

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Jennifer Cruz

From: Andy Akay <akay.andy@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 9:41 AM
To: Jennifer Cruz
Subject: Re: DRAFT of Initial Study

Good morning Jennifer,

I agree to mitigation to measures.

Please note that Project sponsor's and address is AYM LLC P.O. box 824 Orinda CA 94563

Thank you,
Andy Akay

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 10:06 AM Jennifer Cruz <Jennifer.Cruz@dcd.cccounty.us> wrote:

Hi Andy,

Please review the attached document for the 214 Center Avenue, Pacheco. If you agree to the mitigation measures, please provide your agreement in writing.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you.

Jennifer Cruz, Senior Planner

Contra Costa County

Department of Conservation and Development

30 Muir Road | Martinez, CA 94553

☎: (925) 674-7790 | Fax: (925) 674-7258

✉: Jennifer.Cruz@dcd.cccounty.us

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Subdivision for Eight Residential Lots and a Parcel for a Private Road and Guest Parking
County Files #GP16-0007, RZ17-3237, SD17-9466, DP17-3010
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Jennifer Cruz, Senior Planner, (925) 674-7790
4. Project Location: 214 Center Avenue
Pacheco, CA 94553
APN: 125-120-017
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: AYM, LLC.
P.O. Box 824
Orinda, CA 94563
6. General Plan Designation: The subject site has an Office (OF) General Plan designation. The applicant proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the OF designation to Multiple-Family Residential-Medium Density (MM).
7. Zoning: The subject site is located in a Single-Family Residential (R-6) Zoning District. The applicant proposes rezoning of the site to a Planned Unit District (P-1).
8. Project Description: The applicant requests a General Plan Amendment to change the designation of the subject property from Office (OF) to Multiple-Family Residential-Medium Density (MM) and to rezone the subject property from Single-Family Residential (R-6) to a Planned Unit District (P-1). The request also includes an approval of a Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide an approximately 0.49-acre property into eight residential lots (ranging in area from 1,349 to 1,836 square feet) and a separate lot - Lot 9 (9,789 square feet) for the private driveway and for six guest parking spaces and a request to establish a Final Development Plan for the eight residential lots and common area parcel. The construction of eight new residences will range in size from 2,199 – 2,203 square feet of living area and will include a two-car garage for each residential unit. Lots 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7 consists of attached townhomes. Lots 1 and 8 will each consist of a detached residential building.

The applicant requests a variance to allow the rezoning of a 0.49-acre property from R-6 to P-1 (where 5 acres is the minimum for residential uses) and a variance to the public road setback varying per lot from 3-5 feet for Lots 4-8 (where 10 feet is required). An exception to the requirement of parabolic vertical curves is also proposed. Removal of five code-protected trees from the property and two additional trees on Center Avenue is proposed. There will be grading on-site involving approximately 2,424 cubic yards of dirt moved.

9. Site Description & Surrounding Land Uses: The subject property is an approximately 0.49-acre property located west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Aspen Drive, within an urbanized area surrounded by office uses and residential uses. The Pentecostal Church of God is directly north of the subject property. The William T. Hendrick House is located on a property that is directly west of the subject property and Contra Costa County Fire Protection District – Station 9 is south of the subject property. Grayson Creek is approximately 164 feet east of the property. Residential uses are further west and south of the subject property.

The subject property is a vacant rectangular-like shaped property that is accessed from Center Avenue. The property slopes upward from Center Avenue to the rear of the property. There are approximately seven trees on the subject property, where several are small trees that are not considered code-protected trees. Five trees that will be removed consist of several large mature native oaks, almond, and ailanthus trees. There are two street trees on Center Avenue that are directly in front of the subject property and other trees that line the western and northern portion of the property, but are located on the William T. Hendrick House property and the Pentecostal Church of God property.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g. permits, financing, approval or participation agreement):

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Grading Division
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
- Contra Costa Water District
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

No, the Wilton Rancheria tribe has not requested consultation.

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.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☒ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☒ Geology/Soils |
| ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality |
| ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☒ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing | ☐ Public Services |
| ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation/Traffic | ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☐ 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.

CONTACT PLANNER FOR SIGNED VERSION

Signature

12-12-18

Date

Jennifer Cruz, Senior Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant a) According to Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges and Waterways) of the County General Plan, no ridges are located within the immediate area of the property. Figure 5-4 (Scenic Route) of the County General Plan does not identify Center Avenue as a scenic route. No scenic vistas are located within the area and therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. b) The subject property is a residentially zoned vacant property. The property does not contain any rock outcropping or historic buildings. The proposed project includes the removal of 5 code-protected trees and 2 additional trees on Center Avenue is proposed. Chapter 816-6 (Tree Protection and Preservation) of the County Ordinance provides for the preservation of certain trees within the County, and controls tree removal while allowing for property development. Replanting of trees and submittal of a bond will be required as a condition to replace the trees removed for the project. Thus, the project does not proposed to be in conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting trees. c) The subject property is vacant and located within an established neighborhood primarily consisting of residences and commercial uses. The William T. Hendrick house, a National Register-listed property is located immediately west of the property. The Cultural Resources Survey Report prepared by Daniel Shoup and Jennifer Ho, Archaeological/Historical Consultants determined that the proposed project would not potentially affect the William T. Hendricks house. Overall, implementation of the project would be less-than-significant. d) This is an infill residential project located between properties that have office buildings (one is currently being built). No lighting plans have been submitted for the project at this time. However, proposed lighting for the project would have a less-than-significant impact, since the project is a residential development located within an urbanized area.				

