from a review of available regulatory files, this facility does not represent a threat of adverse environmental impact to the subject property.

A review of available regulatory files for the subject site did not reveal any information regarding historical underground storage tanks (USTs), aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), hazardous materials spills or leaks, improper disposal of hazardous materials and/or wastes used at the subject property or adjoining parcels, or other significant environmental concerns associated with hazardous materials use which may have caused a significant environmental impact to the subject property.

1.3 Physical Setting
The subject property is situated in the unincorporated Marin County community of Tiburon, California, on the eastern shore of the Tiburon Peninsula. The Tiburon Peninsula extends south into the San Francisco Bay and is separated from Marin County mainland by Richardson Bay. The subject property is bordered by San Francisco Bay to the north, Paradise Drive to the south and by residential developments to the east and west. Land rises from the Bay to the south, with elevations at the subject site ranging from approximately mean sea level (msl) near the subject site’s northern boundary, to approximately 110 ft above msl adjacent to the roadway and southern site boundaries. According to the EDR Radius Report, the northern portions of the subject site are located within the 100-year flood zone of San Francisco Bay.

1.4 Historical Use of Subject Property
A review of available historical sources indicates that the subject site was first developed in 1942 when the U.S. Navy constructed the Floating Drydock Training Center Annex at the subject property to house and train officers for overseas ship repair. Use of the subject site for this purpose reportedly continued through early 1958, when these uses ceased. The subject site was then acquired by Marin County in 1959, and following removal of debris and structures formerly used by the Navy, was developed into Paradise Park beginning in approximately 1969. Use of the subject site as Paradise Beach Park has continued to the present.

Prior to the subject site’s first reported development in 1942, it may have partially been used for cattle grazing, consistent with regional historical uses on the Tiburon Peninsula. Prior to the subject site’s purported use for livestock grazing as part of greater area-wide ranches, it was
included within the boundaries of the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834.

1.5 Recognized Environmental Conditions
Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) are defined by ASTM Standard Practice E1527-13 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to a release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. In the course of performing this ESA, EC&A did not identify any Recognized Environmental Conditions associated with the subject property or any of the adjoining parcels.

1.6 De Minimis Conditions, Data Gaps and Vapor Encroachment Concerns
During the preparation of this Phase I ESA, EC&A did not encounter any data gaps that would diminish EC&A’s ability to provide an opinion on a release or potential release of hazardous substances at the subject property.

No de minimis conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

EC&A conducted an evaluation for vapor encroachment concerns (VECs) using methodology established in ASTM Standard of Practice E2600-10. Based on a review of available information, EC&A did not identify any VECs at the subject site.

1.7 Conclusions
EC&A has performed this ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E-1527-13 of the property known as Paradise Beach Park, with the primary physical address of 3450 Paradise Drive, designated as Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, located in the unincorporated community of Tiburon, California. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.4 and 2.5 of this Report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the subject property.

This report is governed by the Limitations set forth in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this report. This Executive Summary is not to be used without the accompaniment of the entire report.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose
The purpose of this ESA is to establish whether there are RECs on or near the subject property. RECs are defined as those contaminants identified in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and petroleum products. RECs are defined as follows:

The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products, in, on or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. RECs are additionally defined as any hazardous substances or petroleum products that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures, on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include de minimis conditions that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. Conditions determined to be de minimis are not recognized environmental conditions. (ASTM E1527-13)

Pursuant to the ASTM Standard of Practice E1527-13, RECs do not include asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), lead-based paint (LBP) or other non-CERCLA-related conditions (i.e. radon gas, lead in drinking water, mold, indoor air quality, etc.). However, an evaluation of the potential for VECs to be present at the subject site was conducted, using methodology established in ASTM Standard of Practice E2600-10, the results of which are included in Section 1.6 above.

2.2 Scope of Services
The scope of services for this ESA generally follows the Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments (ASTM E1527-13). Accordingly, it is intended to focus on the contaminants defined by CERCLA, and petroleum products. As such, “all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the property consistent with good commercial or customary practice” as defined in 42 USC 9601(35) (B) is applied. However, an evaluation of business environmental risk associated with a parcel of commercial real estate may necessitate investigation beyond that identified in this ESA.

The scope of services includes inspection of the site and area for RECs, and acquisition of information that can be obtained from regulatory agency files that are obtainable without accessing the archives of the various agencies. Accordingly, it cannot be guaranteed that all files are examined or that every possible condition is evaluated.
The records review includes files available at State, County and/or City offices listed in Section 5.2 of this report. In some cases, the status of a site is established from telephone interviews of staff persons in these offices. For nearby leaking underground storage tank (LUST), Drycleaners, SLIC and other Cleanup program sites, information available online at GeoTracker and/or actual case files may be reviewed, as deemed appropriate. The site reconnaissance includes observation of nearby properties from locations on the site, or public roadways. Interviews, including those of persons known or suspected of being familiar with the history of the site, persons reasonably available at the time of the site inspection(s), and on occasion, by telephone when such interviews are possible were performed.

The scope of services for this ESA does not include a survey for, or analyses of, construction materials that may contain asbestos; however, any obvious indications of its presence are reported. Neither does the scope of services include a survey for, or analyses of, onsite structures for lead-based paint or other non-CERCLA-related conditions (i.e., radon gas, lead in drinking water, mold, indoor air quality, etc.). However, if there is suspicion that these substances or conditions may be present, professionals licensed to assess their presence should be contacted. EC&A can assist with references for such professionals, if requested. For buildings constructed prior to 1981, the Code of Federal Regulations (29 CFR 1916.1101 and 29 CFR 1910.1001) define presumed asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) to be present in numerous types of building materials. In buildings constructed after 1978, it is unlikely that lead-based paint (LBP) is present. Structures built prior to 1978 and especially prior to the 1960s, should be expected to contain LBP. Based on the ages of the site structures, it is likely that ACMs and LBP were used in subject site building materials. As such, prior to any demolition, handling, or disposal of building materials, it may be required by regulatory authorities to conduct a survey for the presence of suspect ACMs and LBP by properly licensed professionals.

2.3 Significant Assumptions
This ESA is intended to assess the environmental conditions of a specific parcel of real estate. It is also intended to constitute appropriate inquiry for purposes of the CERCLA-innocent landowner defense; however, it is not intended to be limited to that purpose. Finally, this ESA is intended to reflect a commercially prudent and reasonable inquiry designed to recognize the environmental conditions of a property.

2.4 Limitations and Exceptions
The scope of services performed to complete this ESA was limited in nature. While this type of work is considered to be valuable in the preliminary evaluation of the possibility of the site being impacted by hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons, it may not reveal releases of these substances that have occurred. Additionally, site conditions can change with time, and this ESA is not intended to predict how those changes will impact the property. The limited nature of an ESA prevents it from being considered to be a risk assessment. Additionally, the scope of services does not include a determination of the extent of business environmental risk or the possible public health impact of known or suspected hazardous substance(s) or petroleum products.
This service has been performed in accordance with generally accepted environmental investigation practices for similar studies conducted at this time and in this geographic area. No other guarantees or warranties, expressed or implied, are provided.

It is understood by the parties hereto that the party who has requested this ESA will use it to evaluate site environmental conditions. EC&A intends no other use or disclosure. Client agrees to hold EC&A harmless for any inverse condemnation or devaluation of said property that may result if this ESA or information generated from it is used for other purposes. This ESA is issued with the understanding that it is to be used only in its entirety.

2.5 User Reliance
This ESA is intended for use only by the Marin County Open Space District and/or their assignees. If other parties wish to rely on it, please have them contact EC&A so that a mutual understanding and agreement of the terms and conditions for its use can be established.

2.6 Involved Parties
Marin County is the current listed owner of the subject property, identified as Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04. EC&A was retained by the Marin County Open Space District to conduct this ESA to identify RECs in connection with the subject property.

2.7 Data Gaps and De Minimis Conditions
Data Gaps
Data gaps occur when required information is missing despite the good faith efforts made by the environmental professional to gather such information. An attempt was made to obtain readily available historical sources at appropriate time intervals back to at least the 1940s, or first reported development of the subject property. Data gaps in our historic research, which ranged between 1895 and 2015, were encountered. Data failure occurs when a significant (10 years or more) gap of time exists between two historic sources and a reasonable effort has been made to obtain additional sources of information. Although data failure with respect to historic research, as defined in the ASTM standard has occurred, it does not diminish EC&A’s ability to provide an opinion on a release or potential release of hazardous substances at the subject property.

No de minimis conditions were identified during the preparation of this Phase I ESA.

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 Site Location and Legal Description
The subject property is located in the unincorporated Marin County community of Tiburon, California. The subject property consist of three contiguous parcels of land, totaling 13.96-acres, with Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, with the primary physical address of 3450 Paradise Drive, Tiburon, California.

3.2 Site and Vicinity General Characteristics
The subject property is situated in the unincorporated Marin County community of Tiburon, California, on the eastern shore of the Tiburon Peninsula. The Tiburon Peninsula extends south
into the San Francisco Bay and is separated from Marin County mainland by Richardson Bay. The subject property is bordered by San Francisco Bay to the north, Paradise Drive to the south and by residential developments to the east and west. Land rises from the Bay to the south, with elevations at the subject site ranging from approximately msl near the subject site’s northern boundary, to approximately 110 ft above msl adjacent to the roadway and southern site boundaries. According to the EDR Radius Report, the northern portions of APN 058-021-04 are located within the 100-year flood zone of San Francisco Bay.

3.3 Current Use of the Property
The subject property, known as Paradise Beach Park, consists of three contiguous parcels of land with Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, totaling approximately 13.96-acres of land, located in the incorporated community of Tiburon, California. APN 058-021-04 is an approximately 11.93-acre parcel of land which comprises a majority of Paradise Beach Park; APN 058-021-03 is an approximately 1.7-acre parcel of sub-tidal land which contains part of the concrete pier and some sub-tidal land. The primary physical address associated with the subject site is 3450 Paradise Drive. The subject site contains asphalt paved parking areas and walking paths, large lawn areas, public boat launch, picnic facilities, restrooms, a staff office building, staff kiosk, park maintenance shed, a public access beach and a T-shaped concrete pier. Site photographs depicting current site conditions and views of adjacent lands are presented in Appendix B.

3.4 Descriptions of Improvements

3.4.1 Structures
There is a public restroom facility, park maintenance shed, staff kiosk and park office building located at the subject site. Picnic benches, solid waste disposal containers, barbeque pits, benches, a horseshoe pit and other public picnic facilities are located at the subject site. A seawall is installed along the subject site’s northern borders, along San Francisco Bay and a 302 ft long concrete fishing pier with a T-shaped 194-ft long end is also present at the subject site. EC&A understands that the public restroom is an old haydite block building constructed in the 1940s by the Navy and upgraded with a wood covering; the staff office building was reportedly constructed approximately 15 years ago; and the maintenance shed was constructed in the 1970s and also upgraded with wood covering approximately 15 years ago.

3.4.2 Roads
Paradise Drive borders the subject site to the south, and provides access to Paradise Park. An asphalt entrance driveway provides access to the subject site off of Paradise Drive.

3.4.3 Heating and Cooling Systems
EC&A understands that there are no heating or cooling systems in any of the site buildings and that portable heaters and fans are used as needed.

3.4.4 Sewage Disposal
EC&A understands that a septic tank and leach field are located adjacent to the public restroom facilities at the subject site. EC&A is not aware of any violations associated with the onsite septic system.
3.4.5 Water Supply
EC&A understands that the subject site is connected to the municipal water supply.

3.5 Current Use of the Adjoining Properties
The subject property is bordered by San Francisco Bay to the north, Paradise Drive to the south and by residential developments to the east and west.

4.0 USER-PROVIDED INFORMATION

4.1 Title Records, Environmental Liens, Activity and Use Limitations, Specialized Knowledge, Value Reduction for Environmental Issues, Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information

The purpose of this section of the ESA Report is to identify tasks that will help identify the possibility of RECs in connection with the subject property. In general, the tasks are:

1). Searches for Environmental Liens;
2). Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues; and
3). Assessments of Specialized Knowledge.

These tasks do not require technical expertise and Environmental Professionals do not normally perform these tasks. These tasks are the responsibility of the Client and/or User. The User did not request EC&A to coordinate with a title company or title professional to undertake a review of Recorded Land Title Records and judicial records for environmental liens or Activity and Use Limitations (AULs). However, the results of these tasks must be made available for the Environmental Professionals to review; if none are provided they will be identified as “data gaps”. The Environmental Professional(s) are required to review these items in order to formulate an opinion regarding the obviousness of the presence or likely presence of contamination at the subject property or identify them as missing “data gaps”.

Review of Title and Judicial Records for Environmental Liens or AULs is the responsibility of the user of the Phase I ESA Report; however, EDR performed a search for environmental liens and activity and use limitations under an Inquiry dated November 16, 2015 (Appendix C) for APN 058-021-04. The EDR lien search report states that no environmental liens or activity and use limitations were identified for this parcel. No title documents were provided for review to the environmental professional and review of such documents were not in the scope of this report.

The user indicated no knowledge of any environmental cleanup liens filed or recorded against the subject property or site activity and no knowledge of AULs that are in place on either of the subject property or that have been filed or recorded in a registry.

4.2 Valuation Reduction for Environmental Issues
An assessment of the relationship of the purchase price to the fair market value of the subject property, assuming there is no contamination on the site, is required under 40 CFR Part 312,
Section 312.29 to maintain innocent landowner defense. The sections from the federal document are summarized below:

1). Persons to whom this part is applicable must consider whether the purchase price of the subject property reasonably reflects the fair market value of the property, assuming there is no contamination on the property; and

2). Persons who conclude that the purchase price of the subject property does not reasonably reflect fair market value, if the property were not contaminated, should consider whether or not the differential in purchase price and fair market value is due to the presence of releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances.

No current appraisal reports were provided to EC&A for review. However, anecdotal information gained during interviews and a review of available information indicates that there is no value reduction for environmental reasons.

4.3 Assessment of Specialized Knowledge
Assessments of any specialized knowledge or experience on the part of the purchaser or landowner is required by 40 CFR Part 312 Section 312.28 to maintain the innocent landowner defense. The sections from this document have been summarized below for clarity:

1). Persons to whom this part is applicable must take into account, their specialized knowledge of the site, the area surrounding the site, conditions of surrounding properties, and any other experience deemed relevant to the inquiry, for the purposes of identifying conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases at the site.

2). All appropriate inquiries are not complete unless the results of the inquiries take into account the relevant and applicable specialized knowledge and experience of the persons responsible for undertaking the inquiry.

The user indicated no specialized knowledge or experience that is material to RECs in connection with the subject property.

4.4 Reason for Performing Phase I
A Phase I ESA is typically performed to provide landowner liability protections (LLPs) under CERCLA; these protections include bona fide prospective purchaser liability protection, contiguous property owner liability protection, and innocent landowner defense from CERCLA liability. In addition to satisfying one of the requirements to qualify for an LLP to CERCLA liability, another reason for performing a Phase I ESA might include the need to understand potential environmental conditions that could materially impact the operation of the business associated with the parcel of commercial real estate. This ESA is being performed at the request of Marin County Open Space District to evaluate whether or not property uses have created any environmental or other nuisance conditions which would indicate a REC.
A copy of the ESA User Questionnaire completed by the Marin County Open Space District is presented in Appendix D.

4.5 Property Manager and Occupant Information
The subject property is current owned and managed by Marin County Parks. EC&A interviewed Craig Richardson, representing Marin County Parks. The results of this interview are detailed in Section 5.4.4.

5.0 RECORDS REVIEW

5.1 Standard Environmental Records
The standard environmental records sources for ESAs as identified by ASTM E1527-13 were searched and pertinent records obtained, by a computer database search company, EDR of Milford, Connecticut. The state, federal and tribal databases were searched by EDR for property with reported environmental issues that are within radii specified by ASTM Standard E 1527-13. They were searched using geocoding information that identified the coordinates of the properties in the databases, or by verifying the physical street addresses of practically reviewable, non-geocoded “orphan” properties within the same zip code as the site. It should be noted that computerized geocoding technology used in the database search is based on available census data and is only accurate to approximately +/- 300 ft. The EDR Radius Report provides a list of unmapped sites for which inadequate location information was provided. EC&A has reviewed the list of unmapped sites to determine if these sites are within the requested search radius for the databases searched. Based on EC&A’s review, none of the unmapped sites are within the requested search radius from the subject site.

The results of the search performed for this site are reported in EDR’s Radius Map Report with GeoCheck (Radius Report) dated November 9, 2015, with Inquiry Number 4461650.2s. A comprehensive listing of federal, state and local government environmental databases searched are presented in the report, which is provided in Appendix E. In some instances, to avoid an exhaustive discussion of the numerous sites identified by EDR, the facilities are discussed together and conclusions consolidated. The lists of the databases accessed and reviewed includes, but is not limited to, the following. Refer to the November 9, 2015 Radius Report for a complete list of databases searched and facilities identified within the requested search radius from the subject site.

U.S. Federal Standard Databases
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) National Priorities List (NPL, or Superfund) sites, Proposed NPL, Delisted NPL, and NPL Recovery (Superfund Liens).
- US EPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) and CERCLIS-NFRAP (No Further Remedial Action Planned).
- ERNS - Emergency Response Notification System.
- Resources Conservation and Recovery Act - Treatment Storage and Disposal Facilities (RCRA - TSDF) and RCRA large quantity and small quantity generators (LQG, SQG).
- CORRACTS - Corrective Action Report, identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.
• Federal institutional control/engineering control registries.

California State Standard Databases
• HIST CAL-SITES - California database of potential or confirmed hazardous substance release sites. This database has been replaced by Envirostor.
• ENVIROSTOR - California Environmental Protection Agency (CALEPA), Department of Toxic Substance Control, Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program, database of sites that have known contamination or sites with reason for further investigation.
• CHMIRS - California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (accidental releases or spills).
• SWF/LS - Solid Waste Information System, California Integrated Waste Management Board: This database consists of active, closed, and inactive Landfills and Disposal Sites.
• Toxic Pits - California State Water Resources Control Board: This database identifies pits and bodies of water suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed. This program is also known as TPCA.
• WMUDS/SWAT - California State Water Resources Control Board database for tracking and inventory of waste management units (solid waste disposal sites), including Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT) program information.
• CORTESE - CALEPA, Office of Emergency Information: These sites are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board (LUST database), the Integrated Waste Management Board (SWF/LS database), and the Department of Toxic Substance Control (Cal-Sites database).
• LUST - California State Water Resources Control Board: The local RWQCB manages this database. It is an inventory of reported Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites.
• UST - Active UST Facilities gathered from the local regulatory agencies.
• CA FID UST - The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive UST locations from the State Water Resources Control Board. Refer to local/county source for current data.
• HIST UST - The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites.

California State Databases (ASTM Supplemental)
• Dry Cleaners - A list of dry cleaner-related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes: power laundries, family and commercial; garment pressing and cleaners’ agents; linen supply; coin-operated laundries and cleaning; industrial launderers; laundry and garment services.
• SLIC - Local Regional Water Quality Control Board: This database is the Spills, Leaks Investigation and Cleanup (SLIC) and is classified as voluntarily cleanup status by the responsible party with RWQCB oversight.

5.1.1 Summary of Findings of EDR Database Search
Listed below are the relevant findings of the EDR database search within the minimum radius search distances of the property as specified by ASTM E1527-13, Section 8.2.1.
Subject Property
According to the EDR report, the subject property is not listed on any of the databases searched by EDR.

Offsite Properties
The EDR records search only identified two offsite facilities within the requested search radius, both of which are located at 3150 Paradise Drive (Tiburon Navy Net Depot Bldg and Tiburon Marine Fishery Service).

The EDR records search only identified two LUST facilities, both of which have been closed by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB), within the requested search radius. A closed LUST facility indicates that site investigation and/or cleanup has been conducted to the satisfaction of the pertinent regulatory oversight agency(s), that the unauthorized release from this facility has been stopped, the original source material removed to the extent practicable, the extent of the soil and/or groundwater impact defined and an evaluation of the potential for the release from this facility to impact any nearby sensitive receptors has been conducted to the satisfaction of the State Water Board.

LUST Database
A discussion of relevant information regarding the identified LUST facility at 3150 Paradise Drive is presented below.

Tiburon Marine Fishery Service/Tiburon Navy Net Depot, 3150 Paradise Drive (Closed)
Based on a review of available information, EC&A understands that one 650-gallon UST for heating oil, one 10,000-gallon UST for diesel/heating oil, and two 6000-gallon USTs for gasoline were removed from this property on November 26, 1991 (SFBRWQCB, 1995a). Soil and groundwater samples collected at the time of UST removal activities reported elevated concentrations of fuel hydrocarbons (FHCs). FHC-impacted soils were reportedly over-excavated and FHC-impacted groundwater pumped from the USTs excavation. Confirmation soil samples collected following over-excavation activities were well below regulatory screening levels. However, EC&A understands that FHC-impacted soils which were inaccessible for removal, were left in-place beneath a concrete slab. Groundwater monitoring wells were subsequently installed and monitored over the course of approximately 18 months. The SFBRWQCB subsequently issued a no further action letter with respect to these USTs dated December 1, 1995 (SFBRWQCB, 1995b). Based on a review of available information, the historical release from these USTs does not represent a threat of adverse environmental impact to the subject property.

