

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Rezoning / 1130 Christie Road, Martinez.
County File #RZ09-3213

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: John Osborne
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
(925) 674-7793

4. Project Location: The project site is approximately 22.25 acres located
1130 Christie Road in the Martinez area.
Assessor's Parcel Number 362-080-016

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Charles R. Lewis, IV
1130 Christie Road
Martinez, CA 94553

6. General Plan Land Use Designation: Agricultural Lands (AL). This land use designation allows a density of 0.2 units per net acre and includes most of the privately owned rural lands in the County, excluding private lands that are composed of prime soils or lands that are located in or near the Delta. Most of the land designated AL is in hilly portions of the County and is used for grazing livestock or dry grain farming.

7. Zoning: A-4 Agricultural Preserve District. This zoning district requires a 40-acre minimum parcel size for non-prime agricultural land and a 10-acre minimum parcel size for prime agricultural land. This district is intended to provide areas primarily for the commercial production of food and fiber and other compatible uses consistent with the intent and purpose of the Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act. The project site is allowed to be less than 40-acres because the Williamson Act contract that encumbered the land was created prior to 2003 when the County amended the A-4 zoning to change the minimum parcel size from 20-acres to a 40-acre minimum.

8. Setting, Site Description & Surrounding Land Uses: The subject parcel is located in a rural area west of the City of Martinez. Parcels in the vicinity range in size from 5-acres to over 100-acres and tend to be vacant or developed with agricultural and/or residential uses. The site is surrounded by properties zoned A-4, Agricultural Preserve District and A-2 General Agricultural District. The area is characterized by steep terrain and large groupings of mature trees.

9. Description of Project: The applicant seeks approval of a rezoning from A-4, Agricultural Preserve District to A-2, General Agricultural District.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems |

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed 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 proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed 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 proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

John Osborne, Senior Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Initial Study Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references, which are available for review either online or at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA were consulted:

1. Application to rezone the subject site from A-4 to A-2
2. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020
3. Contra Costa County Code – Title 8 Zoning Ordinance
4. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
5. Contra Costa County Land Information System
6. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2010* prepared by the California Department of Conservation
7. Public Resources Code section 12220(g)
8. Public Resources Code section 4526
9. Government Code section 51104(g)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Reference: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY:				
<p><u>Summary a-d:</u> The applicant proposes to rezone the site and has not proposed physical development. The steep topography of the site all but preclude development of anything other than low-intensity agricultural uses along with a single-family residence and its appurtenant uses. Without a proposal for a specific land use, any assumption of significant visual impact would be purely speculative. The act of rezoning by itself would not impact trees, rock outcroppings, or other scenic resources, and would not introduce substantial light or glare to the area.</p> <p><u>Impact:</u> None</p>				
2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to 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.</i>				
<i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (References: 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (References: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (References: 1, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (References:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? (References: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

SUMMARY:

Summary a: The 2010 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map designates the subject property as Grazing Land. Thus, there would be no be impact to farmland designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Summary b: The property is currently zoned A-4, which is normally associated with lands under the Williamson Act Program. The property is not under the Williamson Act and therefore rezoning the land to A-2, which is consistent with lands located to the east, would alleviate this discrepancy.

Summary c-d: The site may qualify as forest land under Public Resources Code section 12220(g) and timberland under Public Resources Code 4526. The site is not zoned Timberland Production.

No physical changes are proposed that would directly impact the forest/timber resources onsite. Rezoning the site from A-4 to A-2 would not increase the likelihood of conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the uses that could realistically be established in the two zones are substantially similar.

Summary e: No physical development is proposed and the proposed A-2 District allows for a wide range of agricultural uses. No changes to the existing environment would occur that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Impact: None

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

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Reference: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Reference:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Reference:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Reference:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p>a-c) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade air quality. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the underlying General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review for air quality impacts under CEQA.</p> <p>Impact: None</p> <p><u>Summary d:</u> Residences on nearby properties are the only sensitive receptors in the area. Agricultural land uses can generate pollutants, such as airborne pesticides. However, since the proposal is to change the zoning from one agricultural zoning district to another, the potential for a substantial increase in pollutant concentrations is negligible.</p> <p><u>Summary e:</u> Agricultural land uses routinely generate objectionable odors. However, since the proposal is to change the zoning from one agricultural zoning district to another, the potential for a substantial increase in objectionable odors is negligible.</p> <p>Impact: Less than significant</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (References:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 wildlife nursery sites? (Reference:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p><u>Summary a-e:</u> As explained in the project description above, no development or other physical changes to the site are proposed and the uses that could realistically be established under the proposed A-2 zoning are substantially similar to the uses that can be established under the existing A-4 zoning. Therefore, rezoning the site poses no realistic additional threat to biological resources. In any event, if the applicant were to apply for a discretionary permit through the County for a new use that may affect the</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
biological resources on the site, the new use would be subject to environmental review which would include impacts to biological resources.				
<u>Summary f:</u> No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved or adopted for the project site or its vicinity.				
<u>Impact:</u> None				

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Reference: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (References: 2.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (References: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Reference: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

Summary a: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines historical resources as follows:

“a) For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:
 - (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
 - (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.”