2. AGRICULTURAL 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 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.*

Would the project:

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: No Impact

- a) This infill project is located within an urbanized area and the site is not being used for agricultural purposes. According to the *2016 Important Farmland Map of Contra Costa County*, the property is categorized as "Urban and Built-up Land", and is not considered farmland. Additionally, Figure 8-2 (Important Agricultural Lands) of the County's General Plan, the site is not identified as being within an Important Agricultural Area. Therefore, the proposed project will not convert existing farmland, as categorized by the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use.
- b) The property is located in an Office (OF) General Plan land use designation, with the proposal for a General Plan Amendment to Multiple-Family Residential-Medium Density (MM). The project also proposes a rezoning of the property from Single-Family Residential (R-6) to a Planned Unit District (P-1). No agricultural uses currently exist on site. Thus, the project will not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use. The project does not

conflict with a Williamson Act contract, because no Williamson Act contract is associated with this property. c-e) The site is not identified as "forest land" and no such uses currently exist on the site. Thus, no "forest land" or "timberland" will be lost because of the subdivision of the land or from the proposed residential development.				
3. AIR QUALITY – <i>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.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY: Less than Significant with Mitigations</u> a) Contra Costa County is within the San Francisco Bay air basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) pursuant to the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan. The purpose of the Clean Air Plan is to bring the air basin into compliance with the requirements of Federal and State air quality standards. The construction of eight homes and associated improvements is located with an urbanized portion of the County. The project would have emissions less than the screening size for evaluating impacts related to ozone and particulate matter. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Clean Air Plan. b) The BAAQMD published Air Quality Guidelines in May 2017, which includes revisions made to the Air District's 2010 Guidelines to address the California Supreme Court's 2015 opinion. The BAAQMD prepared Air Quality Guidelines to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin. If the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that exceed the thresholds of significance for the criteria air pollutants.				

In assessing the air quality impacts for the eight residences that would be constructed on the subject property and the roadway improvements, neither the operational screening criteria of 451 dwelling units or the construction-related screening criterion of 240 dwelling units for the land use of townhomes from the 2017 Guidelines would be exceeded, and therefore, the proposed project would not cause a violation of any air quality standard and would not contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation. Thus, the impact of the proposed construction of the residential development, private access road, and guest parking area would have a less-than-significant impact on any air quality standard.

- c) The project is not anticipated to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment. The proposal is to subdivide the property into eight residential lots (ranging in area from 1,349 to 1,836 square feet) and a parcel for the private road and guest parking (Lot 9), and construct attached townhomes and detached residential dwelling units for a total of eight units within an urbanized area. Impacts will be less-than-significant.
- d) BAAQMD defines exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants and risk of accidental releases of acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) as potential adverse environmental impacts. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, and residential areas with children, and convalescent facilities. The surrounding area consists of residential homes and schools. However, due to the scale of the proposed project, it is anticipated that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to pollutant concentrations. Nonetheless, the construction activities will be restricted to specific days of the week and to a limited number of work hours in order to lessen the amount of time during the week that sensitive receptors would be exposed to construction-related air quality impacts. Furthermore, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

IMPACT AIR-1: Exhaust emissions and particulate matter produced by construction activities related to the project may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants or objectionable odors.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

- A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.**
- B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.**
- C. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.**
- D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.**

- E. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.**
- F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.**
- G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.**

The applicant shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Construction activities (earth excavation) would result in exhaust emissions and particulate matter in the form of the dust. Consistent with CEQA, the BAAQMD requires all phases of a project to be evaluated for potential impacts, including impacts associated with construction activity (grading, exhaust from construction equipment, and any required demolition) and with the operation of the completed project (related to vehicle exhaust or stationary sources such as from industrial sources). BAAQMD regards emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented, instead of requiring quantitative analysis of construction activity to determine significance. The following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a level of less-than-significant.

IMPACT AIR-2: Construction activities would result in exhaust emissions and fine particulate matter in the form of dust.

Mitigation Measure AIR -2: During construction, the project developer shall implement standard construction dust control measures recommended by the BAAQMD to include, which shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

- A. Watering active construction areas on the site at least twice daily.**
- B. Daily watering or covering stockpiles of debris, soils, sand, and other materials that can be blown by the wind.**
- C. Covering all trucks hauling soils, sand, and other loose material or require all material-hauling trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.**
- D. Paving, watering three times daily, or applying non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking lots, and staging areas at construction site.**
- E. Sweeping streets daily, preferably with water sweepers, if soil is carried onto adjacent streets.**

F. Seeding disturbed areas as quickly as possible or installation of cover vegetation over exposed soils.

BAAQMD regards emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less-than-significant, if the above dust and particulate control measures are implemented.

- e) The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. Potential odor impacts are based on a list of specific types of facilities, such as wastewater treatment plants, landfills, refineries, etc. Improperly maintained wastewater treatment facilities could result in some occasional objectionable odors. Another example would be the case of a failed leach field. Based on the nature of the project, objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people would not result from the construction activities.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – *Would the project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: Less than Significant

- a) According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not located in or adjacent to an area identified as a County-identified, significant ecological area. The subject property is located within an urbanized area and therefore, there would be no habitat modifications or impacts to special status species.
- b) According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not located in or adjacent to an area identified as a County-identified, significant ecological area. There are no riparian habitats on the subject property. Grayson Creek is approximately 164 feet east of the subject property. A vacant parcel currently being developed for a two-story office building and Aspen Drive are located between the subject property and Grayson Creek. There would be no impacts to riparian habitats or sensitive natural community.
- c) Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes a program to regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. Activities in waters of the United States regulated under this program include fill for development, water resource projects (such as dams and levees), infrastructure development (such as highways and airports), and mining projects. For regulatory purposes under the Clean Water Act, the term wetlands means "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas." The subject property does not contain federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
- d) The 0.49-acre vacant property is located within an urbanized area, surrounded by office uses and residential uses. There are five trees on the subject property, which will all be removed, including two additional trees located on Center Avenue will also be removed. Currently, a two-story office building is under construction on the adjacent property immediately east of the subject property. The project does not propose to interfere with wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites.
- e) The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 816-6) provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal, while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any developable, undeveloped property, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. An Arborist Report dated July 19, 2017 and June 20, 2018, prepared by Darren Edwards, Advance Tree Service identified five trees on the subject property, which include several large mature native oaks, almond, and Ailanthus. The project involves the removal of five trees from the subject property and two trees located on Center Avenue. Replanting of trees will be required as a condition to replace the trees removed for the project. Overall, the project would not conflict with the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance.

f)	The County has adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County. The subject site is located outside of the areas covered by the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, the project does not conflict with the provisions of the HCP/NCCP.
----	---

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – *Would the project:*

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 geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUMMARY: Less than Significant with Mitigation

- a) A memorandum from the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) dated May 7, 2018, raised a question about the property containing possible historic building or structure 45 years or older that may be of historic value. A qualified professional familiar with the architecture and history of Contra Costa County was recommended to conduct a CEQA Evaluation. The subject property is vacant; however, the applicant has retained a Daniel Shoup and Jennifer Ho, Archaeological/Historical Consultants to conduct the survey.