Based on topographic considerations, information obtained from a review of pertinent information on GeoTracker and/or the MCOWM, distance from the site and/or regulatory status and land use in the site vicinity, the historical release from the property identified above at 3150 Paradise Drive does not pose a threat of significant impact to the subject site.
5.2 Additional Environmental Record Sources

To enhance and supplement the EDR reports, database searches for active sites, local records and/or additional state and tribal records were independently searched through their various websites. These records are reasonably ascertainable, and sufficiently useful, accurate and complete for the objective of the records review. Other environmental records sources contacted for information pertaining to the subject property were as follows:

- U.S. EPA [http://www.epa.gov/region09]
- California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control [http://www.calepa.gov/] and [http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/]
- County of Marin – all departments [http://co.marin.ca.us/]
- California State Water Resources Control Board [http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/].

Unified Program

County of Marin Office of Waste Management (MCOWM)
The Unified Program is the consolidation of six state environmental programs into one, under the authority of a Certified Unified Protection Agency (CUPA). These can be a county, city or JPA (Joint Powers Authority). This program was established under the amendments to the California Health and Safety Code made by SB 1082 in 1994.


A CUPA is a local agency that has been certified by CAL EPA to implement the six state environmental programs within the local agency’s jurisdiction. The MCOWM is the designated local agency for the project area. The MCOWM did not possess any records pertaining to hazardous materials releases, emergency response events or other issues which would indicate an environmental risk at any of the subject or immediately adjacent properties.

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
The SFBRWQCB no longer stores physical files at their facility; all information generated after 2005 is available on GeoTracker, which EC&A did review for LUST facilities in the site vicinity. The SFBRWQCB did not possess any files for the subject property. Due to the age of the case for the adjacent LUST facility at 3150 Paradise Drive, information was not available on GeoTracker. As such, EC&A reviewed available information at the MCOWM, discussed above in Section 5.1.1.

5.3 Physical Setting

5.3.1 Geologic and Regional Physiographic Conditions
The subject property is situated in the unincorporated Marin County community of Tiburon, California, on the eastern shore of the Tiburon Peninsula. The Tiburon Peninsula extends south into the San Francisco Bay and is separated from Marin County mainland by Richardson Bay. The subject property is bordered by San Francisco Bay to the north, Paradise Drive to the south and by
residential developments to the east and west. Land rises from the Bay to the south, with elevations at the subject site ranging from approximately msl near the subject site’s northern boundary, to approximately 110 ft above msl adjacent to the roadway and southern site boundaries. According to the EDR Radius Report, the northern portions of the subject site are located within the 100-year flood zone of San Francisco Bay.

The subject site is located near the center of the Coast Range Geomorphic Province of California, which is characterized by northwest-southeast trending mountains and valleys, dominated by northwest-southeast trending faults and other associated fault structures. The Tiburon Peninsula is composed of rocks of the Jurassic Franciscan Formation. Rock is principally arkosic sandstone. Serpentinitized ultrabasic rocks locally intrude the sandstone. Zones of mélangé matrix of various widths are present in places between the serpentinite and sandstone.

5.3.2 Soil Conditions
According to the EDR Radius Map Report, soils beneath the subject property are of the component name Tocaloma. Soils underlying the sub-tidal portions of the subject site consist of Quaternary Estuarine deposits (bay mud). Tocaloma soils beneath the rest of the subject site are characterized as loams, with slow infiltration rates, and layers of soil impeding downward movement of water, with moderately fine or coarse textures.

5.3.3 Groundwater Conditions
None of the groundwater information sources in the EDR Radius Report were helpful in estimating the groundwater depth or flow direction. However, the predominant regional groundwater flow direction in the site vicinity is expected to be northerly, towards San Francisco Bay. Depth to groundwater at the subject site (above msl) is expected to be approximately 7 to 10 ft below ground surface.

5.4 Results of Site History and Land-use Review
The following standard sources of historical data for properties and property use(s) were reviewed: Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, city directories, historical topographic maps, personal interviews, and historical aerial photographs.

5.4.1 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps
EDR’s search for historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the site and area, did not locate any coverage.

5.4.2 City Directories
The results of EDR’s search for historic city directories that include the site and nearby area are provided in the EDR City Directory Abstract, Inquiry Number 4461650.5 dated November 9, 2015, which is in Appendix F. The report identified coverage of the site vicinity at approximately five-year intervals for 1975 through 2013. The subject property was not listed in any of the directories. Most of the returns for vicinity properties were residential and light commercial.

5.4.3 Historical USGS Topo Maps
EDR performed a search for historic United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle maps of the site and vicinity. The result of their investigation is documented in the EDR’s Historical Topographic Map Report, dated November 9, 2015, which is provided in

The historic topographic maps provided by EDR generally corroborate information obtained from other historical sources indicating the subject site being first developed by the early 1940s. The pier and numerous structures are indicated at the subject site in the maps from 1947, 1948 and 1950, presumably those associated with the subject property’s historical uses by the Navy to train and house officers. No structures are indicated at the subject site in the maps from 1915, 1899 and 1895.

5.4.4 Personal Interviews
Telephone, email and/or in-person interviews were conducted with Mr. Craig Richardson, Open Space Planner, and representing the property owner, Marin County Parks, Stephen Petterle, Principal Landscape Architect with Marin County Parks, and Michael Maraccini, Paradise Park Beach Ranger. Mr. Petterle provided information regarding a January 2013 study of the seawall at the subject site, but was not aware of any past studies for the subject site. Mr. Richardson provided general information regarding use of the subject site as a county park dating back to approximately the mid-1960s. Mr. Maraccini provided information regarding construction dates of the onsite buildings and utilities provided to the subject site.

5.4.5 Aerial Photographs

In the 1946 aerial photo, several long rectangular structures are visible at the subject site, presumably barracks for Navy officers which were reportedly housed and trained at the subject property. The T-shaped pier extending out into the Bay is also visible.

In the 1956 aerial photo, the rectangular structures previously visible at the subject site are no longer visible. Several areas of what appears to be equipment or supplies associated with the subject site’s historical uses by the Navy are visible in this aerial photo but no obvious buildings are visible.

In the 1958 aerial photo, the equipment and/or supplies previously visible at the subject site no longer appear to be present and the subject site appears to have been vacated with no obvious active uses.

In the 1968 aerial photo, one building, presumably the current public restroom facility is visible at the subject site and some earthwork or grading appears to have occurred.

The 1977 aerial photo is of very poor quality; however the fishing pier and public restroom building are visible at the subject site.
In the 1982 aerial photo, much of the subject site has clearly been landscaped and grading performed to match current site conditions and the restroom and fishing pier are clearly visible. Residential developments to the east and west of the subject site are now visible.

No significant changes at the subject site are indicated in the aerial photos from 1993 to the present.

The historic aerial photographs prepared by EDR did not reveal any significant potential liability resulting from past site uses onsite or on any of the adjacent properties.

5.4.6 Synopsis of Previous and Current Environmental Investigations
EC&A was not provided with nor was there any evidence of any current or previous environmental investigative reports for the subject site.

5.4.7 Site and Vicinity Land Use History
A review of available historical sources indicates that the subject site was first developed in 1942 when the U.S. Navy constructed the Floating Drydock Training Center Annex at the subject property to house and train officers for overseas ship repair. Use of the subject site for this purpose reportedly continued through early 1958, when these uses ceased. The subject site was then acquired by Marin County in 1959, and following removal of debris and structures formerly used by the Navy, was developed into Paradise Park beginning in approximately 1969. Use of the subject site as Paradise Beach Park has continued to the present. Prior to the subject site’s first reported development in 1942, it may have partially been used for cattle grazing, consistent with regional historical uses on the Tiburon Peninsula. Prior to the subject site’s purported use for livestock grazing as part of greater area-wide ranches, it was included within the boundaries of the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834.

Development of lands in the site vicinity were reportedly primarily agricultural during the Tiburon Peninsula’s inclusion in the Mexican land grant, Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834. By the late 1880s, with the arrival of the San Francisco and North Pacific Railroad, development of lands began to increase to include residential, commercial and light industrial. In the early 1900s fisheries, canneries, brick kilns, rail and ship repair and dismantling, coaling stations and other industrial uses of lands along the Peninsula’s eastern and southern shores were developed. The US Navy also developed the Tiburon Navy Net Depot (commonly associated with the address of 3150 Paradise Drive) in the early 1900s for use as a coaling station. The Depot was subsequently used for a nautical training school, research and training purposes, and staging area for wartime activities. Following World War II and the Korean war, in the late 1950s to early 1960s lands on the Tiburon Peninsula began to be developed for residential use, which continued until the late 1990s.
6.0 SITE AND AREA RECONNAISSANCE

6.1 Methodology and Limiting Conditions
An EC&A Environmental Professional performed a reconnaissance of the subject property and area on November 17, 2015. The method used in conducting the site reconnaissance consisted of documenting observations while walking accessible portions of the subject property.

6.2 General Site Setting
The subject property is situated in the unincorporated Marin County community of Tiburon, California, on the eastern shore of the Tiburon Peninsula. The Tiburon Peninsula extends south into the San Francisco Bay and is separated from Marin County mainland by Richardson Bay. The subject property is bordered by San Francisco Bay to the north, Paradise Drive to the south and by residential developments to the east and west. Land rises from the Bay to the south, with elevations at the subject site ranging from approximately msl near the subject site’s northern boundary, to approximately 110 ft above msl adjacent to the roadway and southern site boundaries. According to the EDR Radius Report, the northern portions of the subject site are located within the 100-year flood zone of San Francisco Bay.

6.3 Subject Property
On November 17, 2015, an EC&A Environmental Professional performed a reconnaissance of the subject and nearby properties. The method used in conducting the site reconnaissance is outlined in Section 6.1 above. The following observations were made in the course of the site reconnaissance.

6.3.1 Interior Survey
EC&A conducted an inspection of the interiors of the structures located at the subject site. Typical use and storage associated with public restroom facilities and office space was observed. The interior of the maintenance shed was observed in use for the storage of typical maintenance tools, equipment and supplies. The maintenance shed has concrete flooring throughout and EC&A observed the storage of small containers of petroleum products such as gasoline and oil, presumably used for maintenance tools and equipment.

An inspection of the interior areas of the buildings at the subject site did not indicate any evidence of environmental or other significant negative conditions which would constitute a REC or other nuisance condition.

6.3.2 Exterior Survey
The following table summarized issues on which the survey of exterior areas of the subject property focused.
### EXTERIOR SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Noted</th>
<th>Location and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage Tanks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual odors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of asphalt patch or surface depressions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pits, ponds or lagoons</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Solid waste cans for the public are located throughout the subject site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers not attributed to current use of the subject property</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil-containing equipment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained soil or pavement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed vegetation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill material of unknown or questionable origin/stockpiles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring wells</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch basin or dry wells</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic systems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A septic system is located in the lawn area adjacent to the public restroom facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EC&A did not observe the use or storage of any hazardous materials, wastes or other harmful chemicals at any exterior areas of the subject property, with the exception of flammable materials being stored in a locked flammable cabinet located near the maintenance shed. EC&A paid particular attention to the exterior areas of the site buildings to see if there was any evidence of a historical UST or AST using information obtained from aerial photographs and other sources cited above, but did not observe any obvious evidence of depressions, stained soils or ancillary structures which would be associated with a UST or AST or any other evidence of its presence.

No evidence of stained soils, distressed vegetation or other evidence of negative environmental or nuisance conditions was observed during EC&A’s site reconnaissance. Nor was there any obvious evidence of active uses of the subject property which would result in negative environmental or nuisance conditions.

### 6.4 Adjacent Properties
EC&A conducted a windshield survey of adjacent properties, and to the extent feasible, walked these properties during the subject site reconnaissance.
7.0 INTERVIEWS

7.1 Interviews with Owner and Site Manager
EC&A interviewed Craig Richardson of Marin County Parks, representing the current property owner (Marin County); Stephen Petterle, Principal Landscape Architect with Marin County Parks, and Michael Maraccini, Paradise Park Beach Ranger. The results of these interviews are detailed in Section 5.4.4, above.

7.2 Interviews with Local Government Officials
Because no facilities of potential concern were located in the immediate vicinity of the site, no interviews were conducted with local government officials for this ESA except for email communications with staff of the Marin County Open Space District.

7.3 Interviews with Others
No other interviews were conducted during the preparation of this Phase I ESA.

8.0 FINDINGS
The subject property, known as Paradise Beach Park, consists of three contiguous parcels of land with Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, totaling approximately 13.96-acres of land, located in the incorporated community of Tiburon, California. APN 058-021-04 is an approximately 11.93-acre parcel of land which comprises a majority of Paradise Beach Park; APN 058-021-03 is an approximately 1.7-acre parcel of sub-tidal land which contains an 302 ft long concrete pier with a t-shaped 194-ft long end; and APN 058-021-04 is a narrow rectangular-shaped sliver consisting of approximately 0.33-acres of land containing part of the concrete pier and some sub-tidal land. The primary physical address associated with the subject site is 3450 Paradise Drive. The subject site contains asphalt paved parking areas and walking paths, large lawn areas, public boat launch, picnic facilities, restrooms, a public access beach and a T-shaped concrete pier.

A review of available historical sources indicates that the subject site was first developed in 1942 when the U.S. Navy constructed the Floating Drydock Training Center Annex at the subject property to house and train officers for overseas ship repair. Use of the subject site for this purpose reportedly continued through early 1958, when these uses ceased. The subject site was then acquired by Marin County in 1959, and following removal of debris and structures formerly used by the Navy, was developed into Paradise Park beginning in approximately 1969. Use of the subject site as Paradise Beach Park has continued to the present.

Prior to the subject site’s first reported development in 1942, it may have partially been used for cattle grazing, consistent with regional historical uses on the Tiburon Peninsula. Prior to the subject site’s purported use for livestock grazing as part of greater area-wide ranches, it was included within the boundaries of the Rancho Corte Madera del Presidio, which was reportedly established in 1834.

The MCOWM is the designated local CUPA agency for the subject site area. The MCOWM did not possess any records for the subject site or for any of the adjacent parcels.
During the preparation of this Phase I ESA, EC&A did not encounter any data gaps that would diminish EC&A’s ability to provide an opinion on a release or potential release of hazardous substances at the subject property.

No *de minimis* conditions were identified in connection with the subject property.

EC&A conducted an evaluation for vapor encroachment concerns (VECs) using methodology established in ASTM Standard of Practice E2600-10. Based on a review of available information, there are no VECs at the subject site.

In the course of performing this ESA, EC&A did not identify any Recognized Environmental Conditions associated with the subject property.

**9.0 CONCLUSIONS AND OPINION**

EC&A has performed this ESA in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Standard Practice E-1527-13 of the property known as Paradise Beach Park, with the primary physical address of 3450 Paradise Drive, designated as Marin County APNs 058-041-03, 058-021-03 and 058-021-04, located in the unincorporated community of Tiburon, California. Any exceptions to, or deletions from, this practice are described in Section 2.4 and 2.5 of this Report. This assessment has revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the subject property.

No additional action appears to be warranted.

**10.0 ADDITIONAL SERVICES**

No additional services beyond ASTM E1527-13 were added to this report.

**11.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PROFESSIONAL STATEMENT AND EC&A RESUME**

I declare that, to the best of our professional knowledge and belief, I meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 312.10 of this part. I have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. I have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312. A resume for EC&A personnel involved in preparation of this ESA is provided in Appendix J.

**12.0 REFERENCES**

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (“CERCLA” or “Superfund”), as amended by Superfund Amendments and

- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Surveys.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property boundary</th>
<th>City Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation**

**SITE LOCATION MAP**

Paradise Beach Park
3450 Paradise Drive
Tiburon, California

Figure 1
Typical view of site; looking northerly towards Bay

Typical view of lawn and picnic areas at site; looking northwesterly

Typical view of public lawn area at site; restroom and staff/public information center visible in distance

Typical view; looking southwesterly
View of fishing pier

View near end of fishing pier

Looking back at site from fishing pier

Typical view to the northwest from fishing pier
Typical view of site

Looking northerly towards Bay

View of public parking areas at site

View of additional parking and road leading to Park maintenance shed
View of entrance driveway

View of public walking trail

Typical view of public picnic facilities

Typical view of upper (southern) portion of site; looking towards Paradise Drive
Typical view of brushy eastern boundary of site

View of cyclone fence along site’s eastern border

View of public picnic facilities

Looking towards fishing pier from picnic area at site
View of adjacent property to east of site

View of public kayak/canoe launch area

View of seawall; looking easterly

View of fishing pier; looking easterly
View of western boundary of site; looking southwesterly from pier towards public kayak/canoe launch

View of seawall along site's northeastern boundary

View of public restrooms and staff/public information center

Close-up view of bathroom facilities
View of steps leading down to beach near site's northwestern border

View of picnic facilities near site's northwestern boundary

View of steep wooded area looking up towards park maintenance shack

View of public trail leading to beach
View of stairway leading to upper parking lot

View of staff kiosk

View of staff maintenance shed

View of park maintenance area and shed
View of interior of maintenance shed

View of maintenance shed; flammable chemical storage cabinet visible

View of misc storage adjacent to maintenance shed

Alternate view of maintenance shed
APPENDIX C

EDR ENVIRONMENTAL LIEN SEARCH
The EDR Environmental LienSearch Report provides results from a search of available current land title records for environmental cleanup liens and other activity and use limitations, such as engineering controls and institutional controls.

A network of professional, trained researchers, following established procedures, uses client supplied address information to:

- search for parcel information and/or legal description;
- search for ownership information;
- research official land title documents recorded at jurisdictional agencies such as recorders’ offices, registries of deeds, county clerks’ offices, etc.;
- access a copy of the deed;
- search for environmental encumbering instrument(s) associated with the deed;
- provide a copy of any environmental encumbrance(s) based upon a review of key words in the instrument(s) (title, parties involved, and description); and
- provide a copy of the deed or cite documents reviewed.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.

Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice
This report was prepared for the use of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., and Discovery Research Solutions, LLC, exclusively. This report is neither a guarantee of title, a commitment to insure, or a policy of title insurance. NO WARRANTY, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) and Discovery Research Solutions, LLC specifically disclaim the making of any such warranties, including without limitation, merchantability or fitness for a particular use or purpose. The information contained in this report is retrieved as it is recorded from the various agencies that make it available. The total liability is limited to the fee paid for this report.

Copyright 2014 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.
TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS

PARADISE BEACH PARK
3450 PARADISE DRIVE
BELVEDERE TIBURON, CA 94920

RESEARCH SOURCE

Source 1: Marin Assessor
Marin County, California

Source 2: Marin Recorder
Marin County, California

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Deed 1:
According to the Marin County Assessor, the current owner of the subject property is the County of Marin. Records were searched at the Marin County Recorder’s Office back to 1980. No conveyance was found of record transferring fee title ownership into the County of Marin for the subject property.

Legal Description: All that certain piece or parcel of land being Lots 3, 4 and 5 on the Map of Paradise Cove Subdivision, filed in Book 5 at Page 81, situate and lying in the County of Marin, State of California.

Legal Current Owner: County of Marin

Property Identifiers: 058-041-03

ENVIRONMENTAL LIEN

Environmental Lien: Found ☐ Not Found ✗
If found:

1st Party:
2nd Party:
Dated:
Recorded:
Book:
Page:
Docket:
Volume:
Instrument:
Comments:
Miscellaneous:
OTHER ACTIVITY AND USE LIMITATIONS (AULs)

Other AUL's: Found ☐ Not Found ☒

If found:

1st Party:
2nd Party:
Dated:
Recorded:
Book:
Page:
Docket:
Volume:
Instrument:
Comments:
Miscellaneous:
APPENDIX D

ASTM ESA USER QUESTIONNAIRE
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment User Questionnaire

In order to qualify for one of the Landowner Liability Protections (LLPs)' offered by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownsfields Revitalization Act of 2001 (the "Brownsfields Amendments"), the user must provide the following information (if available) to the environmental professional. Failure to provide this information could result in a determination that "all appropriate inquiry" is not complete.

1). Environmental cleanup liens that are filed or recorded against the site (40 CFR 312.25).
Are you aware of any environmental cleanup liens against the property that are filed or recorded under federal, tribal, state or local law? Yes___ No✗

2). Activity and land use limitations (AULs) that are in place on the site or that have been filed or recorded in a registry (40 CFR 312.26).
Are you aware of any AULs, such as engineering controls, land use restrictions or institutional controls that are in place at the site and/or have been filed or recorded in a registry under federal, tribal, state or local law? Yes___ No✗ If yes, please explain____________________________

3). Specialized knowledge or experience of the person seeking to qualify for the LLP (40 CFR 312.28).
As the user of this ESA do you have any specialized knowledge or experience related to the property or nearby properties? For example, are you involved in the same line of business as the current or former occupants of the property or an adjoining property so that you would have specialized knowledge of the chemicals and processes used by this type of business? Yes___ No✗ If yes, please explain____________________________

4). Relationship of the purchase price to the fair market value of the property if it were not contaminated (40 CFR 312.29).
Does the purchase price being paid for this property reasonably reflect the fair market value of the property? Yes___ No____ Not applicable

If you conclude that there is a difference, have you considered whether the lower purchase price is because contamination is known or believed to be present at the property?
Yes___ No____

5). Commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property (40 CFR 312.30).
Are you aware of commonly known or reasonably ascertainable information about the property that would help the environmental professional to identify conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases? For example, as user,

a. Do you know the past uses of the property? Yes✓ No

If yes, please list: Former Naval Depot
b. Do you know of specific chemicals that are present or once were present at the property? Yes X No ___ If yes, please list: Pesticides were once used but are not used any longer.

c. Do you know of spills or other chemical releases that have taken place at the property? Yes ___ No X If yes, please list: ____________________________

d. Do you know of any environmental cleanups that have taken place at the property? Yes ___ No X If yes, please explain: ____________________________

6). The degree of obviousness of the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property, and the ability to detect the contamination by appropriate investigation (40 CFR 312.31).

