

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Habitat for Humanity Pacifica Landing Project
County File #SD13-9340/DP13-3027/RZ13-3223/GP13-0001
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Rd.
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Daniel Barrios, (925) 674-7788
4. **Project Location:** 589 Pacifica Avenue, Bay Point
APN: 098-210-001
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Hamid Taeb
Habitat for Humanity
2619 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94612
6. **General Plan Designation:** SM, Single-Family Residential Medium Density
7. **Zoning:** R-10, Single-Family Residential District & A-2, General Agricultural District
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan designation of an existing 2.42-acre parcel from Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM) to Multiple-Family Residential Medium Density (MM), rezone the subject property from Single-Family Residential (R-10) and General Agricultural (A-2) to Planned Unit District (P-1), and subdivide the property into 29 new residential parcels and six common space parcels and construct new townhome units on each new residential parcel with associated site improvements for the entire development.

The applicant proposes to construct a townhouse on each of the 29 parcels, with access provided to the units through two separate 25-foot wide private driveways from Pacifica Avenue. The development will also provide a common space areas for the new residents, including three small, private parks and open space encompassing the remainder of the property not utilized for residences, access, parking or drainage. The 29 new townhomes will be two-story, single-family residential units, and will be developed in triplex and five-plex clusters around the subject property. The 29 units will be a mix of two-, three- and four-bedroom residences ranging in living area from approximately 992 square feet up to 1,442 square feet. Off-street parking for the proposed subdivision is provided by 49 surface parking spaces for the residences and five additional guest parking spaces, while no garage spaces are provided. The site will be accessed through private driveways connecting the parking areas to Pacifica Avenue.

The proposed project also includes a request to remove 13 code-protected trees ranging in size from 10 to 48 inches in diameter. As such, a request for a tree permit is included in this project.

The applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan that provides an underground storm drain system with a bioretention basin. The applicant proposes to tie this bioretention basin to the existing storm drain system in Pacifica Avenue, with the storm water being filtered before it is discharged to the offsite storm drain system

Project Phasing

The project is proposed to be constructed in three phases. Phase 1 will consist of constructing the residential units at Lots 1-3, its parking lot (Parcel B), landscaping and associated site improvements (Parcel A). This phase will have its own utility connections and access so that it can be self-sufficient throughout subsequent phase development.

Phase 2 consists of constructing the residential units on Lots 4-13 and 19-21. Phase 2 also includes the installation of all remaining site work, such as access, parking, common areas, drainage improvements, etc. (Parcels C-E), with the exception of the landscaping and flatwork directly adjacent to the remaining 13 building pads for Phase 3.

Phase 3 will consist of the construction of the remaining 13 residential units on Lots 14-18 and 22-29 and their associated landscaping and flatwork directly adjacent to the buildings (Parcel F). Phase 3 will commence upon the completion of Phase 2.

The proposed project also includes a request to remove 13 code-protected trees ranging in size from 10 to 48 inches in diameter. As such, a request for a tree permit is included in this project.

The applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan that provides an underground storm drain system with a bioretention basin. The applicant proposes to tie this bioretention basin to the existing storm drain system in Pacifica Avenue, with the storm water being filtered before it is discharged to the offsite storm drain system.

- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject site is an approximately 2.42-acre lot located at the southeast corner of Driftwood Drive and Pacifica Avenue in Bay Point. The property is adjacent to the Contra Costa Canal Trail. The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM) General Plan Land Use designation and both the Single-Family Residential District (R-10) and General Agricultural District (A-2), within an established single-family and multi-family residential community of properties. The land to the northwest of the property and approximately 0.5 miles west of the property are established open space and agricultural lands within the A-2 zoning district. The parcels in the surrounding area vary greatly in size, and generally range from about 1,800 square feet to upwards of 130,000 square feet (3+ acres) with the average

lot size being approximately 9,440 square feet. The property and its surrounding area slope gently from southwest to northeast, with the exception of the hilltop community across the Contra Costa Canal Trail to the south of the subject property. Within the local area, Port Chicago Highway is located approximately 0.85 miles east of the property, Highway 4 is located approximately 0.63 miles south of the property, and the Suisun Bay is approximately 0.95 miles north.

Existing Site Condition: Currently, the property is vacant. The property is generally level and slopes downward approximately 30 feet from southwest to northeast toward Pacifica Avenue. There is a small number of trees, and it is presently accessed by a driveway on the Pacifica Avenue frontage.

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 Public Works Department
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
- Contra Costa County Environmental Health Division

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

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

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)

Daniel Barrios Planner II Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development	Date
--	------

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Less than significant)*

Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges & Waterways) of the General Plan Open Space Element identifies the specific resources of Contra Costa County as designated scenic ridges and waterways. The intent of these scenic resource designations is to preserve and protect areas of identified high scenic value, where practical, and in accordance with the Land Use Element. The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive in the Bay Point area. This property is not located along, nor within the direct vicinity of, a designated scenic ridge or waterway, as outlined in the Contra Costa County 2005-2020 General Plan. Furthermore, it is at a low elevation, approximately 70 feet. This elevation is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood to the north, while the area to the south ranges from 100 feet to over 500 feet. As such, its low elevation would not otherwise obstruct the view of the Sacramento River Delta approximately one mile to the north. Therefore, there is a less than significant potential for substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista.

- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (Less than significant)*

Figure 5-4 (Scenic Routes Map) of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element identifies certain roads and highways as General Plan-designated scenic routes. This map identifies Port Chicago Highway as a “Scenic Route;” however, the subject property is located approximately 0.45 miles southwest, at the southeast corner of Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive. Furthermore, the subject property is at a low elevation, approximately 70 feet. This elevation is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood to the north, while the area to the south ranges from 100 feet to over 500 feet. As such, the subject property’s low elevation, being at the

same or similar elevation as the neighborhood to the north between it and Port Chicago Highway, combined with its significant distance away would not significantly affect any views associated with Port Chicago Highway. Therefore, there is a less than significant potential for impacts to tree resources, rock outcroppings, or historic structures on the property within a scenic highway as a result of the proposed project.