The subject property is a vacant site that is located adjacent to the William T. Hendricks house, a National Register-listed property of Historic Places and the former flourmill. According to the Cultural Resources Survey Report prepared by Daniel Shoup and Jennifer Ho, Archaeological/Historical Consultants, the report determined that the no structures are know to have been constructed on the subject property or any historic archaeological deposits were present on site. Since the proposed project will have no effect on the Hendricks house itself, the project would not alter the qualities of location, design, materials, or workmanship. However, the report identified how the proposed development would affect the house's integrity of setting, feeling, or association as recognized in the National Register. The Hendricks house is within a vicinity of suburban and residential. A parking lot adjoins the house itself and detracts from the 19th century feeling of the house. A fence and small trees separate the Hendricks house from the project area, making the house difficult to see from the project area. A 1939 aerial photograph suggests that the project area was once part of a landscaped yard attached to the Hendricks houses, however, none of the landscape features remain. There is no known association between the subject property and Hendricks house, and there are no nearby resources that are associated with the Hendricks house that will be affected by the proposed project. Furthermore, the Cultural Resources Survey Report indicates that the project would not affect the integrity of setting, feeling, or association of the

Hendricks house. As such, the proposed project does not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

- b) According to the *Archaeological Sensitivities* map (Figure 9-2) in the County General Plan, the subject property is located in an area that is considered "largely urbanized." CHRIS does not have any record of previous cultural resource studies for the project area. However, based on an evaluation of the environmental setting and features associated with known sites, Native American resources in this part of Contra Costa County have been found in areas marginal to the Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay, and inland near intermittent and perennial watercourses. The subject property is located approximately four and a half miles inland from Carquinez Strait and is approximately fifty meters from Grayson Creek with alluvial deposits. Given the similarity of one or more of these environmental factors and proximity to known resources, there is a potential for unrecorded Native American resources in the proposed project area.

A study was recommended by CHRIS and a study conducted by Daniel Shoup and Jennifer Ho, Archaeological/Historical Consultants was completed. The study indicated that while the Chupcan Bay Miwok people lived in the vicinity, no prehistoric sites are known in or near the project area, though several adjacent parcels have been previously surveyed. The present survey did not reveal evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological materials. As a result, the project area appears to be of low sensitivity for archeological resources as defined in the CEQA Guidelines. Staff from the Wilton Rancheria Tribe indicated in their comments that there is a possibility that Native American artifacts and /or human remains may be uncovered. The recommendation is that the applicant should immediately stop construction and notify Wilton Rancheria and the appropriate Federal and State agencies. Thus, implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 below would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) The subject property slopes up from Center Avenue to the rear of the property. There are no bedrock out crops are located on the property. Further, the study conducted by the consultants did not indicate finding paleontological resources on the property.
- d) There is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. Consequently, construction activities on the property could result in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact due to disturbance of human remains. Staff from the Wilton Rancheria Tribe indicated in their comments that there is a possibility that Native American artifacts and/or human remains may be uncovered. The recommendation is that the applicant should immediately stop construction and notify Wilton Rancheria and the appropriate Federal and State agencies. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure:

Impact: CULT-1: Construction activities requiring excavations and earth movement could uncover and impact human remains.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: The following mitigation measure shall be implemented during project construction-related ground disturbance, and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

Should human remains be encountered during grading, trenching, or other on-site excavation(s), earthwork within 30 feet of the discovery should be stopped until the County Coroner has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the human remains and determine the proper treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the human remains are of a Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the property and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the adverse environmental impact due to disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – *Would the project:*

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: Less than Significant with Mitigations

- ai- iv) The nearest active fault is Concord – Green Valley fault zone, which is indicated to pass within approximately 2.2 miles of the site. Geologic mapping of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) indicates there are no known inactive or dormant faults that cross the property. The risk of surface fault rupture can be considered to be very low.

According to the County's General Plan Safety Element, the property is located within a "moderately low damage" susceptibility (Figure 10-4). This designation is applied to building site located in areas of Pliocene age as well as Pleistocene alluvial deposits. The risk of structural damage from earthquake ground shaking is controlled building and grading regulations. The California Building Code (CBC) mandates that for structures requiring building permits (including the proposed residential buildings, retaining walls over 3 feet in height and most types of accessory structures), their design is required to take into account foundation conditions, proximity of active faults and their associated ground shaking characteristics. The geotechnical report prepared by Rockridge Geotechnical provides CBC seismic design parameters for the project in their report, which must be used by the structural engineer in the design of civil engineering structures. Conservative design and quality construction could reduce any significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

According to the County's General Plan Safety Element, the property is located in area that rated as generally "moderate to low" liquefaction potential (Figure 10-5). The Safety Element of the General Plan also includes a landslide map that was based on landslide mapping of a well-qualified, experienced USGS Geologist. According to that map, there are no landslides within ½ mile of the site. The Rockridge Geotechnical report indicates the site is mantled by moderately expansive soils that have developed on Pleistocene (or older) alluvial deposits. No evidence of existing shallow or deep-seated instability on the site was reported by the project geotechnical engineer. As a result, the risk of landslides can be considered to be less-than-significant.

- b-d) The Soil Survey considers the soil series that occurs on the site to present a moderate to high erosion hazard when the soil is bare. The grading and drainage plan for the project indicates a grade 2:1 slope that wraps around the south, east, and northeast portions of the site. Although the risk of the project being impacted by a landslide can be considered negligible, slope creep is a potential hazard. It typically occurs on slopes underlain by expansive clays, and the downslope movement includes both lateral and vertical components. Slope creep is a slow process, typically involving a small fraction of an inch per year; however, this movement accumulates over the years and can result in several inches of lateral and vertical movement over the life of a structure. The geotechnical report prepared by Rockridge Geotechnical has proposed measures to control the risk of slope creep. The measures include setback of shallow foundations from the slope, and special construction measures where the recommended setback conflicts with the project objectives. It can be anticipated that DCD, Building Inspection Division will require an Erosion Control Plan as part of the grading permit, which will address short-term construction-related erosion.