As the user of this ESA, based on your knowledge and experience related to the property are there any obvious indications that point to the presence or likely presence of contamination at the property? Yes ___ No X If yes, please explain: ________________________________________

Phase TESA User Questionnaire completed by (please sign and print name):

[Signature] Nov 12-15

(Client/User) Date

*Landowners Liability Protections, or LLPs, is the term used to describe the three types of potential defenses to Superfund liability in EPA's Interim Guidance Regarding Criteria Landowners Must Meet in Order to Qualify for Bona Fide Prospective Purchaser, Contiguous Property Owner, or Innocent Landowner Limitations on CERCLA Liability ("Common Elements" Guide) issued on March 6, 2003.

Please return to Edd Clark & Associates (EC&A) by mail, fax, or

Edd Clark & Associates
P.O. Box 3039
Rohnert Park, California 94927-3039
(707) 792-9500 phone
(707) 792-9504 fax
corpmail@ecaenviron.com
ecaenviron.com
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**Thank you for your business.**

Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.

---

**Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice**
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A search of available environmental records was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The report was designed to assist parties seeking to meet the search requirements of EPA’s Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (40 CFR Part 312), the ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments (E 1527-13) or custom requirements developed for the evaluation of environmental risk associated with a parcel of real estate.

**TARGET PROPERTY INFORMATION**

**ADDRESS**

3450 PARADISE DRIVE  
BELVEDERE TIBURON, CA 94920

**COORDINATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (North)</td>
<td>37.8935000 - 37° 53' 36.60&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (West)</td>
<td>122.4565000 - 122° 27' 23.40&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Tranverse Mercator</td>
<td>Zone 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM X (Meters)</td>
<td>547788.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Y (Meters)</td>
<td>4193932.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>20 ft. above sea level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP ASSOCIATED WITH TARGET PROPERTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Property Map</td>
<td>5641122 SAN QUENTIN, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version Date</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY IN THIS REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portions of Photo from</td>
<td>20120520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>USDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAPPED SITES SUMMARY

**Target Property Address:**
3450 PARADISE DRIVE  
BELVEDERE TIBURON, CA  94920  

Click on Map ID to see full detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>SITE NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DATABASE ACRONYMS</th>
<th>RELATIVE ELEVATION</th>
<th>DIST (ft. &amp; mi.)</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TIBURON NAVY NET DEP</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2024, 0.383, ESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>NATIONAL MARINE FISH</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>CERC-NFRAP, RCRA-SQG, LUST, HAZNET, HIST CORTESE</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2024, 0.383, ESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>TIBURON MARINE FISHER</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2024, 0.383, ESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>TIBURON NAVAL NET DEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>FUDS</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2478, 0.469, ESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>NAVAL NET DEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENVIROSTOR</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2488, 0.471, ESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TARGET PROPERTY SEARCH RESULTS

The target property was not listed in any of the databases searched by EDR.

DATABASES WITH NO MAPPED SITES

No mapped sites were found in EDR’s search of available (“reasonably ascertainable”) government records either on the target property or within the search radius around the target property for the following databases:

STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal NPL site list
NPL ..................... National Priority List
Proposed NPL ............. Proposed National Priority List Sites
NPL LIENS ................. Federal Superfund Liens

Federal Delisted NPL site list
Delisted NPL ................ National Priority List Deletions

Federal CERCLIS list
FEDERAL FACILITY ............ Federal Facility Site Information listing
CERCLIS .................... Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System

Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list
CORRACTS ................ Corrective Action Report

Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list
RCRA-TSDF ................. RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal

Federal RCRA generators list
RCRA-LQG .................. RCRA - Large Quantity Generators
RCRA-SQG .................. RCRA - Small Quantity Generators
RCRA-CESQG ............... RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator

Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries
LUCIS ...................... Land Use Control Information System
US ENG CONTROLS ........ Engineering Controls Sites List
US INST CONTROL .......... Sites with Institutional Controls

Federal ERNS list
ERNS ...................... Emergency Response Notification System
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State- and tribal - equivalent NPL
RESPONSE.................. State Response Sites

State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists
SWF/LF..................... Solid Waste Information System

State and tribal leaking storage tank lists
INDIAN LUST................ Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
SLIC......................... Statewide SLIC Cases

State and tribal registered storage tank lists
FEMA UST.................... Underground Storage Tank Listing
UST.......................... Active UST Facilities
AST......................... Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities
INDIAN UST................ Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites
VCP......................... Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties
INDIAN VCP.................. Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing

State and tribal Brownfields sites
BROWNFIELDS.............. Considered Brownfieds Sites Listing

ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Local Brownfield lists
US BROWNFIELDS......... A Listing of Brownfields Sites

Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites
WMUDS/SWAT.............. Waste Management Unit Database
SWRCY...................... Recycler Database
HAULERS.................... Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
INDIAN ODI................. Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
ODI.......................... Open Dump Inventory
DEBRIS REGION 9........... Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations

Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites
US HIST CDL............... National Clandestine Laboratory Register
HIST Cal-Sites............. Historical Calsites Database
SCH........................ School Property Evaluation Program
CDL........................ Clandestine Drug Labs
Toxic Pits.................. Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites
US CDL..................... Clandestine Drug Labs

Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks
SWEEPS UST............... SWEEPS UST Listing
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HIST UST, Hazardoas Substance Storage Container Database
CA FID UST, Facility Inventory Database

Local Land Records
LIENS, Environmental Liens Listing
LIENS 2, CERCLA Lien Information
DEED, Deed Restriction Listing

Records of Emergency Release Reports
HMIRS, Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
CHMIRS, California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
LDS, Land Disposal Sites Listing
MCS, Military Cleanup Sites Listing
SPILLS 90, SPILLS 90 data from FirstSearch

Other Ascertainable Records
RCRA NonGen / NLR, RCRA - Non Generators / No Longer Regulated
DOD, Department of Defense Sites
SCRD DRYCLEANERS, State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing
US FIN ASSUR, Financial Assurance Information
EPA WATCH LIST, EPA WATCH LIST
2020 COR ACTION, 2020 Corrective Action Program List
TSCA, Toxic Substances Control Act
TRIS, Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
SSTs, Section 7 Tracking Systems
ROD, Records Of Decision
RMP, Risk Management Plans
RAATS, RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
PRP, Potentially Responsible Parties
PADS, PCB Activity Database System
ICIS, Integrated Compliance Information System
FTTS, FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
MLTS, Material Licensing Tracking System
COAL ASH DOE, Steam-Electric Plant Operation Data
COAL ASH EPA, Coal Combustion Residues Surface Impoundments List
PCB TRANSFORMER, PCB Transformer Registration Database
RADINFO, Radiation Information Database
HIST FTTS, FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
DOT OPS, Incident and Accident Data
CONSENT, Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
INDIAN RESERV, Indian Reservations
UMTRA, Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
LEAD SMELTERS, Lead Smelter Sites
US AIRS, Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem
US MINES, Mines Master Index File
FINDS, Facility Index System/Facility Registry System
CA BOND EXP. PLAN, Bond Expenditure Plan
Cortese, “Cortese” Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List
CUPA Listings, CUPA Resources List
DRYCLEANERS, Cleaner Facilities
EMI, Emissions Inventory Data
EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

EDR Exclusive Records
EDR MGP ....................... EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants
EDR US Hist Auto Stat .......... EDR Exclusive Historic Gas Stations
EDR US Hist Cleaners .......... EDR Exclusive Historic Dry Cleaners

EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives
RGA LF ....................... Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List
RGA LUST .................... Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank

SURROUNDING SITES: SEARCH RESULTS
Surrounding sites were identified in the following databases.

Elevations have been determined from the USGS Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified. Sites with an elevation equal to or higher than the target property have been differentiated below from sites with an elevation lower than the target property.

Page numbers and map identification numbers refer to the EDR Radius Map report where detailed data on individual sites can be reviewed.

Sites listed in **bold italics** are in multiple databases.

Unmappable (orphan) sites are not considered in the foregoing analysis.

STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List
CERC-NFRAP: Archived sites are sites that have been removed and archived from the inventory of CERCLIS sites. Archived status indicates that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed
and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL), unless information indicates this decision was not appropriate or other considerations require a recommendation for listing at a later time. This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

A review of the CERC-NFRAP list, as provided by EDR, and dated 10/25/2013 has revealed that there is 1 CERC-NFRAP site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL MARINE FISH</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.383 mi.)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS**

ENVIROSTOR: The Department of Toxic Substances Control’s (DTSC’s) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program’s (SMBRP’s) EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.

A review of the ENVIROSTOR list, as provided by EDR, and dated 08/03/2015 has revealed that there is 1 ENVIROSTOR site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAVAL NET DEPOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.471 mi.)</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 8000711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Inactive - Needs Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State and tribal leaking storage tank lists**

LUST: The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data come from the State Water Resources Control Board Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System.

A review of the LUST list, as provided by EDR, and dated 10/21/2015 has revealed that there are 3 LUST sites within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIBURON NAVY NET DEP</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.383 mi.)</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Id: 21-0336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Status: Case Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date9: 9/18/1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL MARINE FISH</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.383 mi.)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Completed - Case Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TIBURON MARINE FISHE
Facility Id: 21-0208
Facility Status: Case Closed
date9: 1/13/1998

3150 PARADISE DR     ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.383 mi.)     A3     14

ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Other Ascertainable Records

FUDS: The Listing includes locations of Formerly Used Defense Sites Properties where the US Army Corps Of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.

A review of the FUDS list, as provided by EDR, and dated 01/31/2015 has revealed that there is 1 FUDS site within approximately 1 mile of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIBURON NAVAL NET DE</td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.469 mi.)</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIST CORTESE: The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.

A review of the HIST CORTESE list, as provided by EDR, and dated 04/01/2001 has revealed that there is 1 HIST CORTESE site within approximately 0.5 miles of the target property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal/Higher Elevation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Direction / Distance</th>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL MARINE FISH</td>
<td>3150 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>ESE 1/4 - 1/2 (0.383 mi.)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no unmapped sites in this report.
### STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

#### Federal NPL site list
- NPL: 1.000, NR 0, NR 0
- Proposed NPL: 1.000, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal Delisted NPL site list
- Delisted NPL: 1.000, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal CERCLIS list
- FEDERAL FACILITY: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0
- CERCLIS: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site list
- CERC-NFRAP: 0.500, NR 1, NR 1

#### Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list
- CORRACTS: 1.000, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list
- RCRA-TSDF: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal RCRA generators list
- RCRA-LQG: 0.250, NR NR NR
- RCRA-SQG: 0.250, NR NR NR
- RCRA-CESQG: 0.250, NR NR NR

#### Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries
- LUCIS: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0
- US ENG CONTROLS: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0
- US INST CONTROL: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0

#### Federal ERNS list
- ERNS: TP NR NR NR NR NR

#### State- and tribal - equivalent NPL
- RESPONSE: 1.000, NR 0, NR 0

#### State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS
- ENVIRONMENT: 1.000, NR 1, NR 1

#### State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists
- SWF/LF: 0.500, NR 0, NR 0

#### State and tribal leaking storage tank lists
- LUST: 0.500, NR 3, NR 3
## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN LUST</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIC</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State and tribal registered storage tank lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMA UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN VCP</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State and tribal Brownfields sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWNFIELDS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

**Local Brownfield lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US BROWNFIELDS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WMUDS/SWAT</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCY</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAULERS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN ODI</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRIS REGION 9</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US HIST CDL</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST Cal-Sites</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Pits</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US CDL</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWEEPS UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA FID UST</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Land Records**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIENS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIENS 2</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEED</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Records of Emergency Release Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMIRS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Map Findings Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHMIRS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPILLS 90</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Ascertainable Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCRA NonGen / NLR</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUDS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRD DRYCLEANERS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US FIN ASSUR</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA WATCH LIST</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 COR ACTION</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAATS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLTS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL ASH DOE</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL ASH EPA</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB TRANSFORMER</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADINFO</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST FTTS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT OPS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSENT</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN RESERV</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTRA</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD SMELTERS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US AIRS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MINES</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA BOND EXP. PLAN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortese</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA Listings</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRYCLEANERS</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENF</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assurance</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZNET</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST CORTESE</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWP</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWT</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWMP</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAP FINDINGS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Target Property</th>
<th>&lt; 1/8</th>
<th>1/8 - 1/4</th>
<th>1/4 - 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 - 1</th>
<th>&gt; 1</th>
<th>Total Plotted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEST LIC</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROC</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify 65</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTEWATER PITS</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDS</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIP</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

**EDR Exclusive Records**

| EDR MGP | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NR | 0 |
| EDR US Hist Auto Stat | 0.125 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| EDR US Hist Cleaners  | 0.125 | 0 | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |

### EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

**Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives**

| RGA LF | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |
| RGA LUST | TP | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | 0 |

- Totals -- 0 0 0 7 0 0 7

### NOTES:

TP = Target Property
NR = Not Requested at this Search Distance
Sites may be listed in more than one database
### A1
**TIBURON NAVY NET DEPOT BDG 50**
**ESE**
3150 PARADISE DR
TIBURON, CA 94920

- **Region:** LUST REG 2:
- **Facility Status:** 21-0336
- **Case Number:** 21-0336
- **How Discovered:** Tank Closure
- **Leak Cause:** UNK
- **Leak Source:** UNK
- **Date Leak Confirmed:** Not reported
- **Preliminary Site Assessment Begun:** Not reported
- **Pollution Characterization Begun:** Not reported
- **Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted:** Not reported
- **Date Remediation Action Underway:** Not reported
- **Date Post Remedial Action Monitoring Began:** Not reported

- **Relative:** Higher
- **Actual:** 147 ft.
- **Distance:** 0.383 mi.
- **Elevation:** 2024 ft.
- **Relative:** Relative
- **Actual:** Actual

#### CERCLIS-NFRAP Site Contact Details:
- **Contact Sequence ID:** 13286852.00000
- **Person ID:** 13003854.00000
- **Contact Sequence ID:** 13292447.00000
- **Person ID:** 13003858.00000
- **Contact Sequence ID:** 13298305.00000
- **Person ID:** 13004003.00000

#### CERCLIS-NFRAP Assessment History:
- **Action:** DISCOVERY
  - **Date Started:** / / 
  - **Date Completed:** 08/01/87
  - **Priority Level:** Not reported
- **Action:** ARCHIVE SITE
  - **Date Started:** / / 
  - **Date Completed:** 03/10/94
  - **Priority Level:** Not reported
- **Action:** PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
  - **Date Started:** / / 
  - **Date Completed:** 03/10/94

### A2
**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV**
**ESE**
3150 PARADISE DR
TIBURON, CA 94920

- **Region:** CERC-NFRAP:
- **Facility Status:** 0900151
- **Case Number:** Federal Facility
- **How Discovered:** Federal Facility
- **Leak Cause:** Not on the NPL
- **Leak Source:** NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information

### EPA ID Number
- **EDR ID Number:** U003166767
- **EPA ID Number:** N/A

### Database(s)
- **LUST REG 2:**
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued) 1000260553

Priority Level: NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information

RCRA-SOG:
Date form received by agency: 07/09/2001
Facility name: N M F S S W F S C TIBURON LABORATORY
Facility address: 3150 PARADISE DR
TIBURON, CA 94920
EPA ID: CA5143690167
Mailing address: P O BOX 271
LA JOLLA, CA 920380271
Contact: TRANH TRINH
Contact address: P O BOX 271
LA JOLLA, CA 920380271
Contact country: US
Contact telephone: (206) 526-6647
Contact email: Not reported
EPA Region: 09
Classification: Small Small Quantity Generator
Description: Handler: generates more than 100 and less than 1000 kg of hazardous waste during any calendar month and accumulates less than 6000 kg of hazardous waste at any time; or generates 100 kg or less of hazardous waste during any calendar month and accumulates more than 1000 kg of hazardous waste at any time

Owner/Operator Summary:
Owner/operator name: US DEPT OF COMMERCE N M F S
Owner/operator address: 601 E 12TH ST ROOM 1749
KANSAS CITY, MO 64106
Owner/operator country: Not reported
Owner/operator telephone: (816) 426-7267
Legal status: Federal
Owner/Operator Type: Owner
Owner/Op start date: Not reported
Owner/Op end date: Not reported
Owner/operator name: NOT REQUIRED
Owner/operator address: NOT REQUIRED
Owner/operator country: NOT REQUIRED, ME 99999
Owner/operator telephone: (415) 555-1212
Legal status: Federal
Owner/Operator Type: Operator
Owner/Op start date: Not reported
Owner/Op end date: Not reported

Handler Activities Summary:
U.S. importer of hazardous waste: No
Mixed waste (haz. and radioactive): No
Recycler of hazardous waste: No
Transporter of hazardous waste: No
Treater, storer or disposer of HW: No
Underground injection activity: No
On-site burner exemption: No
Furnace exemption: No
Used oil fuel burner: No
Used oil processor: No
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued)

User oil refiner: No
Used oil fuel marketer to burner: No
Used oil Specification marketer: No
Used oil transfer facility: No
Used oil transporter: No

- Waste code: D008
- Waste name: LEAD

Violation Status: No violations found

LUST:
Region: STATE
Global Id: T0604100318
Latitude: 37.889401
Longitude: -122.446983
Case Type: LUST Cleanup Site
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 09/18/1998
Lead Agency: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Case Worker: JMJ
Local Agency: MARIN COUNTY
RB Case Number: 21-0336
LOC Case Number: 21-0336
File Location: Not reported
Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern: Heating Oil / Fuel Oil
Site History: Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id: T0604100318
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: UNK
Organization Name: MARIN COUNTY
Address: Not reported
City: r2 UNKNOWN
Email: Not reported
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0604100318
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: JOHN JANG
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: jjang@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T0604100318
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 09/18/1998

Global Id: T0604100318
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 09/16/1998
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NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued) 1000260553

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T06041000318
Action Type: Other
Date: 09/16/1998
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T06041000318
Action Type: Other
Date: 09/16/1998
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T06041000318
Action Type: Other
Date: 09/16/1998
Action: Leak Reported

Region: STATE
Global Id: T0604100199
Latitude: 37.889401
Longitude: -122.446983
Case Type: LUST Cleanup Site
Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 01/13/1998
Lead Agency: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Case Worker: JMJ
Local Agency: MARIN COUNTY
RB Case Number: 21-0208
LOC Case Number: 154
File Location: Not reported
Potential Media Affect: Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water)
Potential Contaminants of Concern: Gasoline
Site History: Not reported

Click here to access the California GeoTracker records for this facility:

Contact:
Global Id: T0604100199
Contact Type: Local Agency Caseworker
Contact Name: UNK
Organization Name: MARIN COUNTY
Address: Not reported
City: r2 UNKNOWN
Email: Not reported
Phone Number: Not reported

Global Id: T0604100199
Contact Type: Regional Board Caseworker
Contact Name: JOHN JANG
Organization Name: SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2)
Address: 1515 CLAY STREET, SUITE 1400
City: OAKLAND
Email: jjang@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone Number: Not reported

Status History:
Global Id: T06041000318
Global Id: T0604100199
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued)

Status: Completed - Case Closed
Status Date: 01/13/1998

Global Id: T0604100199
Status: Open - Case Begin Date
Status Date: 11/26/1991

Global Id: T0604100199
Status: Open - Site Assessment
Status Date: 07/06/1994

Regulatory Activities:
Global Id: T0604100199
Action Type: Other
Date: 11/26/1991
Action: Leak Stopped

Global Id: T0604100199
Action Type: Other
Date: 11/26/1991
Action: Leak Discovery

Global Id: T0604100199
Action Type: Other
Date: 07/14/1994
Action: Leak Reported

HAZNET:
envid: 1000260553
Year: 2001
GGEPAID: CA5143690167
Contact: DALE CHASTAGNER FACILITY MGR.
Telephone: 8314203901
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 110 SHAFFER RD
Mailing City,St,Zip: SANTA CRUZ, CA 950600000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: WAD991291767
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Tank bottom waste
Disposal Method: Treatment, Incineration
Tons: 0.7
Facility County: Marin

envid: 1000260553
Year: 2000
GGEPAID: CA5143690167
Contact: DALE CHASTAGNER FACILITY MGR.
Telephone: 8314203901
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 110 SHAFFER RD
Mailing City,St,Zip: SANTA CRUZ, CA 950600000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: UTD981552177
TSD County: Not reported
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued)