- c) *Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Less than significant)*

The subject property is currently vacant lot and surrounded by primarily single-family residential development, but also multi-family residential development and public/semi-public land, such as Rio Vista Elementary School adjacent to the east, trails, parks and open spaces to be used by the local residents. There are 13 code-protected trees on-site, but no structures currently exist. The construction of the proposed project would improve the aesthetic value of the subject property and then surrounding area by providing architecturally attractive townhomes with a coordinated landscaping and site improvement plan. Therefore, the potential for the project to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site is less than significant.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less than significant)*

After construction, the 29 new townhomes will introduce more light and glare in the area which may minimally change the existing character of the area. Daytime views would be similar to views of other multi-family residential developments on Pacifica Avenue and other single-family developments on surrounding streets. Lighting of the homes, including potential exterior house lights and vehicle and pedestrian circulation lights, may affect nighttime views; however, the lighting would be similar to that of existing residences in the surrounding area and generally located on the interior of the proposed development rather than the perimeter, thus creating a minimal, if any, impact on the surrounding area. Accordingly, the impact on nighttime views would be less than significant.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project 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?* **(No impact)**

As shown on the California Department of Conservation’s *Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2014* map, the project site does not contain farmland designated “Prime”, “Unique”, or of “Statewide Importance”. Construction of the project would therefore not result in any impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance to a non-agricultural use.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?* **(No impact)**

The project site is within both the Single-Family Residential (R-10) and General Agricultural (A-2) zoning districts with an existing General Plan designation of Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM), a proposed General Plan designation of Multi-family Residential Medium Density (MM), and is not under a Williamson Act contract.

- c) *Would the project 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) or 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)?* **(No impact)**

The project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g) or timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526. The project site is within R-10 Single-Family Residential District and A-2 General Agricultural District with a General Plan designation of Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM), and the proposed use of the property would be an allowed use with the approval of the proposed rezone of the property into a Planned Unit District (P-1) and the proposed General Plan Amendment to Multi-family Residential Medium Density (MM). Construction of the project would not result in the conversion or loss of forest resources.

- d) *Would the project involve or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (No impact)*

The project site is not considered forest land, as discussed above.

- e) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? (No impact)*

The project site is not currently used for agricultural production, and therefore, development of the project would not involve changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Furthermore, the project site is surrounded by single-family and multi-family residential development and public/semi-public land, but it is not surrounded by agricultural land. Thus, development of the project would not contribute indirectly to the conversion of adjacent farmland.

3. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less than significant)*

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 *Clean Air Plan* defines a control strategy that BAAQMD and its partners will implement to: (1) reduce emissions and decrease ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants; (2) safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily impacted by air pollution; and (3) reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to protect the climate. 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. In 2017, 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. To fulfill State ozone planning requirements, the 2017 control strategy includes all feasible measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, including ozone, reactive organic gases, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and fine particulate matter, while also reducing the transport of ozone and its precursors to neighboring basins. The 2017 Air Quality Guidelines include operational, construction-related, and greenhouse gas emissions screening criteria. 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.

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into 29 new lots for the construction of 29 new townhomes for Habitat for Humanity. The 29 proposed townhomes that would be constructed on the subject property after its subdivision would not exceed neither the operational screening criteria of 451 dwelling units nor the construction-related screening criteria of 240 dwelling units as established in the 2017 Air Quality Guidelines. Furthermore, this proposed subdivision would be located in an established residential area within an urbanized portion of the County, and, as explained further in subsequent sections, the proposed project will comply with air quality standards set forth by BAAQMD and the *2017 Clean Air Plan*. Therefore, would not be in conflict with the *2017 Clean Air Plan* or obstruct its implementation.

- b) *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Less than significant)*

In 2017, 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. The 2017 Guidelines include screening criteria for criteria pollutants (ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, fine particulate matter) that are more refined than the screening criteria in the 1999, 2010 and 2012 Air Quality Guidelines. The 2017 Air Quality Guidelines include operational, construction-related, and greenhouse gas emissions screening criteria. 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 of the 29 proposed townhomes that would be constructed on the subject property after its subdivision, neither the operational screening criteria of 451 dwelling units nor the construction-related screening criteria of 240 dwelling units from the 2017 Guidelines would be exceeded. 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 29 new townhomes would have a less than significant impact on any air quality standard.

- c) *Would the project 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)? (Less than significant)*

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in significant emissions of criteria air pollutants during the construction period or during project operation (i.e., occupancy of the single-family residences). Although the proposed project would contribute small increments to the level of criteria air pollutants in the atmosphere, the project would have a less than significant adverse environmental impact on the level of any criteria pollutant.

- d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

Occupancy of the 29 new residences would not be expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors (e.g., residences, schools) to unhealthy long-term air pollutant levels. Construction activities, however, would result in localized emissions of dust and diesel exhaust that could result in temporary impacts to the nearby single-family residences and the Murwood Elementary School, located 0.3 miles to the northeast between South Broadway Avenue and Vanderslice Avenue.

Construction and grading activities would produce combustion emissions from various sources, including heavy equipment engines, asphalt paving, and motor vehicles used by the construction workers. Dust would be generated during site clearing, grading, and construction activities, with the most dust occurring during grading activities. The amount of dust generated would be highly variable and would be dependent on the size of the area disturbed, amount of activity, soil conditions, and meteorological conditions. Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, such activities could have a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures, which the BAAQMD recommends to reduce construction dust and exhaust impacts below **(AIR-1)**.

Potential Impacts

The construction and grading-related activities for the 29 new townhomes have the potential to

have a significant impact on air quality due to combustion emissions and dust generation if not mitigated.

Mitigation Measures

Air Quality 1 (AIR-1): *The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans.*

- 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- 3. 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.*
- 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- 5. 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.*
- 6. 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.*
- 7. All construction and operational equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.*
- 8. 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.*

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact on the sensitive receptors during project construction to a less than significant level.