The project includes four, relatively small bio-retention facilities that are immediately adjacent to proposed curbs, pavement, walkways, and/or foundations. The report prepared by Rockridge Geotechnical has reviewed the location and design of these

structures, and provides recommendations aimed at keeping the basins from creating moist/wet conditions beneath slabs. However, the County Geologist has concerns regarding several issues. The basins designed are small with extremely limited capacity and therefore, a long-term commitment to maintenance would be necessary. Modification by future property owners who may desire to create useable rear yard area may cause the basin to be vulnerable. Finally, even with implementation of the recommendation of the project geotechnical engineer, there is residual risk of damage to improvements located adjacent to the small bio-retention basins (i.e. foundations, flatwork, and the privately maintained road). Therefore, the County Geologist recommends that all needed basin capacity can be provided at a single basin located on Lot #9, since the basin will be oversized to reduce its dependence of regular maintenance. The bio-retention basins are only on Lots 4-8 and the remaining basins for the project are located on Lot 9. It is highly unlikely that there would be sufficient space for a yard on these lots. The basins will be located in front of the buildings along Center Avenue and are located within a storm water treatment easement, which will be maintained by the Homeowner's Association. A deed restriction will be recorded indicating that no modification to the bio-retention is allowed. The bio-retention on Lots 4-8 treat water from the patio area and conveying drainage via pipe or sheet runoff is in infeasible, if located on Lot 9. However, should the applicant choose this option recommended by the County Geologist, the location of the basin would need to be approved by the Public Works Department.

The geotechnical report prepared by Rockridge confirms the soils have a moderate expansion potential. To mitigate the hazard posed by the expansion potential, alternative foundation types have been identified that could be employed to mitigate the effects of expansive soils (i.e., deepened spread footings, stiffened shallow foundations, or drilled, cast-in-place concrete piers). The report goes on to indicate that the most appropriate foundation system for the residences would be a well-reinforced mat foundation with the edge of the mat deepened to reduce the potential for water infiltration. Parameters are provided for the design of the mat, but concerns identified are (i) proximity of any C.3 bio-retention facilities to the foundation, and (ii) setback of the foundation from slopes. The mitigation measures recommended for bio-retention facilities was a required setback from any imaginary slope with a 1 ½:1 gradient from the bottom of the bio-retention facility. To avoid/mitigate the effects of slope creep, Rockridge Geotechnical recommends a minimum setback of 10 feet of foundations from engineered slopes. If that setback is not consistent with project objectives, the geotechnical engineer recommended use of either (i) drilled, cast-in-place concrete pier foundation system, or (II) buried stitch wall. The geotechnical engineer has provided recommendations for capillary break under the concrete mat foundation, and use of a concrete mix which has a low water/cement ratio to aid in minimizing the time required for the concrete to cure.

Testing of one soil sample collected indicates the sample to be "highly corrosive" to buried metal. Since the results of one sample may not be representative of one site conditions, Rockridge Geotechnical recommends additional testing to be performed during the final investigation to confirm/modify these preliminary results. The County Geologist recommends the results of all corrosivity testing be provided to underground and foundation contractors so that suitable measures can be incorporated into project design and construction. In addition, submittal of documentation of the steps taken by

the developer's corrosion engineering firm/contractors to respond to this hazard is required. Nevertheless, the following mitigations would reduce any geological impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Impact GEO-1: The Rockridge Geotechnical investigation confirms the soils have a moderate expansion potential and a risk of soil creep.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: The updated geotechnical report shall include the following: (i) review of project grading and drainage plans, including the siting and design of C.3 bio-retention facilities, (ii) present California Building Code Seismic Design Parameters, (iii) provide geotechnical recommendations pertaining to site clearing, grading, foundation designs, slabs-on-grade, pavement, flat work, and drainage, (iv) outline of details of the proposed observation/monitoring/testing services recommended during construction. The geotechnical monitoring during construction shall commence with clearing, and extending through grading, installation of drainage facilities, and foundation-related work. The required geotechnical update report shall be subject to technical review by the County Peer Review Geologist, and for review and approval by the Department of Conservation and Development.

Impact GEO-2: The Rockridge Geotechnical report indicates that the soils sample tested to be "highly corrosive" to buried metal. However, the results of one sample may not be representative of the site conditions and additional tests should be performed during the final investigation to confirm/modify preliminary results.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2a: The updated geotechnical report shall include additional corrosivity testing to determine if special precautions shall be required to avoid damage to improvements that are in contact with the ground (concrete or steel). Following rough grading, but prior to commencement of foundation-related work, additional testing of each building pad can be required by the County, if deemed to be necessary.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2b: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project geotechnical engineer shall certify that lot preparation work complies with the recommendations in the approved geotechnical report.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2c: During foundation work, the project geotechnical engineer shall provide observation services to ensure the geotechnical recommendations are properly interpreted and implemented by the contractors. Prior to requesting a final building inspection, the Building Inspection Division may require documentation of the geotechnical engineer's observation services during final grading foundation work/lot drainage. The intent of such documentation is to ensure that the lot/building improvements are in conformance with recommendations in the approved geotechnical report.

- e) The project site is served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. The use of a septic tank or other on-site wastewater system is not required.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – *Would the project:*