Waste Category: Polychlorinated biphenyls and material containing PCBs
Disposal Method: Treatment, Incineration
Tons: 0.14
Facility County: Marin

envid: 1000260553
Year: 2000
GEPAID: CA5143690167
Contact: DALE CHASTAGNER FACILITY MGR.
Telephone: 8314203901
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 110 SHAFFER RD
Mailing City,St,Zip: SANTA CRUZ, CA 950600000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CAT080022148
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Liquids with pH <= 2
Disposal Method: Transfer Station
Tons: 0.26
Facility County: Marin

envid: 1000260553
Year: 2000
GEPAID: CA5143690167
Contact: DALE CHASTAGNER FACILITY MGR.
Telephone: 8314203901
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 110 SHAFFER RD
Mailing City,St,Zip: SANTA CRUZ, CA 950600000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CAT080022148
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Alkaline solution without metals pH >= 12.5
Disposal Method: Transfer Station
Tons: 0.03
Facility County: Marin

envid: 1000260553
Year: 1999
GEPAID: CA5143690167
Contact: NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SVC
Telephone: 0000000000
Mailing Name: Not reported
Mailing Address: 3150 PARADISE DR
Mailing City,St,Zip: BELVEDERE TIBURON, CA 949200000
Gen County: Not reported
TSD EPA ID: CAD059494310
TSD County: Not reported
Waste Category: Liquids with pH <= 2
Disposal Method: Disposal, Other
Tons: .0075
Facility County: Marin

Click this hyperlink while viewing on your computer to access
25 additional CA_HAZNET: record(s) in the EDR Site Report.
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERV (Continued)

HIST CORTESE:

Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 21
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 21-0208

Region: CORTESE
Facility County Code: 21
Reg By: LTNKA
Reg Id: 21-0336

A3
ESE
TIBURON MARINE FISHERY SERVICE
1/4-1/2
0.383 mi.
2024 ft.
Site 3 of 3 in cluster A
Relative: Higher
Actual: 147 ft.
LUST REG 2:
Region: 2
Facility Id: 21-0208
Facility Status: Case Closed
Case Number: 154
How Discovered: Tank Closure
Leak Cause: UNK
Leak Source: UNK
Date Leak Confirmed: Not reported
Oversight Program: LUST
Preliminary Site Assessment Began: Not reported
Pollution Characterization Began: Not reported
Pollution Remediation Plan Submitted: Not reported
Date Remediation Action Underway: Not reported
Date Post Remediation Action Monitoring Began: Not reported

B4
ESE
TIBURON NAVAL NET DEPOT
1/4-1/2
0.469 mi.
2478 ft.
Site 1 of 2 in cluster B
Relative: Higher
Actual: 51 ft.
FUDS:
Federal Facility ID: CA9799F5970
FUDS #: J08CA1075
INST ID: 57873
Facility Name: TIBURON NAVAL NET DEPOT
City: TIBURON
State: CA
EPA Region: 09
County: MARIN
Congressional District: 02
US Army District: Sacramento District (SPK)
Fiscal Year: 2013
Telephone: 916-557-7461
NPL Status: Not Listed
RAB: Not reported
CTC: 895.8999
In 1904, the U.S. Navy acquired 61.63 acres comprised of 49.3 acres on land and 12.33 acres tidelands on the Tiburon peninsula to establish the Naval Fuel Depot (California City Coaling Station). In March 1942 two parcels of 1.18 acres and 9.15 acres were added to the facility. In November in 1942, another 18.49 acres of land was acquired for the depot. An additional tract of land for 0.63 acres (water line easement) was acquired such that by 1943 the total area of the Site was 91.08 acres. In May 1956, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) began the divestiture of land declared excess by the Navy. In June 1958, the Navy ceased all net operations and deactivated the Depot. Other programs under Navy control continued on portions of the Site, utilizing a small number of buildings until 1964. In 1969, the Navy transferred the remaining property to the Department of Interior.

History:
In 1904, the U.S. Navy acquired 61.63 acres comprised of 49.3 acres on land and 12.33 acres tidelands on the Tiburon peninsula to establish the Naval Fuel Depot (California City Coaling Station). In April 1929, the Navy deactivated the Naval Fuel Depot; however, the Navy retained control of the Site. From 1931 to 1940, the Site was used by the State of California under a revocable license for the California Maritime Academy. The Depot was expanded in March 1942 through the Navys acquisition by condemnation of two tracts of land: 1.18 acres near the Paradise Road and 9.15 acres formerly used by Roebling and Sons for manufacturing Golden Gate Bridge cables. In November in 1942, the Navy acquired through condemnation 18.49 acres of land from private parties. This land at Paradise Cove, located about one-third of a mile from the northern boundary of the Depot, was used to establish a Floating Dry Dock Training Center. An additional tract of land for 0.63 acres (water line easement) was acquired such that by 1943 the total area of the Site was 91.08 acres. Through the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Site was under continuous occupation by the Navy for operations that included coastal defense training programs. In May 1956, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) began the divestiture of land declared excess by the Navy. In June 1958, the Navy ceased all net operations and deactivated the Depot. Other programs under Navy control continued on portions of the Site, utilizing a small number of buildings until 1964. In 1958 and 1959 the Navy quitclaimed two tracts of land, 18.55 acres and 19.12 acres to Marin County. In 1961 the Navy relinquished control over portions of the Site to the Department of the Interior to establish marine fisheries programs. In 1969, the Navy quitclaimed the Site to the Department of Interior.

Latitude: -122.447998047
Longitude: 37.891201019299
Federal Facility ID: CA9799F5970
FUDS #: J09CA1075
INST ID: 57873
Facility Name: TIBURON NAVAL NET DEPOT
City: TIBURON
State: CA
EPA Region: 09
County: MARIN
Congressional District: 02
US Army District: Sacramento District (SPK)
In 1904, the U.S. Navy acquired 61.63 acres comprised of 49.3 acres on land and 12.33 acres tidelands on the Tiburon peninsula to establish the Naval Fuel Depot (California City Coaling Station). In March 1942, two parcels of 1.18 acres and 9.15 acres were added to the facility. In November 1942, another 18.49 acres of land was acquired for the depot. An additional tract of land for 0.63 acres (water line easement) was acquired such that by 1943 the total area of the Site was 91.08 acres. In May 1956, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) began the divestiture of land declared excess by the Navy. In June 1958, the Navy ceased all net operations and deactivated the Depot. Other programs under Navy control continued on portions of the Site, utilizing a small number of buildings until 1964. In 1969, the Navy transferred the remaining property to the Department of Interior.

In 1904, the U.S. Navy acquired 61.63 acres comprised of 49.3 acres on land and 12.33 acres tidelands on the Tiburon peninsula to establish the Naval Fuel Depot (California City Coaling Station). In April 1929, the Navy deactivated the Naval Fuel Depot; however, the Navy retained control of the Site. From 1931 to 1940, the Site was used by the State of California under a revocable license for the California Maritime Academy. The Depot was expanded in March 1942 through the Navy’s acquisition by condemnation of two tracts of land: 1.18 acres near the Paradise Road and 9.15 acres formerly used by Roebling and Sons for manufacturing Golden Gate Bridge cables. In November 1942, the Navy acquired through condemnation 18.49 acres of land from private parties. This land at Paradise Cove, located about one-third of a mile from the northern boundary of the Depot, was used to establish a Floating Dry Dock Training Center. An additional tract of land for 0.63 acres (water line easement) was acquired such that by 1943 the total area of the Site was 91.08 acres. Through the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Site was under continuous occupation by the Navy for operations that included coastal defense training programs. In May 1956, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) began the divestiture of land declared excess by the Navy. In June 1958, the Navy ceased all net operations and deactivated the Depot. Other programs under Navy control continued on portions of the Site, utilizing a small number of buildings until 1964. In 1958 and 1959 the Navy quitclaimed two tracts of land, 18.55 acres and 19.12 acres to Marin County. In 1961, the Navy relinquished control over portions of the Site to the Department of the Interior to establish marine fisheries programs. In 1969, the Navy quitclaimed the Site to the Department of Interior.
### MAP FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Distance Elevation</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
<th>EPA ID Number</th>
<th>EDR ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B5

**NAVAL NET DEPOT**

**ENVIROSTOR**

**S107736844**

**B5 ESE 1/4-1/2 0.471 mi. 2488 ft.**

**TIBURON, CA**

**Site 2 of 2 in cluster B**

**Relative:**

- **Higher**

**Actual:**

- **48 ft.**

**ENVIROSTOR:**

- **Facility ID:** 80000711
- **Status:** Inactive - Needs Evaluation
- **Status Date:** 07/01/2005
- **Site Code:** Not reported
- **Site Type:** Military Evaluation
- **Site Type Detailed:** FUDS
- **Acres:** 50
- **NPL:** No
- **Regulatory Agencies:** SMBRP
- **Lead Agency:** SMBRP
- **Program Manager:** Not reported
- **Supervisor:** Charles Ridenour
- **Division Branch:** Cleanup Sacramento
- **Assembly:** 10
- **Senate:** 02
- **Special Program:** Not reported
- **Restricted Use:** No
- **Site Mgmt Req:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Funding:** DERA
- **Latitude:** 37.89138
- **Longitude:** -122.4483
- **APN:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Past Use:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Potential COC:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Confirmed COC:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Potential Description:** NONE SPECIFIED
- **Alias Name:** CA99799F597000
- **Alias Type:** Federal Facility ID
- **Alias Name:** J09CA1075
- **Alias Type:** INPR
- **Alias Name:** 80000711
- **Alias Type:** Envirostor ID Number

**Completed Info:**

- **Completed Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Document Type:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** Not reported
- **Comments:** Not reported

- **Future Area Name:** Not reported
- **Future Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Future Document Type:** Not reported
- **Future Due Date:** Not reported
- **Schedule Area Name:** PROJECT WIDE
- **Schedule Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Schedule Document Type:** No Department of Defense Action Indicated (NDAI)
- **Schedule Due Date:** 06/02/2015
- **Schedule Revised Date:** Not reported

**Completed Info:**

- **Completed Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Completed Document Type:** Not reported
- **Completed Date:** Not reported
- **Comments:** Not reported

- **Future Area Name:** Not reported
- **Future Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Future Document Type:** Not reported
- **Future Due Date:** Not reported
- **Schedule Area Name:** PROJECT WIDE
- **Schedule Sub Area Name:** Not reported
- **Schedule Document Type:** No Department of Defense Action Indicated (NDAI)
- **Schedule Due Date:** 06/02/2015
- **Schedule Revised Date:** Not reported
Count: 0 records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>EDR ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Database(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO SITES FOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To maintain currency of the following federal and state databases, EDR contacts the appropriate governmental agency on a monthly or quarterly basis, as required.

**Number of Days to Update:** Provides confirmation that EDR is reporting records that have been updated within 90 days from the date the government agency made the information available to the public.

**STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS**

**Federal NPL site list**

NPL: National Priority List
National Priorities List (Superfund). The NPL is a subset of CERCLIS and identifies over 1,200 sites for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. NPL sites may encompass relatively large areas. As such, EDR provides polygon coverage for over 1,000 NPL site boundaries produced by EPA’s Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC) and regional EPA offices.

- **Date of Government Version:** 03/26/2015
- **Date Data Arrived at EDR:** 04/08/2015
- **Date Made Active in Reports:** 06/22/2015
- **Number of Days to Update:** 75

**NPL Site Boundaries**
Sources:
- EPA’s Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC)
  Telephone: 202-564-7333
- EPA Region 1: Telephone 617-918-1143
- EPA Region 3: Telephone 215-814-5418
- EPA Region 4: Telephone 404-562-8033
- EPA Region 5: Telephone 312-886-6686
- EPA Region 10: Telephone 206-553-8665

**Proposed NPL:** Proposed National Priority List Sites
A site that has been proposed for listing on the National Priorities List through the issuance of a proposed rule in the Federal Register. EPA then accepts public comments on the site, responds to the comments, and places on the NPL those sites that continue to meet the requirements for listing.

- **Date of Government Version:** 03/26/2015
- **Date Data Arrived at EDR:** 04/08/2015
- **Date Made Active in Reports:** 06/22/2015
- **Number of Days to Update:** 75

**NPL LIENS:** Federal Superfund Liens
Federal Superfund Liens. Under the authority granted the USEPA by CERCLA of 1980, the USEPA has the authority to file liens against real property in order to recover remedial action expenditures or when the property owner received notification of potential liability. USEPA compiles a listing of filed notices of Superfund Liens.

- **Date of Government Version:** 10/15/1991
- **Date Data Arrived at EDR:** 02/02/1994
- **Date Made Active in Reports:** 03/30/1994
- **Number of Days to Update:** 56
Federal Delisted NPL site list

Delisted NPL: National Priority List Deletions

The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

Date of Government Version: 03/26/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 75

Source: EPA
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 07/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal CERCLIS list

FEDERAL FACILITY: Federal Facility Site Information listing

A listing of National Priority List (NPL) and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) sites found in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Database where EPA Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office is involved in cleanup activities.

Date of Government Version: 03/26/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015
Number of Days to Update: 64

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-603-8704
Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

CERCLIS: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System

CERCLIS contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the USEPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons, pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLIS contains sites which are either proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites which are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 94

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-412-9810
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal CERCLIS NFRAP site List

CERCLIS-NFRAP: CERCLIS No Further Remedial Action Planned

Archived sites are sites that have been removed and archived from the inventory of CERCLIS sites. Archived status indicates that, to the best of EPA's knowledge, assessment at a site has been completed and that EPA has determined no further steps will be taken to list this site on the National Priorities List (NPL), unless information indicates this decision was not appropriate or other considerations require a recommendation for listing at a later time. This decision does not necessarily mean that there is no hazard associated with a given site; it only means that, based upon available information, the location is not judged to be a potential NPL site.

Date of Government Version: 10/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 94

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-412-9810
Last EDR Contact: 05/29/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Federal RCRA CORRACTS facilities list

CORRACTS: Corrective Action Report

CORRACTS identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.
### Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS TSD facilities list

**RCRA-TSDF:** RCRA - Treatment, Storage and Disposal  
RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Transports are individuals or entities that move hazardous waste from the generator offsite to a facility that can recycle, treat, store, or dispose of the waste. TSDFs treat, store, or dispose of the waste.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: (415) 495-8895 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 82 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Quarterly | |

### Federal RCRA generators list

**RCRA-LQG:** RCRA - Large Quantity Generators  
RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Large quantity generators (LQGs) generate over 1,000 kilograms (kg) of hazardous waste, or over 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: (415) 495-8895 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 82 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Quarterly | |

**RCRA-SQG:** RCRA - Small Quantity Generators  
RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Small quantity generators (SQGs) generate between 100 kg and 1,000 kg of hazardous waste per month.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: (415) 495-8895 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 82 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Quarterly | |

**RCRA-CESQG:** RCRA - Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators  
RCRAInfo is EPA’s comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Conditionally exempt small quantity generators (CESQGs) generate less than 100 kg of hazardous waste, or less than 1 kg of acutely hazardous waste per month.

| Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015 | Telephone: (415) 495-8895 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 82 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies | |
Federal institutional controls / engineering controls registries

LUCIS: Land Use Control Information System
LUCIS contains records of land use control information pertaining to the former Navy Base Realignment and Closure properties.

- Date of Government Version: 05/28/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/29/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 13
- Source: Department of the Navy
- Telephone: 843-820-7326
- Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Varies

US ENG CONTROLS: Engineering Controls Sites List
A listing of sites with engineering controls in place. Engineering controls include various forms of caps, building foundations, liners, and treatment methods to create pathway elimination for regulated substances to enter environmental media or effect human health.

- Date of Government Version: 09/10/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 11/03/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 53
- Source: Environmental Protection Agency
- Telephone: 703-603-0695
- Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Varies

US INST CONTROL: Sites with Institutional Controls
A listing of sites with institutional controls in place. Institutional controls include administrative measures, such as groundwater use restrictions, construction restrictions, property use restrictions, and post remediation care requirements intended to prevent exposure to contaminants remaining on site. Deed restrictions are generally required as part of the institutional controls.

- Date of Government Version: 09/10/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 11/03/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 53
- Source: Environmental Protection Agency
- Telephone: 703-603-0695
- Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Varies

Federal ERNS list

ERNS: Emergency Response Notification System
Emergency Response Notification System. ERNS records and stores information on reported releases of oil and hazardous substances.

- Date of Government Version: 06/22/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 82
- Source: National Response Center, United States Coast Guard
- Telephone: 202-267-2180
- Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Annually

State- and tribal - equivalent NPL

RESPONSE: State Response Sites
Identifies confirmed release sites where DTSC is involved in remediation, either in a lead or oversight capacity. These confirmed release sites are generally high-priority and high potential risk.

- Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/04/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 30
- Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
- Telephone: 916-323-3400
- Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

State- and tribal - equivalent CERCLIS
ENVIROSTOR: EnviroStor Database

The Department of Toxic Substances Control’s (DTSC’s) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program’s (SMBRP’s) EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/03/2015</td>
<td>08/04/2015</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>916-323-3400</td>
<td>08/04/2015</td>
<td>11/16/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State and tribal landfill and/or solid waste disposal site lists

SWF/LF (SWIS): Solid Waste Information System
Active, Closed and Inactive Landfills. SWF/LF records typically contain an inventory of solid waste disposal facilities or landfills. These may be active or inactive facilities or open dumps that failed to meet RCRA Section 4004 criteria for solid waste landfills or disposal sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/17/2015</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery</td>
<td>916-341-6320</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>11/30/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State and tribal leaking storage tank lists

LUST REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigation
Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Modoc, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Trinity counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2001</td>
<td>02/28/2001</td>
<td>03/29/2001</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast (1)</td>
<td>707-570-3769</td>
<td>08/01/2011</td>
<td>11/14/2011</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUST REG 9: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Report
Orange, Riverside, San Diego counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2001</td>
<td>04/23/2001</td>
<td>05/21/2001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region (9)</td>
<td>858-637-5595</td>
<td>09/26/2011</td>
<td>01/09/2012</td>
<td>No Update Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUST: Geotracker’s Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Report
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports. LUST records contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. Not all states maintain these records, and the information stored varies by state. For more information on a particular leaking underground storage tank sites, please contact the appropriate regulatory agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2015</td>
<td>10/22/2015</td>
<td>11/05/2015</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>see region list</td>
<td>10/22/2015</td>
<td>12/28/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LUST REG 7: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara counties.
Date of Government Version: 02/26/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/26/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/24/2004
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region (7)
Telephone: 760-776-8943
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 6V: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
Date of Government Version: 06/07/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/07/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/29/2005
Number of Days to Update: 22
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Victorville Branch Office (6)
Telephone: 760-241-7365
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 6L: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Case Listing
For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.
Date of Government Version: 09/09/2003
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2003
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/07/2003
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Lahontan Region (6)
Telephone: 530-542-5572
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 5: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database
Date of Government Version: 07/01/2008
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008
Number of Days to Update: 9
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region (5)
Telephone: 916-464-4834
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 4: Underground Storage Tank Leak List
Los Angeles, Ventura counties. For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.
Date of Government Version: 09/07/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/07/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2004
Number of Days to Update: 35
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4)
Telephone: 213-576-6710
Last EDR Contact: 09/06/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/19/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 3: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Database
Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations. Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz counties.
Date of Government Version: 05/19/2003
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/19/2003
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2003
Number of Days to Update: 14
Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region (3)
Telephone: 805-542-4786
Last EDR Contact: 07/18/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/31/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

LUST REG 2: Fuel Leak List
LUST REG 8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8). For more current information, please refer to the State Water Resources Control Board’s LUST database.

INDIAN LUST R7: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska

INDIAN LUST R10: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

INDIAN LUST R6: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in New Mexico and Oklahoma.

INDIAN LUST R5: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
Leaking underground storage tanks located on Indian Land in Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

INDIAN LUST R9: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Arizona, California, New Mexico and Nevada.
INDIAN LUST R8: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

Date of Government Version: 04/30/2015  Source: EPA Region 8
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/05/2015  Telephone: 303-312-6271
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 48  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

INDIAN LUST R4: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
LUSTs on Indian land in Florida, Mississippi and North Carolina.

Date of Government Version: 07/30/2015  Source: EPA Region 4
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2015  Telephone: 404-562-8677
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 67  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

INDIAN LUST R1: Leaking Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
A listing of leaking underground storage tank locations on Indian Land.

Date of Government Version: 02/03/2015  Source: EPA Region 1
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/30/2015  Telephone: 617-918-1313
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/22/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Number of Days to Update: 53  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC: Statewide SLIC Cases
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 10/21/2015  Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/22/2015  Telephone: 866-480-1028
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/06/2015  Last EDR Contact: 10/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 15  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC REG 1: Active Toxic Site Investigations
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 04/03/2003  Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (1)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/07/2003  Telephone: 707-576-2220
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/25/2003  Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Number of Days to Update: 18  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC REG 2: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 09/30/2004  Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region (2)
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/20/2004  Telephone: 510-286-0457
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/19/2004  Last EDR Contact: 09/19/2011
Number of Days to Update: 30  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/02/2012
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SLIC REG 3: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.
SLIC REG 4: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 11/17/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/18/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005
Number of Days to Update: 47

Source: Region Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region (4)
Telephone: 213-576-6600
Last EDR Contact: 07/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/17/2011
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SLIC REG 5: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 04/01/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/05/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/21/2005
Number of Days to Update: 16

Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region (5)
Telephone: 916-464-3291
Last EDR Contact: 09/12/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/26/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SLIC REG 6V: Spills, Leaks, Investigation & Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 05/24/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/25/2005
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/16/2005
Number of Days to Update: 22

Source: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Victorville Branch
Telephone: 619-241-6583
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SLIC REG 6L: SLIC Sites
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 09/07/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/07/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2004
Number of Days to Update: 35

Source: California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region
Telephone: 530-542-5574
Last EDR Contact: 08/15/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/28/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

SLIC REG 7: SLIC List
The SLIC (Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup) program is designed to protect and restore water quality from spills, leaks, and similar discharges.