No historical resources are apparent onsite and no physical changes are proposed. Therefore, there would be no impact to

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
historical resources as a result of the proposed rezoning.				
<u>Summary b-d:</u> As no physical changes are proposed, there is no possibility of impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources, unique geologic features, or human remains by this rezoning action.				
<u>Impact:</u> None				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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. (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides? (References:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<u>Summary a) i-iv:</u> The subject site is not located on or near a known earthquake fault. According to the Estimated Seismic Ground Response map (Figure 10-4, County General Plan), the site has the lowest damage susceptibility. In addition, Figure 10-5 in the County General Plan shows that the site has generally low liquefaction potential. Changing the zoning from one agricultural district to another that is substantially similar in terms of the uses that could realistically be established would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.				
<u>Summary b:</u> No physical changes to the site are proposed. Therefore, no erosion or loss of topsoil would occur.				
<u>Summary c-d:</u> Figure 10-4 in the <i>Safety Element</i> of the General Plan indicates that the site is underlain by bedrock. Unstable geologic units or soils are unlikely to be present.				
Expansive soils shrink and swell as a result of moisture changes that can cause heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements, and structures founded on shallow foundations. Expansive soils are an engineering issue, not a land use or feasibility issue. If expansive soils are present, damage resulting from volume changes can be reduced by placing slabs on select, granular fill and by use of rigid mat or post-tensioned slabs on specially prepared and moisture conditioned soils.				
<u>Summary e:</u> As the subject parcel was created through the subdivision process, it is believed that the site is capable of supporting a septic system.				
<u>Impact:</u> None				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p><u>Summary a-b:</u> The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include greenhouse gas emission impacts.</p> <p>Impacts: None.</p>				
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Reference: 3, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Reference: 3, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Reference: 3, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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. (Reference: 6, 14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 4, 6, 15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 4, 6, 15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p><u>Summary a-b:</u> No new land uses are proposed that would routinely handle hazardous materials. Therefore, rezoning the site would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p><u>Summary c:</u> The subject site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><u>Summary d:</u> The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) provides an annually updated list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This list, known as the “Cortese List,” identifies twenty-seven hazardous materials sites within Contra Costa County. According to the list, the subject site is not on or located near any such site.</p> <p><u>Summary e-f:</u> The subject site is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The site is not located within an area covered by an airport land use plan.</p> <p><u>Summary g:</u> The proposed project calls for a change from one agricultural zone to another that is substantially similar in terms of the uses that could realistically be established. As no physical development or substantial change in use is proposed, there would be no interference with implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.</p> <p><u>Summary h:</u> Figure 10-10 in the Safety Element of the County General Plan indicates that the subject site is within a “moderate fire hazard area.” Approval of the proposed rezone would not change the site’s physical characteristics as they pertain to fire hazards, and would not result in substantial intensification of land use. Any future development must meet the requirements of the local fire district.</p> <p><u>Impact:</u> Less than significant</p>				

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – *Would the project:*

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1,)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:
a)- j)
The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the hydrology of the site. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include impacts to hydrological resources.				
Impact: None				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community? (References: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? (Reference:1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
a) The proposed rezoning of the property would not divide an established community. The surrounding land is zoned A-4, Agricultural Preserve District or A-2, General Agricultural District.				
b) The subject property is currently zoned A-4 which is a designation that normally is associated with the land being under a Williamson Act Contract. This land, although zoned A-4, is not under a Williamson Act Contract and therefore is not consistent with the Zoning Code. The proposed rezoning to A-2 would make the property consistent with the Zoning Code.				
c) The subject property is not located within the coverage/inventory area for the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP).				
Impact: Less than significant.				
11. MINERAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (Reference:2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
a-b) Pursuant to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not located within one of the County's identified mineral resource areas.				
Impact: None				
12. NOISE – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-d) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to generate noise. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include analysis of noise impacts.

e-f) Pursuant to the County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (December 2000), the subject property is not located within compatibility plan areas for the Buchanan Field or Byron airports. Additionally, the subject properties are not located within two miles of any known public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip.

Impact: None.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – *Would the project:*

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-c) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to affect housing or population. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include analysis of impacts to housing and population.

Impact: None.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. Public Services – <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a) Fire Protection? (References: 1, 4, 6, 26)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection? (Reference: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (Reference: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks? (Reference: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p>a-e) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to impact public services. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include analysis of impacts to public services.</p> <p>Impact: None.</p>				
15. RECREATION				
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? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u>				
<p>a) – b) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the physical environment. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, including impacts to recreation resources.</p> <p>Impact: None.</p>				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in general 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. (Resources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(Resource: 1, 3)				
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? (Resources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternate transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Resources: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a -f) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the physical environment. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, including traffic impacts.

Impact: None.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – *Would the project:*

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Resource: 1,)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-g) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the physical environment. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA, which would include impacts to utility systems.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Impact: None.				
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a -c) The proposed rezoning is a legislative action. It does not include any site specific designs or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the physical environment, including reducing the habitat for fish or wildlife or adversely affecting humans directly or indirectly. The proposed rezoning from A-4, Exclusive Agricultural District to A-2, General Agricultural District would be consistent with the underlying General Plan designation for this site; AL, Agricultural Lands. If, in the future, the applicant were to pursue discretionary development entitlements on the property those proposals would be subject to their own separate environmental review under CEQA.