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY: Less than Significant

- a) The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the agency responsible for maintaining federal and state air quality standards within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines (Updated, 2017) provide screening criteria with which agencies can derive a conservative indication of whether the proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If the screening criteria are met by the proposed project, then the project will not exceed greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) thresholds of significance, and the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project's air pollutant emissions. According to BAAQMD guidelines, the screening level size for operational GHG for a townhouse land use is 78 dwelling units. The project proposes to subdivide the property into eight residential lots and one common area parcel. Lots 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7 consists of attached townhomes. Lots 1 and 8 will have detached residential buildings. Lot 9 will be used for a private road and for guest parking. Thus, the proposal of eight dwelling units would produce operational emissions that are well below a significant level. The screening level size for the construction-related criteria pollutant, reactive organic gases (ROG), is 240 dwelling units. Here too, the project proposal of eight dwelling units would produce construction-related emissions that are well below a significant level.
- b) BAAQMD The County's Climate Action Plan (CAP) is designed to reduce local greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while improving community health. As an implementation measure, the CAP consists of a GHG reduction strategy that has been designed to be consistent with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) guidance on preparing a qualified GHG reduction strategy. The CAP's 2020 GHG reduction target is also consistent with State Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and the AB 32 scoping plan, which is to reduce community-wide emissions 15% below 2005 levels by 2020. To do so, the CAP's GHG Reduction Strategy is structured around six topic areas and their associated goals. The topic areas include Energy Efficiency and Conservation, Renewable Energy, Land Use and Transportation, Solid Waste, Water Conservation, and Government Operations. To assist planning staff with implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy, the CAP includes a development checklist (Appendix-E) which, when completed, identifies a project's consistency with the CAP. Appendix-E lists the following standards for identification of a development project's consistency with the CAP:
- Installation of high-efficiency appliances and insulation to prepare for the statewide transition to zero net energy.
 - New nonresidential development will install high-efficiency appliances and insulation.
 - New residential and nonresidential development will meet the standards to be solar ready as defined by the California Building Standards Code.

- New single-family houses and multi-family units with private attached garages or carports will provide prewiring for EV charging stations inside the garage or carport.
- New multi-family (greater than five units) and nonresidential (greater than 10,000 square feet) developments will provide EV charging stations in designated parking spots.
- New residential and nonresidential development will be located within one half-mile of a BART or Amtrak station, or within one quarter-mile of a bus station.

Staff will recommend that the entitlement for the proposed subdivision be conditioned to require that staff of the County Building Inspection and Community Development Divisions verify compliance with the CAP's Appendix E standards prior to approval of any building permits for development. By ensuring compliance with the development checklist, the potential for the project conflicting with or obstructing the implementation of the County CAP is reduced to a less than significant level.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – *Would the project:*

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 likely 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

SUMMARY: Less than Significant

- a-b) The project involves subdividing the subject property into eight residential parcels, with Lots 2 and 3, 4 and 5, 6 and 7 having of townhomes and Lots 1 and 8 will have detached residential buildings, a parcel for the private access road and for six guest parking spaces. No hazardous materials are used on the site with the current land use, and the project does not propose any use that involves the use, transport, or disposal of a significant amount of hazardous materials, nor will it introduce routine exposure, or cause new exposure to hazardous materials.
- c) There are two schools within a quarter mile of the site – Jesus Our Restorer Christian School and Little Bilingual Angels Preschool. No hazardous materials are used on site with the current land use, and the intended residential development after the subdivision will not introduce new exposure to hazardous materials.
- d) The subject property is not identified as hazardous materials site, according to Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
- e-f) The property is located within an area covered by the Contra Costa Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as indicated in Figure 3A – airport Influence Area of the Contra Costa County Airport land Use Compatibility Plan and is located within two miles of a public airport. Buchanan Airport is approximately less than one mile east of the property. However, the subject property is not located within the Buchanan Composite Noise Contours per Figure 3B or any of the Safety Zones per figure 3C of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. There are no know private airstrips within the vicinity of the subject property. Further, the proposed project is located within a residential and commercial area and would have a less-than-significant impact.
- g) The subdivision with the proposed residential development does not propose any unusual parcel access, and will conform with the existing neighborhood emergency and evacuation plans. There is no indication that the proposed project would have impact on any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan that may exist in relation to the project site. The project site is served by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) who reviewed the project and indicated that there are no concerns with the proposed access.
- h) The CCCFPD has reviewed the project plans, has made recommendations for the project to comply with current fire codes. Separate approval of the proposal by the CCCFPD will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. The potential of the project to introduce new exposure of people or structures to significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fire or other types of fire danger is unlikely, since the project site is largely surrounded by urbanized lands, and is not adjacent to any wildlands.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which 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) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant				

- a-b) The project site is served by the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) and the Central Contra Costa Sanitary (CCCSD). Both CCWD and CCCSD indicate that service for the proposed subdivision is available, and will provide water and sanitary services that are compliant with current standards. No ground water wells are required or proposed, and the project is not expected to impact groundwater resources in the area.
- c-e) Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code requires that all stormwater entering and/or originating on this property to be collected and conveyed, without diversion and within an adequate storm drainage system, to an adequate natural watercourse having a definable bed and banks or to an existing adequate public storm drainage system which conveys the storm water to an adequate natural watercourse.

The property is currently located within Drainage Area 88 and the Grayson Creek watershed. The site generally drains to Grayson Creek, which is east of the property. There are existing drainage facilities located along the project frontage on Center Avenue. It is anticipated that the existing drainage system will have adequate capacity to accept the storm runoff from the proposed infill project. If the existing drainage system is found to not have adequate capacity to convey the post-development storm runoff, the on-site storm drainage collection system will be designed such that the post-development storm runoff flow will not exceed the pre-development storm runoff flow. This will result in no negative net change to the capacity of the off-site storm drainage collection system. This can be accomplished by providing an on-site flow control structure, providing additional volume to the proposed bio-retention areas, and providing larger pipe diameters for the on-site drainage collection system.

Drainage facilities are schematically shown on the submitted plan set on the Plot Plan Drainage Plan. It appears that three primary private storm drain lines will be constructed. One, located in the private street, will take overflow from the bio-retention basins serving as IMPs 6 and 7 on the north side of the property to the existing storm drain line in Center Avenue. Another, also located within the private road, will take runoff from the roofs of buildings 1, 2, 3, and 5 to the bio-retention basin serving as IMP 8. The third will take overflow from the bio-retention basins along the frontage of Center Avenue to the existing storm drain line in Center Avenue. A private "stormwater treatment" easement is proposed over the line along the project frontage on Center Avenue to ensure the line will be maintained and remain operational.

- f) A Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) is required for applications to subdivide land where the resulting project may result in a total amount of impervious surface area exceeding 10,000 square feet (5,000 square feet for projects that include parking lots, restaurants, automotive service facilities and gas stations). If at least 10,000 (or 5,000) square feet of area can be identified for development, a SWCP shall be prepared and submitted for the review and approval of the Public Works Department, in compliance with the Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014), and the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Based on the buildable areas of Lots 1 through 8, and the impervious surface area for the private road (Lot 9), the total new impervious surface area will exceed the 10,000-square foot threshold. An adequate preliminary SWCP has been submitted with this application.