Date of Government Version: 11/24/2004
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/29/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/04/2005
Number of Days to Update: 36

Source: California Regional Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin Region
Telephone: 760-346-7491
Last EDR Contact: 08/01/2011
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/14/2011
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
<th>SLIC REG 9: Spills, Leaks, Investigation &amp; Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing</th>
<th>State and tribal registered storage tank lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>California Region Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region (8)</td>
<td>FEMA UST: Underground Storage Tank Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>951-782-3298</td>
<td>A listing of all FEMA owned underground storage tanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports</td>
<td>04/14/2008</td>
<td>Date of Government Version: 04/03/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR</td>
<td>04/03/2008</td>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/03/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Government Version</td>
<td>09/10/2007</td>
<td>Date of Government Version: 04/03/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Date of Government Version: 01/01/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last EDR Contact</td>
<td>09/12/2011</td>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/03/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</td>
<td>12/26/2011</td>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 04/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region (9)</td>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>858-467-2980</td>
<td>Source: FEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports</td>
<td>09/28/2007</td>
<td>Telephone: 202-646-5797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR</td>
<td>09/11/2007</td>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 04/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Government Version</td>
<td>09/10/2007</td>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last EDR Contact</td>
<td>08/08/2011</td>
<td>Source: SWRCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</td>
<td>11/21/2011</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-327-5092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency</td>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIAN UST R5: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 5 (Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin and Tribal Nations).

INDIAN UST R1: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and ten Tribal Nations).

INDIAN UST R10: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land

INDIAN UST R9: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 9 (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, the Pacific Islands, and Tribal Nations).

INDIAN UST R8: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 8 (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming and 27 Tribal Nations).

INDIAN UST R6: Underground Storage Tanks on Indian Land
The Indian Underground Storage Tank (UST) database provides information about underground storage tanks on Indian land in EPA Region 6 (Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas and 65 Tribes).
State and tribal voluntary cleanup sites

VCP: Voluntary Cleanup Program Properties
Contains low threat level properties with either confirmed or unconfirmed releases and the project proponents have request that DTSC oversee investigation and/or cleanup activities and have agreed to provide coverage for DTSC’s costs.

INDIAN VCP R1: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 1.

INDIAN VCP R7: Voluntary Cleanup Priority Listing
A listing of voluntary cleanup priority sites located on Indian Land located in Region 7.

State and tribal Brownfields sites

BROWNFIELDS: Considered Brownfields Sites Listing
A listing of sites the SWRCB considers to be Brownfields since these are sites have come to them through the MOA Process.

ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS

Local Brownfield lists

US BROWNFIELDS: A Listing of Brownfields Sites
Brownfields are real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties takes development pressures off of undeveloped, open land, and both improves and protects the environment. Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) stores information reported by EPA Brownfields grant recipients on brownfields properties assessed or cleaned up with grant funding as well as information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments performed by EPA Regions. A listing of ACRES Brownfield sites is obtained from Cleanups in My Community. Cleanups in My Community provides information on Brownfields properties for which information is reported back to EPA, as well as areas served by Brownfields grant programs.
Local Lists of Landfill / Solid Waste Disposal Sites

WMUDS/SWAT: Waste Management Unit Database
Waste Management Unit Database System. WMUDS is used by the State Water Resources Control Board staff and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards for program tracking and inventory of waste management units. WMUDS is composed of the following databases: Facility Information, Scheduled Inspections Information, Waste Management Unit Information, SWAT Program Information, SWAT Report Summary Information, SWAT Report Summary Data, Chapter 15 (formerly Subchapter 15) Information, Chapter 15 Monitoring Parameters, TPCA Program Information, RCRA Program Information, Closure Information, and Interested Parties Information.

SWRCY: Recycler Database
A listing of recycling facilities in California.

HAULERS: Registered Waste Tire Haulers Listing
A listing of registered waste tire haulers.

INDIAN ODI: Report on the Status of Open Dumps on Indian Lands
Location of open dumps on Indian land.

ODI: Open Dump Inventory
An open dump is defined as a disposal facility that does not comply with one or more of the Part 257 or Part 258 Subtitle D Criteria.

Date of Government Version: 06/22/2015  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-566-2777
Last EDR Contact: 06/24/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 70

Date of Government Version: 04/01/2000  
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-227-4448
Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/10/2000
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/10/2000
Number of Days to Update: 30

Date of Government Version: 09/14/2015  
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-3836
Last EDR Contact: 09/15/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 29

Date of Government Version: 09/21/2015  
Source: Integrated Waste Management Board
Telephone: 916-341-6422
Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 44

Date of Government Version: 12/31/1998  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-308-8245
Last EDR Contact: 05/01/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/17/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/03/2007
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/24/2008
Number of Days to Update: 52

Date of Government Version: 06/30/1985  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 800-424-9346
Last EDR Contact: 06/09/2004
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/09/2004
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/17/2004
Number of Days to Update: 39
### DEBRIS REGION 9: Torres Martinez Reservation Illegal Dump Site Locations

A listing of illegal dump sites located on the Torres Martinez Indian Reservation located in eastern Riverside County and northern Imperial County, California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 01/12/2009</th>
<th>Source: EPA, Region 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/07/2009</td>
<td>Telephone: 415-947-4219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 09/21/2009</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 137</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Lists of Hazardous waste / Contaminated Sites

**US HIST CDL: National Clandestine Laboratory Register**

A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/12/2015</th>
<th>Source: Drug Enforcement Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/04/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 202-307-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 11/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 60</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIST CAL-SITES: Calsites Database**

The Calsites database contains potential or confirmed hazardous substance release properties. In 1996, California EPA reevaluated and significantly reduced the number of sites in the Calsites database. No longer updated by the state agency. It has been replaced by ENVIROSTOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/08/2005</th>
<th>Source: Department of Toxic Substance Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/03/2006</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-323-3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/24/2006</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 02/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 21</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 05/25/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCH: School Property Evaluation Program**

This category contains proposed and existing school sites that are being evaluated by DTSC for possible hazardous materials contamination. In some cases, these properties may be listed in the CalSites category depending on the level of threat to public health and safety or the environment they pose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015</th>
<th>Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/04/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-323-3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 30</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs**

A listing of drug lab locations. Listing of a location in this database does not indicate that any illegal drug lab materials were or were not present there, and does not constitute a determination that the location either requires or does not require additional cleanup work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014</th>
<th>Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/10/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-255-6504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 03/18/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 8</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Data Release Frequency: Varies |
TOXIC PITS: Toxic Pits Cleanup Act Sites

Toxic PITS Cleanup Act Sites. TOXIC PITS identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed.

- **Date of Government Version:** 07/01/1995
- **Source:** State Water Resources Control Board
- **Telephone:** 916-227-4364
- **Last EDR Contact:** 01/26/2009
- **Next Scheduled EDR Contact:** 04/27/2009
- **Data Release Frequency:** No Update Planned

US CDL: Clandestine Drug Labs

A listing of clandestine drug lab locations. The U.S. Department of Justice ("the Department") provides this web site as a public service. It contains addresses of some locations where law enforcement agencies reported they found chemicals or other items that indicated the presence of either clandestine drug laboratories or dumpsites. In most cases, the source of the entries is not the Department, and the Department has not verified the entry and does not guarantee its accuracy. Members of the public must verify the accuracy of all entries by, for example, contacting local law enforcement and local health departments.

- **Date of Government Version:** 08/12/2015
- **Source:** Drug Enforcement Administration
- **Telephone:** 202-307-1000
- **Last EDR Contact:** 08/31/2015
- **Next Scheduled EDR Contact:** 12/14/2015
- **Data Release Frequency:** Quarterly

Local Lists of Registered Storage Tanks

SWEEPS UST: SWEEPS UST Listing

Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System. This underground storage tank listing was updated and maintained by a company contacted by the SWRCB in the early 1990's. The listing is no longer updated or maintained. The local agency is the contact for more information on a site on the SWEEPS list.

- **Date of Government Version:** 06/01/1994
- **Source:** State Water Resources Control Board
- **Telephone:** N/A
- **Last EDR Contact:** 06/03/2005
- **Next Scheduled EDR Contact:** N/A
- **Data Release Frequency:** No Update Planned

UST MENDOCINO: Mendocino County UST Database

A listing of underground storage tank locations in Mendocino County.

- **Date of Government Version:** 09/23/2009
- **Source:** Department of Public Health
- **Telephone:** 707-463-4466
- **Last EDR Contact:** 09/14/2015
- **Data Release Frequency:** Annually

HIST UST: Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database

The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites. Refer to local/county source for current data.

- **Date of Government Version:** 10/15/1990
- **Source:** State Water Resources Control Board
- **Telephone:** 916-341-5851
- **Last EDR Contact:** 07/26/2001
- **Next Scheduled EDR Contact:** N/A
- **Data Release Frequency:** No Update Planned

CA FID UST: Facility Inventory Database

The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive underground storage tank locations from the State Water Resource Control Board. Refer to local/county source for current data.
Local Land Records

LIENS: Environmental Liens Listing
A listing of property locations with environmental liens for California where DTSC is a lien holder.

Date of Government Version: 09/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 32
Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 09/08/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LIENS 2: CERCLA Lien Information
A Federal CERCLA ('Superfund') lien can exist by operation of law at any site or property at which EPA has spent Superfund monies. These monies are spent to investigate and address releases and threatened releases of contamination. CERCLIS provides information as to the identity of these sites and properties.

Date of Government Version: 02/18/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/18/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 37
Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-564-6023
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

DEED: Deed Restriction Listing
Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Facility Sites with Deed Restrictions & Hazardous Waste Management Program Facility Sites with Deed / Land Use Restriction. The DTSC Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program (SMBRP) list includes sites cleaned up under the program's oversight and generally does not include current or former hazardous waste facilities that required a hazardous waste facility permit. The list represents deed restrictions that are active. Some sites have multiple deed restrictions. The DTSC Hazardous Waste Management Program (HWMP) has developed a list of current or former hazardous waste facilities that have a recorded land use restriction at the local county recorder's office. The land use restrictions on this list were required by the DTSC HWMP as a result of the presence of hazardous substances that remain on site after the facility (or part of the facility) has been closed or cleaned up. The types of land use restriction include deed notice, deed restriction, or a land use restriction that binds current and future owners.

Date of Government Version: 09/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34
Source: DTSC and SWRCB
Telephone: 916-323-3400
Last EDR Contact: 09/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Records of Emergency Release Reports

HMIRS: Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
Hazardous Materials Incident Report System. HMIRS contains hazardous material spill incidents reported to DOT.

Date of Government Version: 06/24/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 68
Source: U.S. Department of Transportation
Telephone: 202-366-4555
Last EDR Contact: 06/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

CHMIRS: California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
California Hazardous Material Incident Reporting System. CHMIRS contains information on reported hazardous material incidents (accidental releases or spills).
GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

LDS: Land Disposal Sites Listing
The Land Disposal program regulates the discharge of waste to land for treatment, storage and disposal in waste management units.

Date of Government Version: 10/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 14
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

MCS: Military Cleanup Sites Listing
The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards partner with the Department of Defense (DoD) through the Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) to oversee the investigation and remediation of water quality issues at military facilities.

Date of Government Version: 10/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 14
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SPILLS 90: SPILLS90 data from FirstSearch
Spills 90 includes those spill and release records available exclusively from FirstSearch databases. Typically, they may include chemical, oil and/or hazardous substance spills recorded after 1990. Duplicate records that are already included in EDR incident and release records are not included in Spills 90.

Date of Government Version: 06/06/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/03/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/22/2013
Number of Days to Update: 50
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Other Ascertainable Records

RCRA NonGen / NLR: RCRA - Non Generators / No Longer Regulated
RCRAInfo is EPA's comprehensive information system, providing access to data supporting the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. The database includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Non-Generators do not presently generate hazardous waste.

Date of Government Version: 06/09/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/26/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/16/2015
Number of Days to Update: 82
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FUDS: Formerly Used Defense Sites

The listing includes locations of Formerly Used Defense Sites properties where the US Army Corps of Engineers is actively working or will take necessary cleanup actions.

Date of Government Version: 01/31/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 97
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies
DOD: Department of Defense Sites
This data set consists of federally owned or administered lands, administered by the Department of Defense, that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005  
Source: USGS  
Telephone: 888-275-8747  
Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

FEDLAND: Federal and Indian Lands

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005  
Source: U.S. Geological Survey  
Telephone: 888-275-8747  
Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: N/A

SCRD DRYCLEANERS: State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners Listing
The State Coalition for Remediation of Drycleaners was established in 1998, with support from the U.S. EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation. It is comprised of representatives of states with established drycleaner remediation programs. Currently the member states are Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Date of Government Version: 03/07/2011  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency  
Telephone: 615-532-8599  
Last EDR Contact: 05/21/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/31/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US FIN ASSUR: Financial Assurance Information
All owners and operators of facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste are required to provide proof that they will have sufficient funds to pay for the clean up, closure, and post-closure care of their facilities.

Date of Government Version: 09/01/2015  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency  
Telephone: 202-566-1917  
Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

EPA WATCH LIST: EPA WATCH LIST
EPA maintains a "Watch List" to facilitate dialogue between EPA, state and local environmental agencies on enforcement matters relating to facilities with alleged violations identified as either significant or high priority. Being on the Watch List does not mean that the facility has actually violated the law only that an investigation by EPA or a state or local environmental agency has led those organizations to allege that an unproven violation has in fact occurred. Being on the Watch List does not represent a higher level of concern regarding the alleged violations that were detected, but instead indicates cases requiring additional dialogue between EPA, state and local agencies - primarily because of the length of time the alleged violation has gone unaddressed or unresolved.

Date of Government Version: 08/30/2013  
Source: Environmental Protection Agency  
Telephone: 617-520-3000  
Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly
2020 COR ACTION: 2020 Corrective Action Program List

The EPA has set ambitious goals for the RCRA Corrective Action program by creating the 2020 Corrective Action Universe. This RCRA cleanup baseline includes facilities expected to need corrective action. The 2020 universe contains a wide variety of sites. Some properties are heavily contaminated while others were contaminated but have since been cleaned up. Still others have not been fully investigated yet, and may require little or no remediation. Inclusion in the 2020 Universe does not necessarily imply failure on the part of a facility to meet its RCRA obligations.

Date of Government Version: 04/22/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/03/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/09/2015
Number of Days to Update: 6

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 703-308-4044
Last EDR Contact: 05/14/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/24/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act

Toxic Substances Control Act. TSCA identifies manufacturers and importers of chemical substances included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory list. It includes data on the production volume of these substances by plant site.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2012
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/15/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/29/2015
Number of Days to Update: 14

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-260-5521
Last EDR Contact: 06/25/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Every 4 Years

TRIS: Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System

Toxic Release Inventory System. TRIS identifies facilities which release toxic chemicals to the air, water and land in reportable quantities under SARA Title III Section 313.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/12/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 110

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-566-0250
Last EDR Contact: 01/29/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 06/08/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

SSTS: Section 7 Tracking Systems

Section 7 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended (92 Stat. 829) requires all registered pesticide-producing establishments to submit a report to the Environmental Protection Agency by March 1st each year. Each establishment must report the types and amounts of pesticides, active ingredients and devices being produced, and those having been produced and sold or distributed in the past year.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/10/2010
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/25/2011
Number of Days to Update: 77

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-564-4203
Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

ROD: Records Of Decision

Record of Decision. ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid in the cleanup.

Date of Government Version: 11/25/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/12/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/24/2014
Number of Days to Update: 74

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-416-0223
Last EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

RMP: Risk Management Plans
When Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, it required EPA to publish regulations and guidance for chemical accident prevention at facilities using extremely hazardous substances. The Risk Management Program Rule (RMP Rule) was written to implement Section 112(r) of these amendments. The rule, which built upon existing industry codes and standards, requires companies of all sizes that use certain flammable and toxic substances to develop a Risk Management Program, which includes a(n): Hazard assessment that details the potential effects of an accidental release, an accident history of the last five years, and an evaluation of worst-case and alternative accidental releases; Prevention program that includes safety precautions and maintenance, monitoring, and employee training measures; and Emergency response program that spells out emergency health care, employee training measures and procedures for informing the public and response agencies (e.g. the fire department) should an accident occur.

**RAATS: RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System**

RCRA Administration Action Tracking System. RAATS contains records based on enforcement actions issued under RCRA pertaining to major violators and includes administrative and civil actions brought by the EPA. For administration actions after September 30, 1995, data entry in the RAATS database was discontinued. EPA will retain a copy of the database for historical records. It was necessary to terminate RAATS because a decrease in agency resources made it impossible to continue to update the information contained in the database.

**PRP: Potentially Responsible Parties**

A listing of verified Potentially Responsible Parties

**PADS: PCB Activity Database System**

PCB Activity Database. PADS identifies generators, transporters, commercial storers and/or brokers and disposers of PCB’s who are required to notify the EPA of such activities.

**ICIS: Integrated Compliance Information System**

The Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) supports the information needs of the national enforcement and compliance program as well as the unique needs of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.
FTTS: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
FTTS tracks administrative cases and pesticide enforcement actions and compliance activities related to FIFRA, TSCA and EPCRA (Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act). To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Number of Days to Update: 25
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: EPA/Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances
Telephone: 202-566-1667

FTTS INSP: FIFRA/ TSCA Tracking System - FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, & Rodenticide Act)/TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act)
A listing of FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) inspections and enforcements.

Date of Government Version: 04/09/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/16/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 05/11/2009
Number of Days to Update: 25
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: EPA
Telephone: 202-566-1667

MLTS: Material Licensing Tracking System
MLTS is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of approximately 8,100 sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements. To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.

Date of Government Version: 06/26/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/10/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 95
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Source: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Telephone: 301-415-7169

COAL ASH DOE: Steam-Electric Plant Operation Data
A listing of power plants that store ash in surface ponds.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/22/2009
Number of Days to Update: 76
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Department of Energy
Telephone: 202-586-8719

COAL ASH EPA: Coal Combustion Residues Surface Impoundments List
A listing of coal combustion residues surface impoundments with high hazard potential ratings.

Date of Government Version: 07/01/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/10/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/20/2014
Number of Days to Update: 40
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: N/A

PCB TRANSFORMER: PCB Transformer Registration Database
The database of PCB transformer registrations that includes all PCB registration submittals.

Date of Government Version: 02/01/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/19/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/10/2012
Number of Days to Update: 83
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Source: Environmental Protection Agency
Telephone: 202-566-0517

RADINFO: Radiation Information Database
The Radiation Information Database (RADINFO) contains information about facilities that are regulated by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations for radiation and radioactivity.
### HIST FTTS: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Administrative Case Listing
A complete administrative case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

| Date of Government Version: 10/19/2006 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/01/2007 | Telephone: 202-564-2501 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 04/10/2007 | Last EDR Contact: 12/17/2007 |
| Number of Days to Update: 40 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 03/17/2008 |
| Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned | |

### HIST FTTS INSPI: FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System Inspection & Enforcement Case Listing
A complete inspection and enforcement case listing from the FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (FTTS) for all ten EPA regions. The information was obtained from the National Compliance Database (NCDB). NCDB supports the implementation of FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act) and TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act). Some EPA regions are now closing out records. Because of that, and the fact that some EPA regions are not providing EPA Headquarters with updated records, it was decided to create a HIST FTTS database. It included records that may not be included in the newer FTTS database updates. This database is no longer updated.

| Date of Government Version: 10/19/2006 | Source: Environmental Protection Agency |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/01/2007 | Telephone: 202-564-2501 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 04/10/2007 | Last EDR Contact: 12/17/2007 |
| Number of Days to Update: 40 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 03/17/2008 |
| Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned | |

### DOT OPS: Incident and Accident Data
Department of Transporation, Office of Pipeline Safety Incident and Accident data.

| Date of Government Version: 07/31/2012 | Source: Department of Transporation, Office of Pipeline Safety |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2012 | Telephone: 202-366-4595 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/18/2012 | Last EDR Contact: 08/04/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 42 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies | |

### CONSENT: Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
Major legal settlements that establish responsibility and standards for cleanup at NPL (Superfund) sites. Released periodically by United States District Courts after settlement by parties to litigation matters.

| Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014 | Source: Department of Justice, Consent Decree Library |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/17/2015 | Telephone: Varies |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 06/02/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 46 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Varies | |

### BRS: Biennial Reporting System
The Biennial Reporting System is a national system administered by the EPA that collects data on the generation and management of hazardous waste. BRS captures detailed data from two groups: Large Quantity Generators (LQG) and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities.

| Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013 | Source: EPA/NTIS |
| Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/24/2015 | Telephone: 800-424-9346 |
| Date Made Active in Reports: 09/30/2015 | Last EDR Contact: 08/28/2015 |
| Number of Days to Update: 218 | Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015 |
| Data Release Frequency: Biennially | |
INDIAN RESERV:  Indian Reservations
This map layer portrays Indian administered lands of the United States that have any area equal to or greater than 640 acres.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/2005  Source:  USGS
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/08/2006  Telephone:  202-208-3710
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/11/2007  Last EDR Contact: 07/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

UMTRA:  Uranium Mill Tailings Sites
Uranium ore was mined by private companies for federal government use in national defense programs. When the mills shut down, large piles of the sand-like material (mill tailings) remain after uranium has been extracted from the ore. Levels of human exposure to radioactive materials from the piles are low; however, in some cases tailings were used as construction materials before the potential health hazards of the tailings were recognized.