- e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (**Less than significant with mitigation**)*

The proposed single-family residences would not contain any major sources of odor and would not be located in an area with existing odors. Therefore, the operation of the project would have a less-than-significant impact in terms of odors. During construction and grading, diesel powered vehicles and equipment used on the site could create localized odors. These odors would be temporary; however, there could be a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction due to the creation of objectionable odors. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measure **Air Quality 1 (AIR-1)** above. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the impact from the creation of objectionable odors to a less than significant level.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)

The subject property is currently vacant. Pursuant to Figure 8-1 of the County General Plan (Significant Ecological Area and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plans Species Areas), the Shoreline Between Martinez Waterfront and Concord Naval Weapons Station, Bay Point Salt Marsh and the Entrapment Zone Significant Ecological Resource areas are located in the nearby Port Chicago and Bay Point areas. However, the subject property is approximately 1.7 miles southeast, 2 miles southwest and 2.3 miles southwest, respectively, of these areas, and thus will have no impact on these resources based on its location. However, the proposed project includes a request to remove 13 code-protected trees ranging in size from 10 to 48 inches in diameter.

Therefore, no direct impacts to special status species are expected to result from the proposed project, and the potential for the proposed project having a substantial adverse impact on threatened or endangered species that may exist in the area is less than significant.

- b) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

There are no riparian habitats located on the subject property Pursuant to Figure 8-1 of the County General Plan (Significant Ecological Area and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plans Species Areas), the Shoreline Between Martinez Waterfront and Concord Naval Weapons Station, Bay Point Salt Marsh and the Entrapment Zone Significant Ecological Resource areas are located in the nearby Port Chicago and Bay Point areas. However, the subject property is approximately 1.7 miles southeast, 2 miles southwest and 2.3 miles southwest, respectively, of these areas, and thus will have no impact on these resources. The subject property is also not located within any of the local areas managed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project having a substantial impact 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 Wildlife or U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service.

- c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (No impact)*

The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Corps) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are two of the primary Federal agencies which enforce the Clean Water Act and administer the associated permitting program. As such, these agencies define wetland as 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. The subject property would not be categorized as a wetland as defined above. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project having an adverse effect on a federally protected wetland.

- d) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

The subject property is currently vacant. However, as previously discussed, the subject property is not located within a significant ecological resource area, as shown in Figure 8-1 of the County General Plan (Significant Ecological Area and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plans Species Areas). Additionally, the proposed project will not impact the water circulation of any native resident or migratory fish, as there are no waterways or natural habitats on-site. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less than significant)*

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal and development within their drip lines while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any property proposed for development approval, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. The proposed project includes a request to remove 13 code-protected trees ranging in size from 10 to 48 inches in diameter. The proposed tree removal has been evaluated by CDD staff pursuant to the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance as well as the project plans for construction of the new townhomes, driveways, storm water control, and other site improvements. As the project includes the removal of code-protected trees, a tree permit is required in order to remove the trees. The project will require findings for approval or denial, and, if approved, will receive standard conditions of approval for restitution in order to reasonably restore the natural resources on-site. With the standard review and conditions implemented, the project will have a less than significant impact.

- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (No impact)*

There is one adopted habitat conservation plan in Contra Costa County, the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which was approved in May 2007 by the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy, comprised of the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, and Contra Costa County. The HCP/NCCP establishes a coordinated process for permitting and mitigating the incidental take of endangered species in East Contra Costa County. In a response received from HCP/NCCP

staff on January 16, 2018, the project was deemed exempt from compliance requirements due to the subject property being contained entirely within an area mapped as urban, turf, landfill, and/or aqueduct land cover types in the HCP/NCCP, and therefore, the proposed project would not affect the HCP/NCCP.

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

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5? (No impact)*

The California Public Resources code defines a historical resource as a resource that has been listed or is eligible for listing on the California Historical Register of Historical Resources, a resource included in a local register of historical resources, or identified as significant in a historical survey meeting the requirements of the Public Resources Code. As there are no buildings or structures on-site listed on Contra Costa County’s Historic Resources Inventory, on California’s Register of Historical Resources, or on the National Register of Historic places, nor any building or structure that qualifies to be listed, the project site would not be considered a historical resource, and there would be no potential impact for the proposed project resulting in an adverse change of a historical resource.

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

According to the Archaeological Sensitivity map (Figure 9-2) of the County General Plan, the subject site is described as and “areas of medium sensitivity” and “largely urbanized areas and publicly owned lands excluded from archaeological sensitivity survey. However, there are also significant archaeological resources within the area.” Although unlikely, based on this description it is possible that construction of the project can unearth new archaeological finds. The proposed project was also distributed to Wilton Rancheria of the Department of Environmental Resources. There is a possibility that buried archaeological or paleontological resources, or human remains, could be present and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site, Therefore, the following mitigation measure will provide excavation crews with

information needed to identify any potential undiscovered resources and reduce the potential impact to any find to less than significant levels. (**CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3**).

Potential Impact:

The proposed construction activities included as part of the project will result in further ground disturbance at the subject property. This ground disturbance has the possibility for disturbing underground cultural resources that may not have been identified to date. Therefore, staff recommends that the following mitigations be incorporated as part of the project to ensure that if cultural resources are discovered during future ground disturbance, that the proper actions are taken to ensure that any impacts to those resources are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Cultural Resources 1 (CUL-1): *If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during ground disturbance activities, all work within 30 yards of these materials shall be stopped until a professional archaeologist who is certified by the Society for California Archaeology (SCA) and/or the Society of Professional Archaeology (SOPA), and the Native American tribe that has requested consultation and/or demonstrated interest in the project site, have had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation(s) if deemed necessary.*

Cultural Resources 2 (CUL-2): *If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, they will need to be avoided by impacts or such impacts must be mitigated. Upon completion of the archaeological assessment, a report should be prepared documenting the methods, results, and recommendations. The report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa County agencies.*

Prehistoric materials can include flake-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, choppers) or obsidian, chert, or quartzite tool-making debris; culturally darkened soil (i.e., midden soil often containing heat-affected rock, ash and charcoal, shellfish remains, and cultural materials); and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historical materials can include wood, stone, concrete, or adobe footings, walls and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass ceramics, and other refuse.