Provision C.10, Trash Load Reduction, of the County's NPDES permits requires control of trash in local waterways. To prevent or remove trash loads from municipal storm drain systems, trash capture devices shall be installed in catch basins (excludes those located within a bio-retention/stormwater treatment facility). Devices must meet the County's NPDES permits and approved by Public Works Department. The Public Works Department must approve location.

- g-h) The project is located in Zone X, as designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, it is just outside the 100-year flood boundary as is indicated on the Vesting Tentative map. The applicant should ensure that the finished floor remain above the base flood elevation with the one-foot relevant freeboard requirement; otherwise, the applicant should be aware of the requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program and the County Floodplain Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 2000-33), as they pertain to future construction of any structures on this property. Based on the proposed finished floor elevations shown on the "Plot Plan Grading Plan" it appears that the finished floors are currently planned to be at least one foot above the adjacent base flood elevation.
- i) The proposed project does not consist of the removal, creation, or alteration of any dam or levee that exists in the County.
- j) The project site is an inland site well removed from coastal areas that would be inundated by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – *Would the project:*

a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: Less than Significant

- a) The property is adjacent to an existing office building on the west side, a church on the north side, and an office building under construction to the east. Single-family residences are located within the vicinity of the property. The subject property is currently vacant. The project will not divide an established community, but will rather continue to reinforce the existing community.
- b) The project involves an amendment to the General Plan land use designation from Office (OF) to Multiple-Family Residential-Medium Density (MM). A request for an

exception to the parabolic vertical curves is proposed and a request for a variance to the lot size to rezone the property from R-6 to P-1 (0.49 acres requested, where 5 acres is required) and a variance to the public road setback varying per lot from 3-5 feet for Lots 4-8 (where 10 feet is required) is included in the project. Subdivision of the property into eight lots will result in the construction of eight new residences and associated improvements. Removal of five code-protected trees from the property and two additional trees located on the Center Avenue will be required. Chapter 816-6 (Tree Protection and Preservation) of the County Ordinance provides for the preservation of certain trees within the County. In accordance with the Ordinance, if the project is approved, then the applicant will be required to replant trees and post a bond for the trees replanted.

The proposal has been reviewed by the County Department of Conservation and Development Housing Division, which recommends approval of the applicant's proposal to construct one moderate-income unit and pay the in-lieu fee for the remaining fractional unit, in compliance with the County Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Overall, the project does not propose to conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

- c) The County has adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County. This plan covers areas within the Cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, Pittsburg, as well as unincorporated areas of Eastern Contra Costa County. The project site is not located in an area, which is covered by the plan.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES – *Would the project:*

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: No Impact

- a-b) According to the *Mineral Resource Areas* map (Figure 8-4) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not located within a County-designated mineral resource area. There is no indication that known mineral resources would be affected by the proposal.

12. NOISE – *Would the project result in:*

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 ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY: Less than Significant with Mitigations

- a) The Noise Element of the Contra Costa County General Plan discusses the County's goal to improve the overall environment in the County by reducing annoying and physically harmful levels of noise for existing and future residents, and for all land uses. According to the *Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments* chart (Figure 11-6) in the County General Plan, environments with ambient noise levels of up to 60 dBA (decibels) Ldn (day night average sound level) are considered "normally acceptable" for new residential development. Environments with ambient noise levels between 60 dBA and 70 dBA are considered "conditionally acceptable" for new residential development, and new development should be undertaken only after a detailed noise analysis is performed and needed noise reduction features are included in the design. The 2013 California Building Code (CBC) requires that the indoor noise level in new multi-family housing do not exceed DNL 45 dB, where the exterior noise level is greater than DNL 60 dB. The CBC also states that if windows must be closed to meet the interior standard, the design must include a ventilation or air-conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment. The County extends the State's interior noise level standard of 45 dBA Ldn or less for single-family residential development, pursuant to Policy 11-4 of the Noise Element.

According the County's GIS and the County's General Plan Noise Contour map (Figure 11-5 I), the subject property is located within a noise level of 60 dBA. The major noise sources affecting the project are vehicular traffic along the nearby roadways. Thus, the project would be located in an area that could expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. As a result, the applicant has prepared a noise study report prepared by Brian Wourms and Charles M. Salter. The report determined that because the windows must be closed to achieve the interior noise criterion, an alternate means of providing outside air to habitable spaces is required for all building facades exposed to

an exterior DNL of 60 dB or greater. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact NOISE-1: Implementation of the project may result in exposure of persons to an interior noise level of more than 45 dBA.

Mitigation Measure NOISE -1: The project shall comply with the requirements for Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings for windows and exterior doors. STC rating for selected assemblies should be based on laboratory testing performed in accordance within ASTM E-90 and comprise the entire window or door assembly, including the frame. If non-tested assemblies are to be used, an acoustical consultant must review the glazing and frame submittals, and the STC rating of the glass may need to be increased. The location of windows and doors shall comply with Figure 2 of the Noise Study prepared for this project prepared by Brian Wourms and Charles M. Salter.

- b) Approval of the project would result in grading, the construction of eight townhomes, and the construction of the roadway and guest parking spaces. The proposed construction is temporary and will be limited to hours of construction. Overall, the project will not result in substantial exposure of persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.
- c) The subject project is located directly north of Center Avenue. The property is surrounded by various commercial uses such as a church directly north of the project site, and office buildings located directly west and east of the project site, and a fire station located southeast of the project site. The subject property is also surrounded by a mix of single-family development and multi-family residential development. The primary source of noise in the project area are vehicles traveling on Center Avenue and vehicles traveling on Pacheco Boulevard, which is approximately 0.08 miles from the project site. The project involving the construction of buildings, construction of the private access road and, guest parking spaces are temporary and limited to construction hours. Thus, implementation of the project will not result in noise levels in excess of the existing ambient noise levels.
- d) Short-term noise levels would occur during construction and the project has the potential to expose some nearby residents to construction-related noise, as would be the case when construction is undertaken on other properties within the area. The following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact NOISE-2: Short-term noise levels would occur during construction and the project has the potential to expose some nearby residents to construction-related noise.