Date of Government Version: 09/14/2010  Source:  Department of Energy
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/07/2011  Telephone:  505-845-0011
Date Made Active in Reports: 03/01/2012  Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Number of Days to Update: 146  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

LEAD SMELTER 1:  Lead Smelter Sites
A listing of former lead smelter site locations.

Date of Government Version: 11/25/2014  Source:  Environmental Protection Agency
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/26/2014  Telephone:  703-603-8787
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/29/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 64  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

LEAD SMELTER 2:  Lead Smelter Sites
A list of several hundred sites in the U.S. where secondary lead smelting was done from 1931 and 1964. These sites may pose a threat to public health through ingestion or inhalation of contaminated soil or dust.

Date of Government Version: 04/05/2001  Source:  American Journal of Public Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/27/2010  Telephone:  703-305-6451
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/02/2010  Last EDR Contact: 12/02/2009
Number of Days to Update: 36  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

US AIRS (AFS):  Aerometric Information Retrieval System Facility Subsystem (AFS)
The database is a sub-system of Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS). AFS contains compliance data on air pollution point sources regulated by the U.S. EPA and/or state and local air regulatory agencies. This information comes from source reports by various stationary sources of air pollution, such as electric power plants, steel mills, factories, and universities, and provides information about the air pollutants they produce. Action, air program, air program pollutant, and general level plant data. It is used to track emissions and compliance data from industrial plants.

Date of Government Version: 07/22/2015  Source:  EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015  Telephone:  202-564-2496
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 40  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

US AIRS MINOR:  Air Facility System Data
A listing of minor source facilities.

Date of Government Version: 07/22/2015  Source:  EPA
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015  Telephone:  202-564-2496
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015  Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 40  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/22/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually
US MINES: Mines Master Index File
Contains all mine identification numbers issued for mines active or opened since 1971. The data also includes violation information.

Date of Government Version: 05/14/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/03/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/02/2015
Number of Days to Update: 91

Source: Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration
Telephone: 303-231-5959
Last EDR Contact: 09/01/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

US MINES 2: Ferrous and Nonferrous Metal Mines Database Listing
This map layer includes ferrous (ferrous metal mines are facilities that extract ferrous metals, such as iron ore or molybdenum) and nonferrous (Nonferrous metal mines are facilities that extract nonferrous metals, such as gold, silver, copper, zinc, and lead) metal mines in the United States.

Date of Government Version: 12/05/2005
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 02/29/2008
Date Made Active in Reports: 04/18/2008
Number of Days to Update: 49

Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-648-7709
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

US MINES 3: Active Mines & Mineral Plants Database Listing
Active Mines and Mineral Processing Plant operations for commodities monitored by the Minerals Information Team of the USGS.

Date of Government Version: 04/14/2011
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/08/2011
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/13/2011
Number of Days to Update: 97

Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-648-7709
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FINDS: Facility Index System/Facility Registry System
Facility Index System. FINDS contains both facility information and ‘pointers’ to other sources that contain more detail. EDR includes the following FINDS databases in this report: PCS (Permit Compliance System), AIRS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System), DOCKET (Enforcement Docket used to manage and track information on civil judicial enforcement cases for all environmental statutes), FURS (Federal Underground Injection Control), C-DOCKET (Criminal Docket System used to track criminal enforcement actions for all environmental statutes), FFIS (Federal Facilities Information System), STATE (State Environmental Laws and Statutes), and PADS (PCB Activity Data System).

Date of Government Version: 07/20/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 55

Source: EPA
Telephone: (415) 947-8000
Last EDR Contact: 09/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

CA BOND EXP. PLAN: Bond Expenditure Plan
Department of Health Services developed a site-specific expenditure plan as the basis for an appropriation of Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act funds. It is not updated.

Date of Government Version: 01/01/1989
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/1994
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/02/1994
Number of Days to Update: 6

Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 916-255-2118
Last EDR Contact: 05/31/1994
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CORTESO: "Cortese" Hazardous Waste & Substances Sites List
The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board (LUST), the Integrated Waste Board (SWF/LS), and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (Cal-Sites).
DRYCLEANERS: Cleaner Facilities
A list of drycleaner related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes:
- power laundries, family and commercial; garment pressing and cleaner’s agents; linen supply; coin-operated laundries
  and cleaning; drycleaning plants, except rugs; carpet and upholstery cleaning; industrial launderers; laundry and
  garment services.

EMI: Emissions Inventory Data
Toxics and criteria pollutant emissions data collected by the ARB and local air pollution agencies.

ENF: Enforcement Action Listing
A listing of Water Board Enforcement Actions. Formal is everything except Oral/Verbal Communication, Notice of
Violation, Expedited Payment Letter, and Staff Enforcement Letter.

Financial Assurance 1: Financial Assurance Information Listing
Financial Assurance information

Financial Assurance 2: Financial Assurance Information Listing
A listing of financial assurance information for solid waste facilities. Financial assurance is intended to ensure
that resources are available to pay for the cost of closure, post-closure care, and corrective measures if the
owner or operator of a regulated facility is unable or unwilling to pay.

HAZNET: Facility and Manifest Data
Facility and Manifest Data. The data is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year
by the DTSC. The annual volume of manifests is typically 700,000 - 1,000,000 annually, representing approximately
350,000 - 500,000 shipments. Data are from the manifests submitted without correction, and therefore many contain
some invalid values for data elements such as generator ID, TSD ID, waste category, and disposal method. This
database begins with calendar year 1993.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date of Government Version</th>
<th>Date Data Arrived at EDR</th>
<th>Date Made Active in Reports</th>
<th>Number of Days to Update</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Last EDR Contact</th>
<th>Next Scheduled EDR Contact</th>
<th>Data Release Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIST CORTESE</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste &amp; Substance Site List. The sites for the list are designated by the State Water Resource Control Board [LUST], the Integrated Waste Board [SWF/LS], and the Department of Toxic Substances Control [CALSITES]. This listing is no longer updated by the state agency.</td>
<td>04/01/2001</td>
<td>01/22/2009</td>
<td>04/08/2009</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>916-323-3400</td>
<td>01/22/2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Update Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWP</td>
<td>EnviroStor Permitted Facilities Listing. Detailed information on permitted hazardous waste facilities and corrective action (&quot;cleanups&quot;) tracked in EnviroStor.</td>
<td>08/24/2015</td>
<td>08/26/2015</td>
<td>10/01/2015</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>916-323-3400</td>
<td>08/26/2015</td>
<td>12/07/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWT</td>
<td>Registered Hazardous Waste Transporter Database. A listing of hazardous waste transporters. In California, unless specifically exempted, it is unlawful for any person to transport hazardous wastes unless the person holds a valid registration issued by DTSC. A hazardous waste transporter registration is valid for one year and is assigned a unique registration number.</td>
<td>07/13/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>08/03/2015</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>916-440-7145</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>10/28/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td>Mines Site Location Listing. A listing of mine site locations from the Office of Mine Reclamation.</td>
<td>09/14/2015</td>
<td>09/15/2015</td>
<td>10/14/2015</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>916-322-1080</td>
<td>09/15/2015</td>
<td>12/28/2015</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWMP</td>
<td>Medical Waste Management Program Listing. The Medical Waste Management Program (MWMP) ensures the proper handling and disposal of medical waste by permitting and inspecting medical waste Offsite Treatment Facilities (PDF) and Transfer Stations (PDF) throughout the state. MWMP also oversees all Medical Waste Transporters.</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td>09/09/2015</td>
<td>10/12/2015</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>916-558-1784</td>
<td>09/09/2015</td>
<td>12/21/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>NPDES Permits Listing. A listing of NPDES permits, including stormwater.</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td>09/09/2015</td>
<td>10/12/2015</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Department of Public Health</td>
<td>916-558-1784</td>
<td>09/09/2015</td>
<td>12/21/2015</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEST LIC: Pesticide Regulation Licenses Listing
A listing of licenses and certificates issued by the Department of Pesticide Regulation. The DPR issues licenses and/or certificates to: Persons and businesses that apply or sell pesticides; Pest control dealers and brokers; Persons who advise on agricultural pesticide applications.

Date of Government Version: 09/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/09/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 33
Source: Department of Pesticide Regulation
Telephone: 916-445-4038
Last EDR Contact: 09/09/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

PROC: Certified Processors Database
A listing of certified processors.

Date of Government Version: 09/14/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/15/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 29
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-3836
Last EDR Contact: 09/15/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

NOTIFY 65: Proposition 65 Records
Listings of all Proposition 65 incidents reported to counties by the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This database is no longer updated by the reporting agency.

Date of Government Version: 08/04/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/25/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 41
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: 916-445-3846
Last EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/04/2016
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

UIC: UIC Listing
A listing of wells identified as underground injection wells, in the California Oil and Gas Wells database.

Date of Government Version: 07/23/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/15/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 28
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-445-2408
Last EDR Contact: 09/15/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

WASTEWATER PITS: Oil Wastewater Pits Listing
Water officials discovered that oil producers have been dumping chemical-laden wastewater into hundreds of unlined pits that are operating without proper permits. Inspections completed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board revealed the existence of previously unidentified waste sites. The water board’s review found that more than one-third of the region’s active disposal pits are operating without permission.

Date of Government Version: 04/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 06/23/2015
Number of Days to Update: 67
Source: RWQCB, Central Valley Region
Telephone: 559-445-5577
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

WDS: Waste Discharge System
Sites which have been issued waste discharge requirements.
EDR HIGH RISK HISTORICAL RECORDS

EDR Exclusive Records

EDR MGP: EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plants
The EDR Proprietary Manufactured Gas Plant Database includes records of coal gas plants (manufactured gas plants) compiled by EDR’s researchers. Manufactured gas sites were used in the United States from the 1800’s to 1950’s to produce a gas that could be distributed and used as fuel. These plants used whale oil, rosin, coal, or a mixture of coal, oil, and water that also produced a significant amount of waste. Many of the byproducts of the gas production, such as coal tar (oily waste containing volatile and non-volatile chemicals), sludges, oils and other compounds are potentially hazardous to human health and the environment. The byproduct from this process was frequently disposed of directly at the plant site and can remain or spread slowly, serving as a continuous source of soil and groundwater contamination.

EDR US Hist Auto Stat: EDR Exclusive Historic Gas Stations
EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential gas station/filling station/service station sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR’s review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR’s opinion, include gas station/filling station/service station establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to gas, gas station, gasoline station, filling station, auto, automobile repair, auto service station, service station, etc. This database falls within a category of information EDR classifies as "High Risk Historical Records", or HRHR. EDR’s HRHR effort presents unique and sometimes proprietary data about past sites and operations that typically create environmental concerns, but may not show up in current government records searches.

EDR US Hist Cleaners: EDR Exclusive Historic Dry Cleaners
EDR has searched selected national collections of business directories and has collected listings of potential dry cleaner sites that were available to EDR researchers. EDR’s review was limited to those categories of sources that might, in EDR’s opinion, include dry cleaning establishments. The categories reviewed included, but were not limited to dry cleaners, cleaners, laundry, laundromat, cleaning/laundry, wash & dry etc. This database falls within a category of information EDR classifies as "High Risk Historical Records", or HRHR. EDR’s HRHR effort presents unique and sometimes proprietary data about past sites and operations that typically create environmental concerns, but may not show up in current government records searches.
EDR RECOVERED GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES

Exclusive Recovered Govt. Archives

RGA LF: Recovered Government Archive Solid Waste Facilities List
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Landfill database provides a list of landfills derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery in California.

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/13/2014
Number of Days to Update: 196
Source: Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2012
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

RGA LUST: Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank
The EDR Recovered Government Archive Leaking Underground Storage Tank database provides a list of LUST incidents derived from historical databases and includes many records that no longer appear in current government lists. Compiled from Records formerly available from the State Water Resources Control Board in California.

Date of Government Version: N/A
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/01/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 12/30/2013
Number of Days to Update: 182
Source: State Water Resources Control Board
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2012
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A
Data Release Frequency: Varies

COUNTY RECORDS

ALAMEDA COUNTY:

Contaminated Sites
A listing of contaminated sites overseen by the Toxic Release Program (oil and groundwater contamination from chemical releases and spills) and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program (soil and ground water contamination from leaking petroleum USTs).

Date of Government Version: 07/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/05/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12
Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 08/10/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

Underground Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Alameda county.

Date of Government Version: 07/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12
Source: Alameda County Environmental Health Services
Telephone: 510-567-6700
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

AMADOR COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List
Date of Government Version: 08/24/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 35
Source: Amador County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-223-6439
Last EDR Contact: 09/08/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

BUTTE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 11/20/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 11/24/2014
Date Made Active in Reports: 01/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 44
Source: Public Health Department
Telephone: 530-538-7149
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

CALVERAS COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
Cupa Facility Listing
Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 17
Source: Calveras County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-754-6399
Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/12/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

COLUSA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 06/08/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 22
Source: Health & Human Services
Telephone: 530-458-0396
Last EDR Contact: 09/11/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY:

Site List
List includes sites from the underground tank, hazardous waste generator and business plan/2185 programs.
Date of Government Version: 08/24/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/25/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/01/2015
Number of Days to Update: 37
Source: Contra Costa Health Services Department
Telephone: 925-646-2286
Last EDR Contact: 08/03/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

DEL NORTE COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility list
Date of Government Version: 05/20/2015  Source: Del Norte County Environmental Health Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/03/2015  Telephone: 707-465-0426
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Number of Days to Update: 31  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

EL DORADO COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 09/23/2015  Source: El Dorado County Environmental Management Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/25/2015  Telephone: 530-621-6623
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/15/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

FRESNO COUNTY:

CUPA Resources List
Certified Unified Program Agency. CUPA’s are responsible for implementing a unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste management regulatory program. The agency provides oversight of businesses that deal with hazardous materials, operate underground storage tanks or aboveground storage tanks.

Date of Government Version: 07/13/2015  Source: Dept. of Community Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/14/2015  Telephone: 559-445-3271
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 07/06/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

HUMBOLDT COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.
Date of Government Version: 08/04/2015  Source: Humboldt County Environmental Health
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2015  Telephone: N/A
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

IMPERIAL COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 08/11/2015  Source: San Diego Border Field Office
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/14/2015  Telephone: 760-339-2777
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20  Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

INYO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list.
Date of Government Version: 09/10/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/11/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2013
Number of Days to Update: 33
Source: Inyo County Environmental Health Services
Telephone: 760-878-0238
Last EDR Contact: 05/21/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

KERN COUNTY:
Underground Storage Tank Sites & Tank Listing
Kern County Sites and Tanks Listing.
Date of Government Version: 05/19/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/18/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34
Source: Kern County Environment Health Services Department
Telephone: 661-862-8700
Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

KINGS COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
A listing of sites included in the county’s Certified Unified Program Agency database. California’s Secretary
for Environmental Protection established the unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory program
as required by chapter 6.11 of the California Health and Safety Code. The Unified Program consolidates the administration,
permits, inspections, and enforcement activities.
Date of Government Version: 08/25/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/27/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/30/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34
Source: Kings County Department of Public Health
Telephone: 559-584-1411
Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LAKE COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list
Date of Government Version: 08/11/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/14/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20
Source: Lake County Environmental Health
Telephone: 707-263-1164
Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

LOS ANGELES COUNTY:
San Gabriel Valley Areas of Concern
San Gabriel Valley areas where VOC contamination is at or above the MCL as designated by region 9 EPA office.
Date of Government Version: 03/30/2009
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/31/2009
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/23/2009
Number of Days to Update: 206
Source: EPA Region 9
Telephone: 415-972-3178
Last EDR Contact: 06/17/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned
## HMS: Street Number List

**Industrial Waste and Underground Storage Tank Sites.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 11/24/2014</th>
<th>Source: Department of Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/30/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 626-458-3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 03/04/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 33</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List of Solid Waste Facilities

**Solid Waste Facilities in Los Angeles County.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 07/20/2015</th>
<th>Source: La County Department of Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/21/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 818-458-5185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/21/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 13</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## City of Los Angeles Landfills

**Landfills owned and maintained by the City of Los Angeles.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 01/01/2015</th>
<th>Source: Engineering &amp; Construction Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/27/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 213-473-7889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/10/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 14</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Site Mitigation List

**Industrial sites that have had some sort of spill or complaint.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 01/15/2015</th>
<th>Source: Community Health Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/29/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 323-890-7806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 03/10/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/15/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 40</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## City of El Segundo Underground Storage Tank

**Underground storage tank sites located in El Segundo city.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 03/30/2015</th>
<th>Source: City of El Segundo Fire Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 04/02/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 310-524-2236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 04/13/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/17/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 11</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## City of Long Beach Underground Storage Tank

**Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Long Beach.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 03/03/2015</th>
<th>Source: City of Long Beach Fire Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 05/26/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 562-570-2563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 06/11/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/27/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 16</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## City of Torrance Underground Storage Tank

**Underground storage tank sites located in the city of Torrance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 06/03/2015</th>
<th>Source: City of Torrance Fire Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/04/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 310-618-2973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 07/06/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 06/04/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 32</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MADERA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
A listing of sites included in the county’s Certified Unified Program Agency database. California’s Secretary for Environmental Protection established the unified hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory program as required by chapter 6.11 of the California Health and Safety Code. The Unified Program consolidates the administration, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities.

Date of Government Version: 09/15/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: Madera County Environmental Health
Telephone: 559-675-7823
Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

MARIN COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Sites
Currently permitted USTs in Marin County.

Date of Government Version: 10/05/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/08/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/15/2015
Number of Days to Update: 7
Source: Public Works Department Waste Management
Telephone: 415-499-6647
Last EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/18/2016
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

MERCED COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.

Date of Government Version: 09/21/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/22/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 42
Source: Merced County Environmental Health
Telephone: 209-381-1094
Last EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

MONO COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA Facility List

Date of Government Version: 09/02/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/04/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/13/2015
Number of Days to Update: 39
Source: Mono County Health Department
Telephone: 760-932-5580
Last EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/14/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

MONTEREY COUNTY:

CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program listing from the Environmental Health Division.

Date of Government Version: 06/30/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/07/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/16/2015
Number of Days to Update: 9
Source: Monterey County Health Department
Telephone: 831-796-1297
Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

NAPA COUNTY:
Sites With Reported Contamination
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.

Date of Government Version: 12/05/2011  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/06/2011  
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/07/2012  
Number of Days to Update: 63  
Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management  
Telephone: 707-253-4269  
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

Closed and Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites
Underground storage tank sites located in Napa county.

Date of Government Version: 01/15/2008  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 01/16/2008  
Date Made Active in Reports: 02/08/2008  
Number of Days to Update: 23  
Source: Napa County Department of Environmental Management  
Telephone: 707-253-4269  
Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015  
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

NEVADA COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility list.

Date of Government Version: 06/03/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/04/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/22/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 48  
Source: Community Development Agency  
Telephone: 530-265-1467  
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies

ORANGE COUNTY:

List of Industrial Site Cleanups
Petroleum and non-petroleum spills.

Date of Government Version: 08/01/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/10/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 24  
Source: Health Care Agency  
Telephone: 714-834-3446  
Last EDR Contact: 08/06/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Annually

List of Underground Storage Tank Cleanups
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Cleanups (LUST).

Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/10/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/11/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 32  
Source: Health Care Agency  
Telephone: 714-834-3446  
Last EDR Contact: 05/06/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/24/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

List of Underground Storage Tank Facilities
Orange County Underground Storage Tank Facilities (UST).