Cultural Resources 3 (CUL-3): *If human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery should be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist should be contacted to assess the situation. 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.*

Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist should prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa agencies.

- c) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

With respect to paleontological resources, there is a possibility that buried archaeological resources could be present and accidental discovery could occur. Standard CDD practice is to require that work shall stop if such materials are uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite earthwork until a certified archaeologist has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation as deemed necessary. Nevertheless, the included mitigation measures (**CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3**) will address any unexpected discovery or find which may occur during the construction phase of the project.

- d) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

There is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. Standard CDD practice is to require that work shall stop if human remains are uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite earthwork 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 Coroner determines the remains may those of a Native American, the Coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission. Nevertheless, the included mitigation measures (**CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3**) will address any unexpected discovery or find which may occur during the construction phase of the project.

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

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

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo (A-P) zones along the known active faults in California. According to County GIS data, the nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Concord Fault zone which is located approximately 4.8 miles west of the subject property. However, the subject property does not lie within an A-P zone that encompasses recently active and potential active traces of the Concord fault or any other fault. Due to the subject property not being located within an A-P zone and not having a known active fault crossing the site, the risk of surface fault rupture is considered low. Therefore, there is a less than significant potential of exposing people or structures to the rupturing of any earthquake faults.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less than significant)*

According to Figure 10-4 “Estimated Seismic Ground Response” of the General Plan Safety Element the site is in an area rated “moderately low” damage susceptibility. The risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building code and the County Grading Ordinance. The Building Code requires use of seismic parameters which allows structural engineers to design buildings to be based on soil profile types and proximity of faults deemed capable of generating strong/violent earthquake shaking. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. Thus, the environmental impact from seismic ground shaking would be considered to be less than significant.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Less than significant)*

Figure 10-5 of the County General Plan Indicates that the subject property is located within an area of the County with a “generally low” liquefaction potential. However, further investigation through use of the “Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of the San Francisco Bay Area” GIS system provided by the U.S. Geologic Survey shows that the property is located in a “moderate” area. Site-specific investigations are needed to determine if liquefiable sands are present and to provide stabilization measures where liquefiable sands are confirmed. However, this is a standard requirement for building permit reviews, and it is not anticipated to have any liquefiable sands or hazardous ground failures. This is evidenced by the fact that the property is generally flat, and the proposed gas station is replacing an existing gas station on-site, where there has been no evidence of liquefaction or ground failure. Furthermore, the implementation of modern building practices for grading and the California Building code will result in a less than significant impact.

iv) *Landslides? (Less than significant)*

Figure 10-1 “Generalized Geology of Contra Costa County” of the General Plan Safety Element has compiled maps from the U.S. Geological Survey and California Geological Survey into one survey for the County. It characterizes the subject property as both “Quaternary Alluvium,” which is described as consolidated and unconsolidated sediments with localized problems for building, that include expansive clays, hillside earthflows, and unstable cut slopes, and “Tertiary Formations,” which is described as Hard marine sandstone and shale overlain by soft non-marine (Pliocene) units. Slope stability conditions range from good (marine sandstone) to poor (Orinda Formation). Generally, the presence of a significant landslide hazard requires the existence of a steep slope, certain soil characteristics, and action of gravity. The subject property is relatively flat and has minimal change in elevation throughout. Therefore, the potential for exposing structures or people to substantial adverse impacts as a result of landslides is less than significant. Supplemented with modern building practices for grading and hillside development and the California Building code, there is less than significant potential for landslides.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less than significant)*

Expansive soils are soils that expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out. This continuous change in soil volume causes homes and other structures to move unevenly and crack. The County Building Inspection Division will require that any proposed buildings or structures are engineered according to building code standards. As a result there would be a less than significant adverse environmental impact related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

c) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

Figure 10-5 of the County General Plan Indicates that the subject property is located within an area of the County with a “generally moderate to low” or “generally low” liquefaction potential. However, further investigation through use of the “Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of the San Francisco Bay Area” GIS system provided by the U.S. Geologic Survey shows that the property is located in a “low” to “very low” area. Site-specific investigations are needed to determine if liquefiable sands are present and to provide stabilization measures where liquefiable sands are confirmed. However, this is a standard requirement for building permit reviews, and it is not anticipated to have any liquefiable sands or hazardous ground failures. This is evidenced by the fact that the property is generally flat, and the proposed subdivision will be on a property where there has been no evidence of liquefaction or ground failure. Furthermore, the implementation of modern building practices for grading and the California Building code will result in a less than significant impact. As a result, there would be a less than significant adverse environmental impact related to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

- d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Less than significant)*

Expansive soils are soils that expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out. This continuous change in soil volume causes homes and other structures to move unevenly and crack. The County Building Inspection Division will require that any buildings or structures, as well as any accessory buildings or structures, are engineered according to building code standards. However, the engineering of any structures pursuant to the applicable building code will ensure that any risks to life or property are reduced to a less than significant level.

- e) *Would the project 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? (No impact)*

The project is within the area served by the Delta Diablo Sanitary District. There will not be a septic system within the project.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Less than significant)*

Greenhouse gases are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere and contribute to global climate change. Greenhouse gases include gases such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and various fluorocarbons commonly found in aerosol sprays. Typically, a single residential or commercial construction project in the County would not generate enough greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to substantially change the global average temperature; however, the accumulation of GHG emissions from all projects both within the County and outside the County has contributed and will contribute to global climate change.

The construction and operation of the three single-family residences will generate some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. This determination has been made using the screening criteria provided in the 2017 BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines as a guide, which specifies 78 dwelling units as the operational greenhouse gas screening size; the BAAQMD does not have any standards for construction-related greenhouse gases. If the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance, as identified in the 2017 BAAQMD Guidelines which were used as a guide in determining GHG impacts.