Mitigation Measure NOISE -2: To reduce potential construction noise impacts, the following multi-part mitigation measure shall be implemented for the project, and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

- A. All construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on state and federal

holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the state or federal government as listed below:

**New Year's Day (State and Federal)
Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
Washington's Birthday (Federal)
Lincoln's Birthday (State)
President's Day (State and Federal)
Cesar Chavez Day (State)
Memorial Day (State and Federal)
Independence Day (State and Federal)
Labor Day (State and Federal)
Columbus Day (State and Federal)
Veterans Day (State and Federal)
Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
Day after Thanksgiving (State)
Christmas Day (State and Federal)**

For specific details on the actual day the state and federal holidays occur, please visit the following websites:

Federal Holidays <http://www.opm.gov/fedhol>
California Holidays <http://www.edd.ca.gov/eddsth.htm>

- B. The applicant shall make a good faith effort to minimize project-related disruptions to adjacent properties, and to uses on the site. This shall be communicated to all project-related contractors.**
- C. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.**
- e) The property is located within an area covered by the Contra Costa Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as indicated in Figure 3A – airport Influence Area of the Contra Costa County Airport land Use Compatibility Plan and is located within two miles of a public airport. Buchanan Airport is approximately less than one mile east of the property. However, the subject property is not located within the Buchanan Composite Noise Contours per Figure 3B or any of the Safety Zones per figure 3C of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels and therefore, would have a less-than-significant impact.
- f) There are no know private airstrips within the vicinity of the subject property. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant a) The project proposes to amend the General Plan, rezone the property in order to subdivide the subject property into eight residential lots and a parcel (Lot 9) used for the private road and for guest parking. Although the project is expected to increase the amount of housing for the area, this increase in housing is not considered a significant growth in population. b-c) As discussed above in 13a, the project proposal is expected to <i>increase</i> the amount of housing for the area, not decrease it. The project does not pose nor will it result in displacement of people.				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant a-e) As discussed above in 13a, the project proposal is not expected to cause a substantial increase in population, and generally would not require any new public service facilities. Additionally, the project proposal has been reviewed by local public agencies and there is no indication that additional facilities are necessary.				
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?				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant a-b) As discussed above in 13a, the project proposal is not expected to cause a substantial increase in population, and thus, is not expected to substantially increase the use or deterioration of existing recreational facilities, nor require new or expanded recreational facilities in the area.				
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant				

- a-b) The project proposes an amendment to the General Plan land use designation, rezoning of the property to allow a subdivision of the property into eight residential lots and to develop each resultant parcel with a residential building, and a parcel for the private road and guest parking. Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis for any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips. The project is not expected to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips, and thus would not require further analysis of traffic impact.
- c) The project is to allow the subdivision of one parcel into eight residential lots and to allow the construction of eight new townhomes, and a parcel for the private road and guest parking. Implementation is not expected to cause an increase in air traffic levels.
- d) The subject site is located directly north of Center Avenue, west of Aspen Drive; both are public roads. Center Avenue is defined as an ultimate 64-foot wide road within an 84-foot right-of-way. The ultimate pavement width, alignment and right-of way alignment is based on the County precise alignment drawing, PA-3471. It appears that adequate right-of-way was obtained for the ultimate road design for a Center Avenue road project in the late 1970's. Therefore, additional right-of-way dedication is not required. Frontage improvements, which include curb, gutter, and sidewalk, appear to have been completed along this portion of Center Avenue.

The applicant is proposing a private on-site roadway system (Lot 9), to be owned and maintained by a Home Owners Association, that will have access from Center Avenue. The intersection with Center Avenue is proposed to align with Blackwood Drive, which is acceptable. The applicant proposes to construct minimum 20-foot wide private roads within a 25-foot wide Emergency Vehicle and Private Access easement on-site, which meets County standards for private roads.

Design requirements for private roads are found in Division 98 of the County Ordinance Code. Based on the Plot Plan Preliminary Grading Plan, it appears that the proposed road will not meet the requirements of Section 98-6.010 requiring parabolic vertical curves be used at changes of grade. It appears that the applicant has designed the portion of the private road between Center Avenue and the private cross-street within the site to County driveway standards, utilizing grade breaks rather than vertical curves. The applicant has requested an exception to the Section 98-6.010 requirement.

Due to the required location of the site access relative to existing roadways, the limited depth of the parcel, the difference in elevation between the back of the lot and the front and the required minimum length of the vertical curves, it would not be possible to fit a road using the two necessary vertical curves on the parcel. Additionally, if the site were lowered to avoid the need for vertical curves, they would not be able to connect into the existing storm drain system because the onsite drain system would be too low due to the necessary bio-retention basins. Allowing the exception would not be detrimental to public welfare because on-site traffic should be limited to residents and their guests and on-site vehicle speed will be low, similar to an apartment complex driveway. For the above reasons the Public Works Department would not oppose the granting of the exception to section 98-6.010 provided that the applicant designs and constructs the access roadway in accordance with County Standard Plan CA20.

All required parking to be provided by this project will need to be on-site, not on Center Avenue. It appears that on-site parking is proposed in the area between Buildings 4 and 5, and in the area east of Building 5. Overall, the proposed project does not proposed hazards due to a design feature.