Date of Government Version: 08/01/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/11/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 23  
Source: Health Care Agency  
Telephone: 714-834-3446  
Last EDR Contact: 08/11/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

PLACER COUNTY:
Master List of Facilities
List includes aboveground tanks, underground tanks and cleanup sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 09/08/2015</th>
<th>Source: Placer County Health and Human Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/08/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 530-745-2383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 10/14/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 09/08/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 36</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/21/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RIVERSIDE COUNTY:

Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Riverside County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015</th>
<th>Source: Department of Environmental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 951-358-5055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 17</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underground Storage Tank Tank List
Underground storage tank sites located in Riverside county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 07/15/2015</th>
<th>Source: Department of Environmental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 951-358-5055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 06/22/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 17</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SACRAMENTO COUNTY:

Toxic Site Clean-Up List
List of sites where unauthorized releases of potentially hazardous materials have occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 05/07/2015</th>
<th>Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-875-8406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 07/22/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 10</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master Hazardous Materials Facility List
Any business that has hazardous materials on site - hazardous material storage sites, underground storage tanks, waste generators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/03/2015</th>
<th>Source: Sacramento County Environmental Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/06/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 916-875-8406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 11/06/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 10/06/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 31</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY:

Hazardous Material Permits
This listing includes underground storage tanks, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers.
SAN DIEGO COUNTY:

Hazardous Materials Management Division Database
The database includes: HE58 - This report contains the business name, site address, business phone number, establishment 'H' permit number, type of permit, and the business status. HE17 - In addition to providing the same information provided in the HE58 listing, HE17 provides inspection dates, violations received by the establishment, hazardous waste generated, the quantity, method of storage, treatment/disposal of waste and the hauler, and information on underground storage tanks. Unauthorized Release List - Includes a summary of environmental contamination cases in San Diego County (underground tank cases, non-tank cases, groundwater contamination, and soil contamination are included.)

Solid Waste Facilities
San Diego County Solid Waste Facilities.

Environmental Case Listing
The listing contains all underground tank release cases and projects pertaining to properties contaminated with hazardous substances that are actively under review by the Site Assessment and Mitigation Program.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY:

Local Oversight Facilities
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

Underground Storage Tank Information
Underground storage tank sites located in San Francisco county.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY:
San Joaquin Co. UST
A listing of underground storage tank locations in San Joaquin county.
Date of Government Version: 09/23/2015  
Source: Environmental Health Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/25/2015  
Telephone: N/A
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/15/2015  
Last EDR Contact: 09/21/2015
Number of Days to Update: 20  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/04/2016
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List.
Date of Government Version: 08/25/2015  
Source: San Luis Obispo County Public Health Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/27/2015  
Telephone: 805-781-5596
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/30/2015  
Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015
Number of Days to Update: 34  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SAN MATEO COUNTY:
Business Inventory
List includes Hazardous Materials Business Plan, hazardous waste generators, and underground storage tanks.
Date of Government Version: 07/20/2015  
Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/22/2015  
Telephone: 650-363-1921
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  
Last EDR Contact: 06/15/2015
Number of Days to Update: 12  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually
Fuel Leak List
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in San Mateo county.
Date of Government Version: 09/16/2015  
Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/17/2015  
Telephone: 650-363-1921
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015  
Last EDR Contact: 09/14/2015
Number of Days to Update: 49  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility Listing
CUPA Program Listing from the Environmental Health Services division.
Date of Government Version: 09/08/2011  
Source: Santa Barbara County Public Health Department
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/09/2011  
Telephone: 805-686-8167
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/07/2011  
Last EDR Contact: 05/22/2015
Number of Days to Update: 28  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

SANTA CLARA COUNTY:
Cupa Facility List
Cupa facility list
## HIST LUST - Fuel Leak Site Activity Report
A listing of open and closed leaking underground storage tanks. This listing is no longer updated by the county. Leaking underground storage tanks are now handled by the Department of Environmental Health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 03/29/2005</th>
<th>Source: Santa Clara Valley Water District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/30/2005</td>
<td>Telephone: 408-265-2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 04/21/2005</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 03/23/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 22</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 06/22/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LOP Listing
A listing of leaking underground storage tanks located in Santa Clara county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 03/03/2014</th>
<th>Source: Department of Environmental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/05/2014</td>
<td>Telephone: 408-918-3417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 03/18/2014</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 06/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 13</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/14/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Hazardous Material Facilities
Hazardous material facilities, including underground storage tank sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/10/2015</th>
<th>Source: City of San Jose Fire Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/14/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 408-535-7694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 20</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/23/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:

### CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 08/25/2015</th>
<th>Source: Santa Cruz County Environmental Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/26/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 831-464-2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 10/01/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 36</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SHASTA COUNTY:

### CUPA Facility List
Cupa Facility List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Government Version: 09/15/2015</th>
<th>Source: Shasta County Department of Resource Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/17/2015</td>
<td>Telephone: 530-225-5789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015</td>
<td>Last EDR Contact: 08/24/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days to Update: 49</td>
<td>Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Release Frequency: Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SOLANO COUNTY:
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Solano county.

Date of Government Version: 09/02/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/17/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 49  
Source: Solano County Department of Environmental Management  
Telephone: 707-784-6770  
Last EDR Contact: 09/10/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SONOMA COUNTY:

Cupa Facility List
Cupa Facility list

Date of Government Version: 09/28/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/30/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 36  
Source: County of Sonoma Fire & Emergency Services Department  
Telephone: 707-565-1174  
Last EDR Contact: 09/28/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/11/2016  
Data Release Frequency: Varies

Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites
A listing of leaking underground storage tank sites located in Sonoma county.

Date of Government Version: 10/01/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 10/02/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 11/05/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 34  
Source: Department of Health Services  
Telephone: 707-565-6565  
Last EDR Contact: 09/28/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 01/11/2016  
Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

SUTTER COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tanks
Underground storage tank sites located in Sutter county.

Date of Government Version: 06/05/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/09/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/06/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 27  
Source: Sutter County Department of Agriculture  
Telephone: 530-822-7500  
Last EDR Contact: 06/05/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/21/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Semi-Annually

TUOLUMNE COUNTY:

CUPA Facility List
Cupa facility list

Date of Government Version: 07/13/2015  
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/28/2015  
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/03/2015  
Number of Days to Update: 6  
Source: Division of Environmental Health  
Telephone: 209-533-5633  
Last EDR Contact: 07/24/2015  
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015  
Data Release Frequency: Varies

VENTURA COUNTY:
Business Plan, Hazardous Waste Producers, and Operating Underground Tanks
The BWT list indicates by site address whether the Environmental Health Division has Business Plan (B), Waste Producer (W), and/or Underground Tank (T) information.

- Date of Government Version: 07/27/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/17/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 17
- Source: Ventura County Environmental Health Division
- Telephone: 805-654-2813
- Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Inventory of Illegal Abandoned and Inactive Sites
Ventura County Inventory of Closed, Illegal Abandoned, and Inactive Sites.

- Date of Government Version: 12/01/2011
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 12/01/2011
- Date Made Active in Reports: 01/19/2012
- Number of Days to Update: 49
- Source: Environmental Health Division
- Telephone: 805-654-2813
- Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/19/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Annually

Listing of Underground Tank Cleanup Sites
Ventura County Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Sites (LUST).

- Date of Government Version: 05/29/2008
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/24/2008
- Date Made Active in Reports: 07/31/2008
- Number of Days to Update: 37
- Source: Environmental Health Division
- Telephone: 805-654-2813
- Last EDR Contact: 08/12/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/30/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Medical Waste Program List
To protect public health and safety and the environment from potential exposure to disease causing agents, the Environmental Health Division Medical Waste Program regulates the generation, handling, storage, treatment and disposal of medical waste throughout the County.

- Date of Government Version: 07/27/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/29/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 36
- Source: Ventura County Resource Management Agency
- Telephone: 805-654-2813
- Last EDR Contact: 07/27/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/09/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

Underground Tank Closed Sites List
Ventura County Operating Underground Storage Tank Sites (UST)/Underground Tank Closed Sites List.

- Date of Government Version: 08/26/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 09/15/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 10/15/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 30
- Source: Environmental Health Division
- Telephone: 805-654-2813
- Last EDR Contact: 09/15/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/28/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Quarterly

YOLO COUNTY:

Underground Storage Tank Comprehensive Facility Report
Underground storage tank sites located in Yolo county.

- Date of Government Version: 07/08/2015
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/13/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 07/22/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 9
- Source: Yolo County Department of Health
- Telephone: 530-666-8646
- Last EDR Contact: 07/06/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/05/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Annually

YUBA COUNTY:
CUPA Facility List
CUPA facility listing for Yuba County.
Date of Government Version: 08/04/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/07/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 09/03/2015
Number of Days to Update: 27
Source: Yuba County Environmental Health Department
Telephone: 530-749-7523
Last EDR Contact: 07/31/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Varies

OTHER DATABASE(S)
Depending on the geographic area covered by this report, the data provided in these specialty databases may or may not be complete. For example, the existence of wetlands information data in a specific report does not mean that all wetlands in the area covered by the report are included. Moreover, the absence of any reported wetlands information does not necessarily mean that wetlands do not exist in the area covered by the report.

CT MANIFEST: Hazardous Waste Manifest Data
Facility and manifest data. Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a TSD facility.
Date of Government Version: 07/30/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/19/2013
Date Made Active in Reports: 10/03/2013
Number of Days to Update: 45
Source: Department of Energy & Environmental Protection
Telephone: 860-424-3375
Last EDR Contact: 05/18/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 08/31/2015
Data Release Frequency: No Update Planned

NJ MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/17/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/12/2015
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: N/A
Last EDR Contact: 07/13/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/28/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

NY MANIFEST: Facility and Manifest Data
Manifest is a document that lists and tracks hazardous waste from the generator through transporters to a TSD facility.
Date of Government Version: 08/01/2015
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 08/06/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/24/2015
Number of Days to Update: 18
Source: Department of Environmental Conservation
Telephone: 518-402-8651
Last EDR Contact: 08/06/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/16/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

PA MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 07/24/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 08/18/2015
Number of Days to Update: 25
Source: Department of Environmental Protection
Telephone: 717-783-8990
Last EDR Contact: 07/20/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/02/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually

RI MANIFEST: Manifest Information
Hazardous waste manifest information.
Date of Government Version: 12/31/2013
Date Data Arrived at EDR: 06/19/2015
Date Made Active in Reports: 07/15/2015
Number of Days to Update: 26
Source: Department of Environmental Management
Telephone: 401-222-2797
Last EDR Contact: 05/26/2015
Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/07/2015
Data Release Frequency: Annually
WI MANIFEST: Manifest Information

Hazardous waste manifest information.

- Date of Government Version: 12/31/2014
- Date Data Arrived at EDR: 03/19/2015
- Date Made Active in Reports: 04/07/2015
- Number of Days to Update: 19

Source: Department of Natural Resources
Telephone: N/A

- Last EDR Contact: 06/11/2015
- Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/28/2015
- Data Release Frequency: Annually

Oil/Gas Pipelines

Source: PennWell Corporation

Petroleum Bundle (Crude Oil, Refined Products, Petrochemicals, Gas Liquids (LPG/NGL), and Specialty Gases (Miscellaneous)) N = Natural Gas Bundle (Natural Gas, Gas Liquids (LPG/NGL), and Specialty Gases (Miscellaneous)). This map includes information copyrighted by PennWell Corporation. This information is provided on a best effort basis and PennWell Corporation does not guarantee its accuracy nor warrant its fitness for any particular purpose. Such information has been reprinted with the permission of PennWell.

Electric Power Transmission Line Data

Source: PennWell Corporation

This map includes information copyrighted by PennWell Corporation. This information is provided on a best effort basis and PennWell Corporation does not guarantee its accuracy nor warrant its fitness for any particular purpose. Such information has been reprinted with the permission of PennWell.

Sensitive Receptors: There are individuals deemed sensitive receptors due to their fragile immune systems and special sensitivity to environmental discharges. These sensitive receptors typically include the elderly, the sick, and children. While the location of all sensitive receptors cannot be determined, EDR indicates those buildings and facilities - schools, daycares, hospitals, medical centers, and nursing homes - where individuals who are sensitive receptors are likely to be located.

AHA Hospitals:

Source: American Hospital Association, Inc.
Telephone: 312-280-5991

The database includes a listing of hospitals based on the American Hospital Association's annual survey of hospitals.

Medical Centers: Provider of Services Listing

Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Telephone: 410-786-3000

A listing of hospitals with Medicare provider number, produced by Centers of Medicare & Medicaid Services, a federal agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Nursing Homes

Source: National Institutes of Health
Telephone: 301-594-6248

Information on Medicare and Medicaid certified nursing homes in the United States.

Public Schools

Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300

The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on elementary and secondary public education in the United States. It is a comprehensive, annual, national statistical database of all public elementary and secondary schools and school districts, which contains data that are comparable across all states.

Private Schools

Source: National Center for Education Statistics
Telephone: 202-502-7300

The National Center for Education Statistics' primary database on private school locations in the United States.

Daycare Centers: Licensed Facilities

Source: Department of Social Services
Telephone: 916-657-4041

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2003 & 2011 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100-year and 500-year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

NWI: National Wetlands Inventory. This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2002, 2005 and 2010 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

State Wetlands Data: Wetland Inventory

Source: Department of Fish & Game
Telephone: 916-445-0411
TARGET PROPERTY ADDRESS

PARADISE BEACH PARK
3450 PARADISE DRIVE
BELVEDERE TIBURON, CA 94920

TARGET PROPERTY COORDINATES

Latitude (North): 37.8935 - 37° 53’ 36.60”
Longitude (West): 122.4565 - 122° 27’ 23.40”
Universal Tranverse Mercator: Zone 10
UTM X (Meters): 547788.1
UTM Y (Meters): 4193932.5
Elevation: 20 ft. above sea level

USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

Target Property Map: 5641122 SAN QUENTIN, CA
Version Date: 2012

EDR’s GeoCheck Physical Setting Source Addendum is provided to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of potential contaminant migration.

Assessment of the impact of contaminant migration generally has two principal investigative components:

1. Groundwater flow direction, and
2. Groundwater flow velocity.

Groundwater flow direction may be impacted by surface topography, hydrology, hydrogeology, characteristics of the soil, and nearby wells. Groundwater flow velocity is generally impacted by the nature of the geologic strata.
GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION INFORMATION
Groundwater flow direction for a particular site is best determined by a qualified environmental professional using site-specific well data. If such data is not reasonably ascertainable, it may be necessary to rely on other sources of information, such as surface topographic information, hydrologic information, hydrogeologic data collected on nearby properties, and regional groundwater flow information (from deep aquifers).

TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Surface topography may be indicative of the direction of surficial groundwater flow. This information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

TARGET PROPERTY TOPOGRAPHY
General Topographic Gradient: General NNE

SURROUNDING TOPOGRAPHY: ELEVATION PROFILES

Source: Topography has been determined from the USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model and should be evaluated on a relative (not an absolute) basis. Relative elevation information between sites of close proximity should be field verified.
**HYDROLOGIC INFORMATION**

Surface water can act as a hydrologic barrier to groundwater flow. Such hydrologic information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

Refer to the Physical Setting Source Map following this summary for hydrologic information (major waterways and bodies of water).

**FEMA FLOOD ZONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Property County</th>
<th>FEMA Flood Electronic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIN, CA</td>
<td>YES - refer to the Overview Map and Detail Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Plain Panel at Target Property</th>
<th>06041C - FEMA DFIRM Flood data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Additional Panels in search area    | Not Reported                  |

**NATIONAL WETLAND INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWI Quad at Target Property</th>
<th>NWI Electronic Data Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN QUENTIN</td>
<td>YES - refer to the Overview Map and Detail Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYDROGEOLOGIC INFORMATION**

Hydrogeologic information obtained by installation of wells on a specific site can often be an indicator of groundwater flow direction in the immediate area. Such hydrogeologic information can be used to assist the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the impact of nearby contaminated properties or, should contamination exist on the target property, what downgradient sites might be impacted.

**Site-Specific Hydrogeological Data**:  
- **Search Radius**: 1.25 miles  
- **Status**: Not found

**AQUIFLOW®**

Search Radius: 1.000 Mile.

EDR has developed the AQUIFLOW Information System to provide data on the general direction of groundwater flow at specific points. EDR has reviewed reports submitted by environmental professionals to regulatory authorities at select sites and has extracted the date of the report, groundwater flow direction as determined hydrogeologically, and the depth to water table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>LOCATION FROM TP</th>
<th>GENERAL DIRECTION GROUNDWATER FLOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* ©1996 Site-specific hydrogeological data gathered by CERCLIS Alerts, Inc., Bainbridge Island, WA. All rights reserved. All of the information and opinions presented are those of the cited EPA report(s), which were completed under a Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) investigation.*
GROUNDWATER FLOW VELOCITY INFORMATION

Groundwater flow velocity information for a particular site is best determined by a qualified environmental professional using site specific geologic and soil strata data. If such data are not reasonably ascertainable, it may be necessary to rely on other sources of information, including geologic age identification, rock stratigraphic unit and soil characteristics data collected on nearby properties and regional soil information. In general, contaminant plumes move more quickly through sandy-gravelly types of soils than silty-clayey types of soils.

GEOLOGIC INFORMATION IN GENERAL AREA OF TARGET PROPERTY

Geologic information can be used by the environmental professional in forming an opinion about the relative speed at which contaminant migration may be occurring.

ROCK STRATIGRAPHIC UNIT

- Era: Cenozoic
- System: Tertiary
- Series: Pliocene
- Code: Tp (decoded above as Era, System & Series)

GEOLOGIC AGE IDENTIFICATION

- Category: Stratified Sequence

DOMINANT SOIL COMPOSITION IN GENERAL AREA OF TARGET PROPERTY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Soil Conservation Service (SCS) leads the National Cooperative Soil Survey (NCSS) and is responsible for collecting, storing, maintaining and distributing soil survey information for privately owned lands in the United States. A soil map in a soil survey is a representation of soil patterns in a landscape. The following information is based on Soil Conservation Service SSURGO data.

Soil Map ID: 1

Soil Component Name: TOCALOMA
Soil Surface Texture: loam
Hydrologic Group: Class C - Slow infiltration rates. Soils with layers impeding downward movement of water, or soils with moderately fine or fine textures.
Soil Drainage Class: Well drained
Hydric Status: Not hydric
Corrosion Potential - Uncoated Steel: Moderate
Depth to Bedrock Min: > 46 inches
Depth to Watertable Min: > 0 inches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Saturated hydraulic conductivity</th>
<th>Soil Reaction (pH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>micro m/sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 inches to 18 inches</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit less than 50%), Lean Clay. FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit less than 50%), silt.</td>
<td>Max: 42 Min: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 inches to 38 inches</td>
<td>very gravelly loam</td>
<td>Granular materials (35 pct. or less passing No. 200), Silty, or Clayey Gravel and Sand. FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit less than 50%), Lean Clay. FINE-GRAINED SOILS, Silts and Clays (liquid limit less than 50%), silt.</td>
<td>Max: 42 Min: 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOCHECK® - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

Soil Layer Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Saturated hydraulic conductivity micro m/sec</th>
<th>Soil Reaction (pH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Texture Class</td>
<td>AASHTO Group</td>
<td>Unified Soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 inches</td>
<td>42 inches</td>
<td>weathered bedrock</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soil Map ID: 2

Soil Component Name: Water
Soil Surface Texture: loam
Hydrologic Group: Class C - Slow infiltration rates. Soils with layers impeding downward movement of water, or soils with moderately fine or fine textures.
Soil Drainage Class: 
Hydric Status: Not hydric
Corrosion Potential - Uncoated Steel: Not Reported
Depth to Bedrock Min: > 0 inches
Depth to Watertable Min: > 0 inches
No Layer Information available.

LOCAL / REGIONAL WATER AGENCY RECORDS

EDR Local/Regional Water Agency records provide water well information to assist the environmental professional in assessing sources that may impact ground water flow direction, and in forming an opinion about the impact of contaminant migration on nearby drinking water wells.

WELL SEARCH DISTANCE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATABASE</th>
<th>SEARCH DISTANCE (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal USGS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal FRDS PWS</td>
<td>Nearest PWS within 1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Database</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEDERAL USGS WELL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>WELL ID</th>
<th>LOCATION FROM TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Wells Found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOCHECK® - PHYSICAL SETTING SOURCE SUMMARY

FEDERAL FRDS PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>WELL ID</th>
<th>LOCATION FROM TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No PWS System Found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PWS System location is not always the same as well location.

STATE DATABASE WELL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>WELL ID</th>
<th>LOCATION FROM TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Wells Found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal EPA Radon Zone for MARIN County: 3

Note: Zone 1 indoor average level > 4 pCi/L.
Zone 2 indoor average level >= 2 pCi/L and <= 4 pCi/L.
Zone 3 indoor average level < 2 pCi/L.

Federal Area Radon Information for Zip Code: 94920
Number of sites tested: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average Activity</th>
<th>% &lt;4 pCi/L</th>
<th>% 4-20 pCi/L</th>
<th>% &gt;20 pCi/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Area - 1st Floor</td>
<td>0.200 pCi/L</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Area - 2nd Floor</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>0.600 pCi/L</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
Source: United States Geologic Survey
EDR acquired the USGS 7.5' Digital Elevation Model in 2002 and updated it in 2006. The 7.5 minute DEM corresponds to the USGS 1:24,000- and 1:25,000-scale topographic quadrangle maps. The DEM provides elevation data with consistent elevation units and projection.

Current USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Map
Source: U.S. Geological Survey

HYDROLOGIC INFORMATION

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2003 & 2011 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100-year and 500-year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

NWI: National Wetlands Inventory. This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 2002, 2005 and 2010 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

State Wetlands Data: Wetland Inventory
Source: Department of Fish & Game
Telephone: 916-445-0411

HYDROGEOLOGIC INFORMATION

AQUIFLOW® Information System
Source: EDR proprietary database of groundwater flow information
EDR has developed the AQUIFLOW Information System (AIS) to provide data on the general direction of groundwater flow at specific points. EDR has reviewed reports submitted to regulatory authorities at select sites and has extracted the date of the report, hydrogeologically determined groundwater flow direction and depth to water table information.