- b) *Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Less than significant)*

In December 2015, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan. This Climate Action Plan (CAP) demonstrates Contra Costa County's (County) commitment to addressing the challenges of climate change by reducing local GHG emissions while improving community health. Additionally, this CAP meets the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements for developing a qualified GHG reduction strategy, and is consistent with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) guidance on preparing a qualified GHG reduction strategy. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing vehicle and transit-related emissions, and reducing waste disposal.

The proposed project, including a 29-lot subdivision to construct townhomes, would generate some GHG emissions, but not at levels that would result in a conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Other than energy-efficient buildings, the Contra Costa County CAP does not include goals, policies or implementation strategies for single-family residential development. Therefore, the project will not conflict with the Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan and will have a less than significant impact related to reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project does not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Over the long term, it can be anticipated that the use of chemicals by future owners of the 29 new townhouses would be typical of residences (e.g. cleaning and gardening products). Accordingly, the risks of creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are considered to be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

As described above, the proposed project does not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Over the long term, it can be anticipated that the use of chemicals by future owners of the 29 new townhouses would be typical of residences (e.g. cleaning and gardening products). Additionally, a review of regulatory databases maintained by County, State, and federal agencies found no documentation of hazardous materials violations or discharge on the subject property. Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the subject property is not identified as a hazardous materials site. Accordingly, the impact of a release of hazardous materials on the site would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less than significant)*

There are four schools located within one-quarter mile of the subject property, including Shore Acres Elementary, Rio Vista Elementary, Riverview Middle School, and Gateway High School. Construction and grading activities would produce combustion emissions from various sources, including heavy equipment engines, asphalt paving, and motor vehicles used by the construction workers. Dust would be generated during site clearing, grading, and construction activities, with the most dust occurring during grading activities. The construction and operation-related activities for the new facility have the potential to have a significant impact on air quality due to combustion emissions and dust generation if not mitigated. Accordingly, mitigation measure **Air Quality 1 (AIR-1)** has been included to mitigate these potentially hazardous emissions to a less than significant level. With the already included mitigation measure, **AIR-1**, in place for construction and grading-related activities, impacts on the school due to hazardous substances at the project site would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (No impact)*

A review of regulatory databases maintained by County, State, and federal agencies found no documentation of hazardous materials violations or discharge on the subject property. Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the subject property is not identified as a hazardous materials site. Therefore, there would be no impact from 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (No impact)*

The subject property is not located within the coverage area of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as shown in Figure 5-5 of the County General Plan. The nearest public airport is the Buchanan Field Airport located approximately 4.85 miles southwest from the

subject property. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk.

- 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? (No impact)*

There are no established private airstrips located in Contra Costa County. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any safety hazards for people in the surrounding area related to private airstrips.

- g) *Does the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into 29 new residential lots and the subsequent construction of 29 new townhomes. The subject property is bounded by two major roads to the north and west, including Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive respectively. These roads would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area, as they both lead directly out of the area and lead to other major roads that connect to Highway 4. Pacifica Avenue connects with Port Chicago Highway to the east and then Willow Pass Road to the south, which then connects to Highway 4. Both of these roads are major arterial roads. Driftwood Drive connects to Evora Road to the south and then either Willow Pass Road to the east or Willow Pass Road to the west: both of which are major roads that connect to Highway 4. The location of the project would not cause it to significantly impair or interfere with emergency evacuation. In addition, the project was sent to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) for comments. The CCCFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for fire lane delineation, water supply, fire hydrants, and CCCFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. Prior to operation of the proposed facility, the revised plans would be reviewed and approved by the CCCFPD. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- h) *Does the project Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Less than significant)*

The subject property is located within the jurisdiction of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD). The CCCFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for fire lane delineation, water supply, fire hydrants, and CCCFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. Prior to issuance of building permits or commencement of use, the construction drawings would have to be reviewed and approved by the CCCFPD, ensuring that the new residences, residents, and the surrounding area are safe from wildfires. In addition, construction on the site would conform to California Building Code Chapter 7A (Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure), California Fire Code

Chapter 47 (Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas), and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Building Standards). As a result, the fire-related risks of the proposed project would be less than significant.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Does the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Less than significant)*

The new impervious surface, grading and excavation proposed in this project would be regulated pursuant to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The State Water Resources Control Board has adopted a statewide General Permit that applies to most storm water discharges associated with construction activity. Pursuant to the General Permit, if the proposed construction activity would disturb more than one acre of land, an applicant would be required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality through both construction and the life of the project.

In addition, the proposed project must comply with applicable Contra Costa County C.3 requirements. Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and 16 incorporated cities in the county have formed the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. In October 2009, Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) adopted the NPDES Municipal Regional Permit for the Program, which regulates discharges from municipal storm drains. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control storm water runoff. The County has the authority to enforce compliance with its Municipal Regional Permit authority in its adopted C.3 requirements. The C.3 requirements stipulate that projects creating and/or redeveloping at least 10,000 square feet (5,000 square feet for projects that include parking lots, restaurants, automotive service facilities and gas stations) of impervious surface shall treat storm water runoff with permanent storm water management facilities, along with measures to control runoff rates and volumes.

The applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan (SWCP) has been reviewed by the Public Works Department (PWD) who has recommended that the application be deemed complete and has recommended conditions of approval regarding storm water management. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impact on water quality from project operation would be less than significant.

- b) *Does the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Less than significant)*

The applicant has included bioretention basins onsite for storm water control, which would facilitate groundwater recharge and help offset the increase in impervious surface on the project site created by construction of the new facility. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact.