- e) The project has been reviewed by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and recommendations were made for the project to ensure adequate emergency access. The District's approval will be required prior to the issuance of building permits.
- f) There is an existing concrete sidewalk along the frontage of the property. As mentioned in Section D above, all required parking provided by this project would need to be on-site, not on Center Avenue. The project will provide a two-car garage and 6 guest parking spaces on the subject property. There is no indication that the project would impact public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY: Less than Significant

a – b) The Chupcan Bay Miwok lived in the vicinity of the project site; however, no prehistoric sites are known in or near the project area. According to the Cultural Resources Survey Report prepared for the project, several adjacent parcels have been previously surveyed. The present survey did not reveal evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological materials. As a result, the project area appears to be of low sensitivity for archaeological resources and does not appear to contact any historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines. Further, according to the *Archaeological Sensitivities* map (Figure 9-2) in the County General Plan, the subject property is located in an area that is considered "largely urbanized." Nonetheless, staff from the Wilton Rancheria Tribe indicated in their comments that there is a possibility that Native American artifacts and /or human remains may be uncovered. The recommendation is that the applicant should immediately stop construction and notify Wilton Rancheria and the appropriate Federal and State agencies. Implementation of Mitigation Measure Cult-1 would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less than Significant a-b) The project site is served by the Central County Costa Sanitary District. The District has reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that sanitary sewer service is available. The project would not be expected to produce an unmanageable added capacity demand on wastewater system, nor interfere with existing facilities. The District's approval will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. c) Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code requires that all stormwater entering and/or originating on this property to be collected and conveyed, without diversion and within an adequate storm drainage system, to an adequate natural watercourse having a definable bed and banks or to an existing adequate public storm drainage system which conveys the storm water to an adequate natural watercourse. The property is currently located within Drainage Area 88 and the Grayson Creek watershed. The site generally drains to Grayson Creek, which is east of the property. There are existing drainage facilities located along the project frontage on Center Avenue. It is anticipated that the existing drainage system will have adequate capacity to accept the storm runoff from the proposed infill project. If the existing drainage system is found to				

not have adequate capacity to convey the post-development storm runoff, the on-site storm drainage collection system will be designed such that the post-development storm runoff flow will not exceed the pre-development storm runoff flow. This will result in no negative net change to the capacity of the off-site storm drainage collection system. This can be accomplished by providing an on-site flow control structure, providing additional volume to the proposed bio-retention areas, and providing larger pipe diameters for the on-site drainage collection system.

Drainage facilities are schematically shown on the submitted plan set on the Plot Plan Drainage Plan. It appears that three primary private storm drain lines will be constructed. One, located in the private street, will take overflow from the bioretention basins serving as IMPs 6 and 7 on the north side of the property to the existing storm drain line in Center Avenue. Another, also located within the private road, will take runoff from the roofs of buildings 1, 2, 3, and 5 to the bioretention basin serving as IMP 8. The third will take overflow from the bioretention basins along the frontage of Center Avenue to the existing storm drain line in Center Avenue. A private "stormwater treatment" easement is proposed over the line along the project frontage on Center Avenue to ensure the line will be maintained and remain operational.

- d) The project site is served by the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD). The District has reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that water service is available for the site. The project will be required to comply with the District's requirements.
- e) The project site is served by the Central County Costa Sanitary District. The District has reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that sanitary sewer service is available. The project would not be expected to produce an unmanageable added capacity demand on wastewater system, nor interfere with existing facilities. The District's approval will be required prior to the issuance of building permits.
- f-g) The project proposal for eight new townhomes on the property is not expected to significantly increase the amount of solid waste over what is currently generated by the residential neighborhood in the vicinity. The project is expected to conform with the same federal, state or local solid waste regulations which apply to the entire residential neighborhood.

19. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY: Less than Significant with Mitigations

- a) As discussed in individual sections of this initial study, the project proposal to subdivide the subject property into eight residential lots and develop each resultant parcel with a townhome with Lot 9 for the private road and guest parking, has the potential to impact the quality of the environment (Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Noise). However, the impact will be reduced to a less than significant level with the adoption of the recommended mitigation measures that are specified in the respective sections of this initial study.
- b) There is a 2-lot subdivision project located on Center Avenue, Deodar Drive, and Terra Lane, approximately 200 feet from the subject property. This project proposes a duplex on each of the lot; however, the application is on hold at this time, as the application is deemed incomplete. There are no significant projects know in the vicinity that would be "cumulatively considerable" in relation to the subject project proposal. The mitigation measures recommended for the subject project proposal will serve to minimize any cumulative impacts that may result from the project, and reduce the potential cumulative impact of future projects.
- c) As shown in this initial study, the project is not expected to have significant environmental effects if the recommended mitigation measures are adopted. There is no evidence showing that the project would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, if the recommended mitigation measures are adopted and implemented.

REFERENCES

1. Project application, description and plans for County Files #GP16-0007/RZ17-3237/SD17-9466/DP17-3010
2. Staff Field Visit
3. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines
4. Contra Costa County General Plan (2005 – 2020)
5. Contra Costa County Ordinance
6. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
7. Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development Accela System
8. 2016 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/con16.pdf>
9. East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP)
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2017)
<http://www.baaqmd.gov>
11. Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (December, 2015)
12. California Department of Toxic Substances, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List)
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
13. Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (12/13/00)
14. Arborist Report, prepared by Darren Edwards, Advance Tree Service and Landscaping, dated July 19, 2017 and Addendum dated June 14, 2018
15. Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report, prepared by Craig S. Shields, Rockridge Geotechnical, dated August 14, 2017
16. Stormwater Control Plan, prepared by Joseph McCue, Luk and Associates, dated April 2018
17. Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Daniel Shoup and Jennifer Ho, Archaeological/Historical Consultants dated August 8, 2018
18. Environmental Noise Study, prepared by Brian Wourms, Charles M. Salter, Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. dated May 30, 2018
19. Agency Comment Letter, California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated May 7, 2018

20. Agency Comment Letter, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD), dated May 9, 2018
21. Agency Comment Letter, Contra Costa Fire Protection District (CCFPD), dated April 30, 2018
22. Agency Comment Letter, Contra Costa County Housing Division, dated May 22, 2018
23. Agency Comment Letter, Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), dated May 16, 2017
24. Agency Comment Letter, Contra Costa Health Services, Environmental Health, dated May 23, 2018
25. Geological Peer Review, Darwin Myers Associates (County Geologist), dated January 15, 2018
26. Agency Comment Letter, Contra Costa County , dated April 27, 2016
27. Memo, Contra Costa County Public Works Department, dated April 27, 2017 and July 16, 2018
28. Memo, Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), dated May 18, 2018
29. Agency Comment Letter, Building Inspection Division, dated May 15, 2018
30. Memo, Department of Environmental Resources, Wilton Rancheria, dated October 23, 2018

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Mitigation Monitoring Program
- 2) County Parcel Page
- 3) Subject Property and Surrounding General Plan Designations
- 4) Subject Property and Surrounding Zoning Districts
- 5) Aerial View of Subject Property and Vicinity
- 6) Vesting Tentative Map and Elevations