GEOLOGIC INFORMATION

Geologic Age and Rock Stratigraphic Unit

STATSGO: State Soil Geographic Database
Source: Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services
The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) leads the national Conservation Soil Survey (NCSS) and is responsible for collecting, storing, maintaining and distributing soil survey information for privately owned lands in the United States. A soil map in a soil survey is a representation of soil patterns in a landscape. Soil maps for STATSGO are compiled by generalizing more detailed (SSURGO) soil survey maps.

SSURGO: Soil Survey Geographic Database
Source: Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS)
Telephone: 800-672-5559
SSURGO is the most detailed level of mapping done by the Natural Resources Conservation Services, mapping scales generally range from 1:12,000 to 1:63,360. Field mapping methods using national standards are used to construct the soil maps in the Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database. SSURGO digitizing duplicates the original soil survey maps. This level of mapping is designed for use by landowners, townships and county natural resource planning and management.
LOCAL / REGIONAL WATER AGENCY RECORDS

FEDERAL WATER WELLS

PWS: Public Water Systems
Source: EPA/Office of Drinking Water
Telephone: 202-564-3750
Public Water System data from the Federal Reporting Data System. A PWS is any water system which provides water to at least 25 people for at least 60 days annually. PWSs provide water from wells, rivers and other sources.

PWS ENF: Public Water Systems Violation and Enforcement Data
Source: EPA/Office of Drinking Water
Telephone: 202-564-3750

USGS Water Wells: USGS National Water Inventory System (NWIS)
This database contains descriptive information on sites where the USGS collects or has collected data on surface water and/or groundwater. The groundwater data includes information on wells, springs, and other sources of groundwater.

STATE RECORDS

Water Well Database
Source: Department of Water Resources
Telephone: 916-651-9648

California Drinking Water Quality Database
Source: Department of Public Health
Telephone: 916-324-2319
The database includes all drinking water compliance and special studies monitoring for the state of California since 1984. It consists of over 3,200,000 individual analyses along with well and water system information.

OTHER STATE DATABASE INFORMATION

California Oil and Gas Well Locations
Source: Department of Conservation
Telephone: 916-323-1779
Oil and Gas well locations in the state.

RADON

State Database: CA Radon
Source: Department of Health Services
Telephone: 916-324-2208
Radon Database for California

Area Radon Information
Source: USGS
Telephone: 703-356-4020
The National Radon Database has been developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and is a compilation of the EPA/State Residential Radon Survey and the National Residential Radon Survey. The study covers the years 1986 - 1992. Where necessary data has been supplemented by information collected at private sources such as universities and research institutions.

EPA Radon Zones
Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-356-4020
Sections 307 & 309 of IRAA directed EPA to list and identify areas of U.S. with the potential for elevated indoor radon levels.
OTHER

Airport Landing Facilities: Private and public use landing facilities
Source: Federal Aviation Administration, 800-457-6656

Epicenters: World earthquake epicenters, Richter 5 or greater
Source: Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

California Earthquake Fault Lines: The fault lines displayed on EDR's Topographic map are digitized quaternary fault lines, prepared in 1975 by the United State Geological Survey. Additional information (also from 1975) regarding activity at specific fault lines comes from California's Preliminary Fault Activity Map prepared by the California Division of Mines and Geology.

STREET AND ADDRESS INFORMATION

© 2010 Tele Atlas North America, Inc. All rights reserved. This material is proprietary and the subject of copyright protection and other intellectual property rights owned by or licensed to Tele Atlas North America, Inc. The use of this material is subject to the terms of a license agreement. You will be held liable for any unauthorized copying or disclosure of this material.
APPENDIX F

EDR CITY DIRECTORY
Paradise Beach Park
3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

Inquiry Number: 4461650.5
November 09, 2015
Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.

Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report "AS IS". Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2015 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DESCRIPTION

Environmental Data Resources, Inc.’s (EDR) City Directory Report is a screening tool designed to assist environmental professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDR’s City Directory Report includes a search of available city directory data at 5 year intervals.

RESEARCH SUMMARY

The following research sources were consulted in the preparation of this report. A check mark indicates where information was identified in the source and provided in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECORD SOURCES

EDR is licensed to reproduce certain City Directory works by the copyright holders of those works. The purchaser of this EDR City Directory Report may include it in report(s) delivered to a customer. Reproduction of City Directories without permission of the publisher or licensed vendor may be a violation of copyright.
### TARGET PROPERTY STREET

3450 Paradise Drive  
Belvedere Tiburon, CA  94920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CD Image</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>pg A1</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>pg A2</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>pg A3</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>pg A4</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>pg A5</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>pg A6</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>pg A7</td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>pg A8</td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>pg A9</td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>pg A10</td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

CROSS STREETS

No Cross Streets Identified
City Directory Images
PARADISE DR  2013

3193  GENE ERICKSON
3201 LEONORE FERRIS
3215 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3245 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3300 JOHN CHRISTENSEN
3312 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3330 DOUGLAS IVEY
3333 DAVID PEERY
3340 THOMAS PARDINI
3344 ALAN MCMILLEN
3348 ALBERT SANDELL
3350 DON SEARS
3369 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3370 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3390 ALVIN LANG
3491 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3499 KAREN PLACEK
3515 JOHN DIAMOND
3535 ROBERT HARTNETT
3550 SCOTT ANDERSON
3555 TODD WHITLOCK
3560 ALVAR GREEN
3561 EDWARD MCDONNELL
3564 OCCUPANT UNKNOWN
3585 PAUL NARGIZ
3600 LAWRENCE GOLDBERG
3605 BRUCE TODD
3606 TROY SANDUSKY
3608 EDMOND JACKSON
3610 JOHN DUPEN
3614 THOMAS BERSOT
3628 RUTH GOLDSTEIN
3630 SOREN HOY
3635 RICHARD HARPER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>GENE ERICKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>LEONORE FERRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>SAEED GHAZI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>DAVID PEERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAURA SHEEHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>NATHAN RUSSELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>NANCY MCMILLEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>SPENCER SCHEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>ALBERT SANDELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>SCOTT ADELSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491</td>
<td>JOHN CHRISTENSEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>JOHN DIAMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>ROBERT HARTNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>SCOTT ANDERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>TODD WHITLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560</td>
<td>ALVAR GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>HARVEY FRANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3564</td>
<td>CAROL HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>TERRY ONEILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>LAWRENCE GOLDBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>BRUCE TODD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE SANDUSKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3608</td>
<td>EDMOND JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>JOHN DUPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>THOMAS BERSOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>RUTH GOLDSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>RICHARD HARPER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>GENE ERICKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>LESTER FERRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215</td>
<td>MICHAEL KERAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>SAEED GHAZI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>RUSSELL SHAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>DONALD COURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>DOUGLAS IVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>SUSAN DELUXE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>NATHAN RUSSELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>ALAN MCMILLEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>DEAN ECHENBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370</td>
<td>ECHENBERG DEAN F MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491</td>
<td>JOHN CHRISTENSEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>EMANUEL KOPSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>ROBERT HARTNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>DIANA ANDERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>TODD WHITLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560</td>
<td>JOSHUA WEINBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>HARVEY FRANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3564</td>
<td>MARION HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>PAUL NARGIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>LAWRENCE GOLDBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>BRUCE TODD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>CHARLES TARRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>JACK DUPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>THOMAS BERSOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630</td>
<td>JOHN WOLFERSPERGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>RICHARD HARPER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>GENE ERICKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>LEONORE FERRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>SAEED GHAZI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>DAVID PEERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STOP THE FIVE DOLLAR TOLL NOW COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>NATHAN RUSSELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>ALAN MCMILLEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>RALPH COLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>DON SEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370</td>
<td>NEAL GAPOFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>EMANUEL KOPSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VORTEX SNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>JOHN DIAMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>ROBERT HARTNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>SCOTT ANDERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>TODD WHITLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560</td>
<td>ALVAR GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>PAUL NARGIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>LAWRENCE GOLDBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>BRUCE TODD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>TROY SANDUSKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3608</td>
<td>EDMOND JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>JOHN DUPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>THOMAS BERSOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3616</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRI J CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>RUTH GOLDSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>RICHARD HARPER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4461650.5  Page: A4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>ERICKSON, GENE C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>CRITTENDEN, W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>CLARK, LINDA A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>PHILLIPS, DAVID C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>GALLAGHER, CHARLES</td>
<td>GRAND ENTRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>RUSSELL, NATHAN G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>COONAN, PATRICK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>COLE, RALPH N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>SPERLING, GEORGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390</td>
<td>LANG, ALVIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491</td>
<td>CHRISTENSEN, JOHN R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>KOPSTEIN, EMANUEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>DIAMOND, JOHN L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUCIA M DIAMON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>ANDERSON, EUGENE R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>FRANK, HARVEY R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>NARGIZ, PAUL B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONEILL, TERRY D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>LALANNE, LOUIS C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>TARRIS, CHARLES V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>RED GARTER MUSICIANS CALLIOPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>OCCUPANT UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630</td>
<td>WOLFERSPERGER, JOHN J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>HARPER, RICHARD R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Street</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole Information Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193</td>
<td>ERICKSON, GENE C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>FERRIS, LESTER W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>CRITTENDEN, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE, SUSAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHULBERG, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>CARTER, WILLIAM J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>GALLAGHER, CHARLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND ENTRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>COLE, RALPH N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370</td>
<td>CADY, FEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390</td>
<td>LANG, ALVIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>KOPSTEIN, EMANUEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>DIAMOND, JOHN L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>ANDERSON, EUGENE R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3585</td>
<td>ONEILL, TERRY D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>LALANNE, LOUIS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>TARRIS, CHARLES V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>DUPEN, JOHN S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>GOLDSMITH, RUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630</td>
<td>WOLFERSPERGER, JOHN J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>HARPER, RICHARD R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR 1985</td>
<td>HEATH BRIAN 435-0</td>
<td>3310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARTER WM J 435-4400</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAMS KENNETH M 435-3651</td>
<td>3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETERSEN L R 435-1864 2</td>
<td>3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WELCH LAWRENCE W JR 435-1358</td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLE RALPH N 435-3505 1</td>
<td>3348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPERLING GEO 435-0724 2</td>
<td>3369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADY FEN DDS 435-1071 0</td>
<td>3370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LANG ALVIN 435-4860</td>
<td>3390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOPSTEIN EMANUEL 435-4189 +5</td>
<td>3499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOPSTEIN EMANUEL Z 435-4189 +5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOPSTEIN EMANUEL Z 435-5897 +5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSGLOBL MKT CORP 435-5897 +5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALLTRICK ROBT T MD 435-3469 2</td>
<td>3515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANDERSON E R 435-3863 8</td>
<td>3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARGIZ P B 435-1774 +5</td>
<td>3585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NARGIZ P J 435-5604 +5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONEILL TERRY D 435-1774 +5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOTT LARRY 435-4304</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOTT SUSIE 435-4304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LALANNE LOUIS CAL 435-4304 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARRIS CHAS V 435-1985</td>
<td>3606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUTICHI LAVON O MRS 435-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUTICHI NORMAN A 435-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBINSON JAS 435-5371 +5</td>
<td>3614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENARD B 435-1155 2</td>
<td>3628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOLFSPERGER J J 435-4800</td>
<td>3630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HARPER RICHARD R 435-9961 0</td>
<td>3635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAPLAN MELVYN S 435-2091 0</td>
<td>3636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>3663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Target Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>435-0456 9</td>
<td>HEATH BRIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>435-4400</td>
<td>TRYON M P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>435-1864 2</td>
<td>CARTER WM J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>435-0532+0</td>
<td>WILLIAMS KENNETH M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>435-1071+0</td>
<td>RUSSELL NATHAN G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>435-3023 8</td>
<td>WELCH LAWRENCE W JR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>435-5300+0</td>
<td>DAVIES M M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>CUNNINGHAM JAS T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>CADY FEN-DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>LANG ALVIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3475</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>HSU KAI YU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>BRITTELL JERI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3499</td>
<td>435-2300+0</td>
<td>KOPSTEIN E Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Street</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3515</td>
<td>WHITNER A C</td>
<td>435–2387 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535</td>
<td>SIMS DURWARD M</td>
<td>435–1285 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>ANDERSON E R</td>
<td>435–3863 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3564</td>
<td>BOWEN R V</td>
<td>435–9279 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOWEN R V</td>
<td>435–2252 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>TARRIS CHAS V</td>
<td>435–1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>LUTICH LAVON O MRS</td>
<td>435–1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUTICH NORMAN A</td>
<td>435–1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628</td>
<td>BENARD B</td>
<td>435–1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630</td>
<td>WOLFERSPERGER J J</td>
<td>435–4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3635</td>
<td>HARPER RICHARD R</td>
<td>435–9961 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636</td>
<td>GAARD DAVID</td>
<td>435–9405 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3650</td>
<td>KAPLAN MELVYN S</td>
<td>435–2091 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORSLINE LESTER</td>
<td>435–1396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94920 CONT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haines Criss-Cross Directory</td>
<td>PARADISE DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3310 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>DOSE NORBERT G HEATH BRIAN</td>
<td>435-2480+5 435-0456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>TRYON M P</td>
<td>435-4456 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>CARTER WM J</td>
<td>435-4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>WILLIAMS KENNETH M</td>
<td>435-3651 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>RUSSELL NATHAN G</td>
<td>435-1864 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>WELCH LAWRENCE W JR</td>
<td>435-1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3369 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>APHRODITES</td>
<td>435-1988+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3370 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>CADY FENIMORE DDS</td>
<td>435-1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LANG ALVIN</td>
<td>435-4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3475 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LORAN WM DR</td>
<td>435-0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3491 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>HSU KAI YU</td>
<td>435-3023+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>WHITNER A C</td>
<td>435-2387 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3535 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>PEDERSEN N S MD</td>
<td>435-4533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3560 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>DODGE E L</td>
<td>435-4338 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3564 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>BOWEN JOHN W LTGEN</td>
<td>435-9279 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>TARRIS CHAS V</td>
<td>435-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>WITKIN LUCY A</td>
<td>435-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LUTICH LAVON O MRS</td>
<td>435-1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>LUTICH NORMAN A</td>
<td>435-1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3628 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>BENARD B</td>
<td>435-1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>WOLFERSPERGER J J</td>
<td>435-4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>REAGAN BILL BRIAN</td>
<td>435-4777 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>SPARTACUS ELDRIDGE</td>
<td>435-1115+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3636 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>TELLIS ALEXIS</td>
<td>435-4777 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3650 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>TELLIS ANNE</td>
<td>435-4777+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3650 PARADISE DR</td>
<td>GORSLINE LESTER</td>
<td>435-1396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

EDR HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
REPORT
Paradise Beach Park
3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

Inquiry Number: 4461650.4
November 09, 2015
EDR Historical Topo Map Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Paradise Beach Park</th>
<th>Client Name:</th>
<th>Edd Clark &amp; Associates, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>3450 Paradise Drive</td>
<td>320 Professional Center Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920</td>
<td>Rohnert, CA 94928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.#</td>
<td>0794,001.15</td>
<td>Contact: Kevin Coker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDR Topographic Map Library has been searched by EDR and maps covering the target property location as provided by Edd Clark & Associates, Inc. were identified for the years listed below. EDR’s Historical Topo Map Report is designed to assist professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDR’s Historical Topo Map Report includes a search of a collection of public and private color historical topographic maps, dating back to the late 1800s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Results:</th>
<th>Coordinates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name:</td>
<td>Paradise Beach Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>3450 Paradise Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.#</td>
<td>0794,001.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Paradise Beach Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>37.8935 37° 53' 37&quot; North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-122.4565 -122° 27' 23&quot; West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Zone:</td>
<td>Zone 10 North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM X Meters:</td>
<td>547786.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Y Meters:</td>
<td>4194137.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation:</td>
<td>19.84' above sea level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maps Provided:

- 2012
- 1996
- 1995
- 1980
- 1973
- 1956, 1959
- 1948, 1950
- 1947

---

Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report "AS IS". Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2015 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.
This EDR Topo Map Report is based upon the following USGS topographic map sheets.

### 2012 Source Sheets
- **San Quentin** 2012, 7.5-minute, 24000
- **San Francisco North** 2012, 7.5-minute, 24000

### 1996 Source Sheets
- **San Quentin** 1996, 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1993
  - Edited 1996
- **San Francisco North** 1996, 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1993
  - Edited 1996

### 1995 Source Sheets
- **San Quentin** 1995, 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Photo Inspected 1995
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1993
- **San Francisco North** 1995, 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Photo Inspected 1995
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1995

### 1980 Source Sheets
- **San Quentin** 1980, 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Photo Revised 1980
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1979
This EDR Topo Map Report is based upon the following USGS topographic map sheets.

1973 Source Sheets

- San Francisco North
  - 1973
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Photo Revised 1973
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1973
- San Quentin
  - 1973
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Photo Inspected 1973
  - Photo Revised 1968

1956, 1959 Source Sheets

- San Francisco North
  - 1956
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1956
- San Quentin
  - 1959
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1958

1948, 1950 Source Sheets

- San Quentin
  - 1948
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1947
- San Francisco North
  - 1950
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1946

1947 Source Sheets

- San Francisco North
  - 1947
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1946
- San Quentin
  - 1947
  - 7.5-minute, 24000
  - Aerial Photo Revised 1947
This EDR Topo Map Report is based upon the following USGS topographic map sheets.

1915 Source Sheets

San Francisco
1915
15-minute, 62500

1899 Source Sheets

San Francisco
1899
15-minute, 62500

1895 Source Sheets

San Francisco
1895
15-minute, 62500
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

- TP, San Quentin, 2012, 7.5-minute
- S, San Francisco North, 2012, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1996, 7.5-minute
S, San Francisco North, 1996, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
          Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1995, 7.5-minute
S, San Francisco North, 1995, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1980, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1973, 7.5-minute
S, San Francisco North, 1973, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
         Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT:  Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

- TP, San Quentin, 1959, 7.5-minute
- S, San Francisco North, 1956, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
           Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1948, 7.5-minute
S, San Francisco North, 1950, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Quentin, 1947, 7.5-minute
S, San Francisco North, 1947, 7.5-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Francisco, 1915, 15-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
          Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

TP, San Francisco, 1899, 15-minute

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
This report includes information from the following map sheet(s).

SITE NAME: Paradise Beach Park
ADDRESS: 3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920
CLIENT: Edd Clark & Associates, Inc.
APPENDIX H

EDR AERIAL PHOTO DECADE PACKAGE
Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Aerial Photo Decade Package is a screening tool designed to assist environmental professionals in evaluating potential liability on a target property resulting from past activities. EDR’s professional researchers provide digitally reproduced historical aerial photographs, and when available, provide one photo per decade.

When delivered electronically by EDR, the aerial photo images included with this report are for ONE TIME USE ONLY. Further reproduction of these aerial photo images is prohibited without permission from EDR. For more information contact your EDR Account Executive.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050 with any questions or comments.

Disclaimer - Copyright and Trademark Notice

This Report contains certain information obtained from a variety of public and other sources reasonably available to Environmental Data Resources, Inc. It cannot be concluded from this Report that coverage information for the target and surrounding properties does not exist from other sources. NO WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, IS MADE WHATSOEVER IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPORT. ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIMS THE MAKING OF ANY SUCH WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR USE OR PURPOSE. ALL RISK IS ASSUMED BY THE USER. IN NO EVENT SHALL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. BE LIABLE TO ANYONE, WHETHER ARISING OUT OF ERRORS OR OMISSIONS, NEGLIGENCE, ACCIDENT OR ANY OTHER CAUSE, FOR ANY LOSS OF DAMAGE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES. ANY LIABILITY ON THE PART OF ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES, INC. IS STRICTLY LIMITED TO A REFUND OF THE AMOUNT PAID FOR THIS REPORT. Purchaser accepts this Report AS IS. Any analyses, estimates, ratings, environmental risk levels or risk codes provided in this Report are provided for illustrative purposes only, and are not intended to provide, nor should they be interpreted as providing any facts regarding, or prediction or forecast of, any environmental risk for any property. Only a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by an environmental professional can provide information regarding the environmental risk for any property. Additionally, the information provided in this Report is not to be construed as legal advice.

Copyright 2015 by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or map of Environmental Data Resources, Inc., or its affiliates, is prohibited without prior written permission.

EDR and its logos (including Sanborn and Sanborn Map) are trademarks of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. or its affiliates. All other trademarks used herein are the property of their respective owners.
Date EDR Searched Historical Sources:
Aerial Photography November 09, 2015

Target Property:
3450 Paradise Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1946</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1956</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1958</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1968</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1977</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1982</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>/DOQQ - acquisition dates: 1993</td>
<td>USGS/DOQQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 1998</td>
<td>USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 2005</td>
<td>USDA/NAIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 2009</td>
<td>USDA/NAIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 2010</td>
<td>USDA/NAIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Aerial Photograph. Scale: 1&quot;=500'</td>
<td>Flight Year: 2012</td>
<td>USDA/NAIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INQUIRY #: 4461650.12
YEAR: 1956

1 = 500'