- c) *Does the project 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area or result in substantial erosion or siltation. The property is generally level and slopes from southwest to northeast toward Pacifica Avenue. Storm water presently sheet flows off the property over the sidewalk and into the street where it is collected by existing storm drain facilities and ultimately conveyed to tidal marsh lands north of the railroad tracks. The applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan that provides an underground storm drain system with a bioretention basin. The applicant proposes to tie this bioretention basin to the existing storm drain system in Pacifica Avenue, with the storm water being filtered before it is discharged to the offsite storm drain system. The bioretention basin would be designed to intercept storm water collected in the storm drains, remove pollutants from storm water, and allow for percolation into the ground or into the drainage pipes. The preliminary SWCP has been reviewed by the Public Works Department (PWD) who site has recommended that the application be deemed complete and has recommended conditions of approval regarding storm water management. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would result in a less than significant impact for erosion or siltation.

- d) *Does the project 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? (Less than significant)*

As previously mentioned in part “c,” the proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area or result in flooding on- or off-site. The property is generally level and slopes toward Pacifica Avenue. Storm water presently sheet flows off the property over the sidewalk and into the street. The applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan that provides an underground storm drain system with a bioretention basin. The applicant proposes to tie this bioretention basin to the existing storm drain system in Pacifica Avenue, with the storm water being filtered before it is discharged to the offsite storm drain system. The bioretention basin would be designed to intercept storm water collected in the storm drains, remove pollutants from storm water, and allow for percolation into the ground or into the drainage pipes. The preliminary SWCP has been reviewed by the Public Works Department (PWD) who has recommended that the application be deemed complete and has recommended conditions of approval regarding storm water management. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would result in a less than significant impact for the project on downstream drainage facilities and there would not be any significant risk due to an increase in the project-related volume of runoff that would result in onsite or off-site flooding.

- e) *Does the project 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area or result in substantial erosion or siltation. Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code requires that all storm water 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. A preliminary SWCP has been reviewed by the Public Works Department (PWD) who has recommended that the application be deemed complete and has recommended conditions of approval regarding storm water management. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would reduce the impact of the project on San Pablo Creek to a less than significant level and there would not be any significant risk due to an increase in the project-related volume of runoff that would result in onsite or off-site flooding. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would result in a less than significant impact.

- f) *Does the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Less than significant)*

Residential developments typically discharge pollutants from vehicles, landscape maintenance and pest control. Therefore, the project could contribute sediment, heavy metals, oils and greases, nutrients and pesticides into the drainage channel. These pollutants have the potential to degrade the receiving waters. The bio-retention areas located onsite would be engineered to collect runoff from the impervious surfaces created by the construction of the 29 townhomes and common areas. The bio-retention area would serve as a soil filtration facility prior to the discharge of storm water to the existing drainage channel. Compliance of the project with C.3 standards ensures that the water quality effects of the project will be less than significant.

- g) *Does the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (No impact)*

The subject property is located within Flood Zone X, which is not a Special Flood Hazard Area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Therefore, the project will not require floodplain permits or flood-related improvements, and there is no potential for the proposed project placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) *Does the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows? (No impact)*

The subject property is located within Flood Zone X, which is not a Special Flood Hazard Area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Therefore, the project will not require floodplain permits or flood-related improvements, and there is no potential for the proposed project to impede or redirect flood flows.

- i) *Does the project 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? (No impact)*

With regard to dam or levee failure inundation, this hazard does not exist for the subject property as there is no proposal to remove or modify any existing dam, levee, or other infrastructure used to divert or otherwise control large volumes of water as part of the project. In addition the subject property is located within Flood Zone X, which is not a Special Flood Hazard Area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. As such, the project will not require floodplain permits or flood-related improvements. Therefore, there is no potential impact.

- j) *Is the project susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (No impact)*

Seiche, tsunami, and mudflow events are generally associated with large bodies or large flows of water. The subject property is located in close proximity to one of the County's large water bodies or natural water courses, the Suisun Bay within the Sacramento River Delta, which would increase the potential for a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow event. However, there is no proposal to remove or modify any existing dam, levee, or other infrastructure used to divert or otherwise control large volumes of water as part of the project. In addition the subject property is located within Flood Zone X, which is not a Special Flood Hazard Area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. As such, the project will not require floodplain permits or flood-related improvements. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact to current exposures of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project physically divide an established community? (No impact)*

The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive in the Bay Point area. The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM) General Plan Land Use designation and both the Single-Family Residential District (R-10) and General Agricultural District (A-2), within an established single-family and multi-family residential community of properties. The proposed project is fully contained on the

subject property, and it includes the subdivision of the subject property into 29 new lots and the subsequent construction of 29 new townhomes. In addition, the subject property is surrounded by developed single-family and multi-family residential properties, so the proposed townhome subdivision among these properties would maintain the established residential setting. Thus, the proposed project would not divide an established community.

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

The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM) General Plan Land Use designation and both the Single-Family Residential District (R-10) and General Agricultural District (A-2), within an established single-family and multi-family residential community of properties. The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan designation of the existing 2.42-acre parcel from Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM) to Multiple-Family Residential Medium Density (MM), then subsequently rezone the subject property from Single-Family Residential (R-10) and General Agricultural (A-2) to Planned Unit District (P-1), and finally subdivide the property into 29 new lots and construct new townhome units on each new parcel with associated site improvements for the entire development.

As proposed, the project will comply with the proposed General Plan land use designation and zoning district. The intent of the MM General Plan land use designation is to promote the orderly establishment of medium-density residential development. This designation allows between 12.0 and 21.9 multiple-family units per net acre, and sites can range up to 3,349 square feet. With an average of 2.5 persons per unit, population densities would normally range between about 30 to about 55 persons per acre. The proposed 29-unit subdivision of the 2.42-acre property would result in a density of 14.97 units per net acre, which falls well within the density range for the proposed MM designation. Furthermore, the project proponent, Habitat for Humanity, has successfully developed projects that provide homeownership opportunities for low-income households and has a track record for developing affordable housing in the unincorporated Contra Costa County areas, thereby also supporting the goals and policies of the General Plan Housing Element.

The planned unit district is intended to allow diversification in the relationship of various uses, buildings, structures, lot sizes and open space while insuring substantial compliance with the general plan and the intent of the county code in requiring adequate standards necessary to satisfy the requirements of the public health, safety and general welfare. A large-scale integrated development or a general plan special area of concern provides an opportunity for, and requires cohesive design when flexible regulations are applied; whereas the application of conventional regulation, designed primarily for individual lot development, to a large-scale development or special area may create a monotonous and inappropriate neighborhood. The proposed project will meet the intent of this proposed zoning district, as it proposes a comprehensive plan to both subdivide and develop the property with 29 new townhome units and comprehensive site

improvements for common usage of the new tenants. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact to land use plans and regulations for the subject property adopted for mitigating an environmental effect.

- c) *Does the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? (No impact)*

As discussed in the “biological resources” section of this Initial Study, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan in May 2007. The HCP/NCCP is the only adopted habitat conservation plan in Contra Costa County. The subject property’s location in the Bay Point area is exempt from compliance the HCP/NCCP, and therefore, the proposed project would not affect the HCP/NCCP.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (No impact)*

The project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

- b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (No impact)*

The project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

12. NOISE – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project expose people 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? (**Less than significant with mitigation**)*

Activities at the 29 new townhomes within this subdivision are not expected to expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of the Community Noise Exposure Levels shown on Figure 11-6 of the General Plan Noise Element. Figure 11-6 shows that levels of 65 dB or less are normally acceptable and 70 dB or less are conditionally acceptable. According to Figure 11-5 D of the Noise Element, the property is not located within an area potentially exposed to DNL and CNEL noise levels exceeding 60 dBA. As the property would not exceed 60 dBA, the noise levels are considered “normally acceptable,” and the applicant would not be required to implement noise-reducing mitigations to reduce noise levels.

In addition, Policy 11-4 of the Noise Element and Title 24, Part 2, of the California Code of Regulations require that interior noise levels in new multi-family residences meet a DNL of 45 dBA. All new multi-family residences are required by the Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division to provide a Title 24 report that includes building materials that will satisfy the required interior noise levels at a DNL of 45 dBA. Therefore, no additional mitigations would be required for interior noise levels.

Finally, during project grading and construction, there may be periods of time where there would be loud noise from construction equipment, vehicles, and tools. Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, such activities could have a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the noise mitigation measures to bring potential noise impacts to a less than significant level (**Noise-1**).

Potential Impact

Construction and grading-related activities for the 29 new townhomes and overall site improvements have the potential to have a significant noise impact on the surrounding neighborhood if not mitigated.

Mitigation Measure

Noise-1: *The following noise reduction measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans.*

- *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.*
- *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.*
- *Large trucks and heavy equipment are subject to the same restrictions that are imposed on construction activities, except that the hours are limited to 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.*
- *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)*

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce construction period noise impacts to a less than significant level.

- b) *Would the project expose persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? (Less than significant)*

Residential use of the project site would not generate significant ground borne vibration. Also, the project does not include any components (e.g., pile driving) that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels during construction activities. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact on ground-borne vibration or noise levels.

- c) *Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less than significant)*

Vehicular traffic generated by the 29 multi-family residences in the proposed project, along with noise typically associated with multi-family residences (e.g., yard maintenance, recreation, etc.), would increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. However, the types and levels of noise generated from the 29 proposed houses on the minor subdivision would be similar to noise levels from the existing residential developments in the area, and therefore, the impact on ambient noise levels in the vicinity would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

A temporary increase in ambient noise levels would occur during construction of the proposed project. During construction and grading, noise would be created by construction equipment, vehicles, and tools. The construction noise would be temporary; however, there could be a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction due to the creation of noise if not mitigated. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measure **Noise-1** above. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the impact from the construction noise to a less than significant level.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No impact)*

The subject property is not located within the coverage area of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as shown in Figure 5-5 of the County General Plan. The nearest public airport is the San Rafael Airport located approximately 9 miles west across the San Francisco Bay from the subject property, and the nearest public airport on the property's side of the Bay is Buchanan Field, which is located approximately 17 miles east of the subject property. Thus the proposed project is not considered to be located within an area where airport operations present a potential hazard.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No Impact)*

There are no established private airstrips in Contra Costa County. Therefore, there would be no private airstrip-related noise impacts.

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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project 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)? (Less than significant)*

The project would construct 29 new townhomes subsequent to subdividing the subject property, which would directly increase the Bay Point area population by an estimated 80 people, based on the Census 2010 estimate of 2.77 people per household for Contra Costa County. Currently, the property is vacant, so the net increase in population would be approximately 80 people. The County General Plan’s Growth Management Plan standards generally consider an increase of 1,000 people as the threshold of significance. Therefore, the impact of adding 80 people to the Bay Point area would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No impact)*

The subject property is currently vacant lot and surrounded by residential and public/semi-public uses. The proposed project is residential in nature, and, since the subject property is undeveloped, would not cause a reduction in the number of housing units in the area. Rather, the project proposes to create an additional 29 new living units in the Bay Point area. Therefore, the project would not have a negative effect on existing housing.

- c) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No impact)*

The subject property is currently vacant lot and surrounded by residential and public/semi-public uses. The proposed project is residential in nature, and, since the subject property is undeveloped, would not cause a reduction in the number of housing units in the area. Rather, the project proposes to create an additional 29 new living units in the Bay Point area. Therefore, the project would not displace any person currently residing on the project site.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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:

a) Fire Protection? (Less than significant)

Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD). The closest fire station to the subject property is Station #86 located approximately 2.1 miles away at 3000 Willow Pass Road, in Bay Point. The CCCYPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for fire lane delineation, water supply, fire hydrants, and CCCYPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. Prior to operation of the proposed facility, the revised plans would be reviewed and approved by the CCCYPD. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project on fire protection services would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection? (Less than significant)

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, through the Muir Station, located approximately 7.3 miles driving distance to the northwest of the project site. Public protection standards under Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Program (GMP) of the County General Plan require a Sheriff facility standard of 155 square feet of station area and support facilities per 1,000 in population shall be maintained within the unincorporated area of the County. The proposed project would not induce a significant population increase within the County that would equal or exceed 1,000 persons. The project would construct 29 new townhomes subsequent to subdividing the subject property, which would

directly increase the Bay Point area population by an estimated 80 people, based on the Census 2010 estimate of 2.77 people per household for Contra Costa County. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase the Sheriff or support facility requirements for the area.

c) Schools? (Less than significant)

Public education services for students from the Bay Point area are provided by the Mount Diablo Unified School District. These students attend Rio Vista Elementary School, Riverview Middle School, and Mount Diablo High School. For each new townhome in the 29-lot subdivision, the applicant would be required to pay the state-mandated school impact fees. Payment of the fees pursuant to State regulations for school services would reduce school impacts to less than significant levels.

d) Parks? (Less than significant)

Parks and recreation standards under the GMP require three acres of neighborhood park area per 1,000 in population. The proposed project would not induce a significant population increase within the County that would equal or exceed 1,000 persons. The project would construct 29 new townhomes subsequent to subdividing the subject property, which would directly increase the Bay Point area population by an estimated 80 people, based on the Census 2010 estimate of 2.77 people per household for Contra Costa County. Furthermore, the applicant would be required to pay a Park Impact Fee for each new residence, which is used to acquire parkland and develop parks and recreation facilities to serve new residential development in the unincorporated areas of the County. Thus, there would be no impact from this project on the use of the local public parks and recreational facilities by residents of the Bay Point area.

e) Other public facilities? (Less than significant)

Libraries: Contra Costa Library operates 25 facilities in Contra Costa County. The closest facility is the El Sobrante Library, which is approximately 0.6 miles driving distance to the northeast of the subject property. The Contra Costa Library system is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. Accordingly, there would be a less than significant impact created by the 29 new townhomes of the proposed subdivision on the public libraries utilized by residents of Contra Costa.

Health Facilities: Contra Costa County Health Services District (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 11 health centers and clinics in the County. County health facilities generally serve low income and uninsured patients. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact created by the 29 new townhomes of the proposed subdivision on the use of public health facilities by residents of the Contra Costa County.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

As discussed in the “public services” section of this Initial Study, parks and recreation standards under the GMP require three acres of neighborhood park area per 1,000 in population. The proposed subdivision for 29 new townhomes at the project site would not induce a substantial population increase within the County. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact from this project on the use of the local public parks and recreational facilities by residents of the Bay Point area.

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

The proposed subdivision for 29 new townhomes at the project site would not result in a substantial increase in residential population. Parks and recreation standards under the GMP require three acres of neighborhood park area per 1,000 in population. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact or result from this project on the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Less than significant)*

Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis of any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more additional AM or PM peak-hour trips. The proposed project consisting of a 29-lot subdivision and the construction of three single-family residences would generate an estimated 29 AM and 29 PM peak-hour trips, and therefore, is not required to have a project-specific traffic impact analysis. Since the project would yield less than 100 peak hour AM or PM trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the circulation system in the Bay Point area.

- b) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority is responsible for ensuring local government conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP), a program aimed at reducing regional traffic congestion. The CMP requires that each local jurisdiction identify existing and future transportation facilities that will operate below an acceptable service level and provide mitigation where future growth degrades that service level. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority has review responsibility for proposed development projects that are expected to generate 100 or more additional peak-hours trips. As the project would yield less than 100

additional peak hour AM or PM trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the CMP would result in a less than significant impact.

- c) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (No impact)*

The subject property is not located within the coverage area of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as shown in Figure 5-5 of the County General Plan. The nearest public airport is the Buchanan Field Airport located approximately 4.85 miles southwest from the subject property. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk.

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less than significant)*

There are no increased hazards due to a design feature such as curves or intersections. The ingress/egress to the subject property is already established along Pacifica Avenue, and new/improved ingress and egress (sidewalks included) will be provided for each new residence and the overall development. The Contra Costa Fire Protection District has also reviewed the project for conformance with the Fire District standards, which include emergency access, and no comments of concern were received. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact.

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into 29 new lots and the subsequent construction of 29 new townhomes. The subject property is bounded by two major roads to the north and west, including Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive respectively. These roads would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area, as they both lead directly out of the area and lead to other major roads that connect to Highway 4. Pacifica Avenue connects with Port Chicago Highway to the east and then Willow Pass Road to the south, which then connects to Highway 4. Both of these roads are major arterial roads. Driftwood Drive connects to Evora Road to the south and then either Willow Pass Road to the east or Willow Pass Road to the west: both of which are major roads that connect to Highway 4. The location of the project would not cause it to significantly impair or interfere with emergency evacuation. In addition, the project was sent to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) for comments. The CCCFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for fire lane delineation, water supply, fire hydrants, and CCCFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. Prior to operation of the proposed facility, the revised plans would be reviewed and approved by the CCCFPD. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access with the CCCFPD comments integrated into the project and their approval of the building plans.

- f) *Would the project conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Less than significant)*

The Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan contains several policies that support the provision and use of alternative modes of transportation. The project is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Driftwood Drive and Pacifica Avenue. The site is presently accessed by one driveway on Pacifica Avenue. All access to the site will come from Pacifica Avenue, a 36-foot wide street within a 60-foot right-of-way. No additional right-of-way dedication is required. Except for street lights, frontage improvements are in place. As both Pacifica Avenue and Driftwood Drive are at their ultimate width and right-of-way, require no dedications, and already contains a sidewalk, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on pedestrian and bicycle activity in the vicinity.

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) 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:				
i) 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), or,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) 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. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *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:*
- i) *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)? (Less than significant)*

As discussed in “cultural resources” Section 5.a of this Initial Study, the California Public Resources code defines a historical resource as a resource that has been listed or is eligible for listing on the California Historical Register of Historical Resources, a resource included in a local register of historical resources, or identified as significant in a historical survey meeting the requirements of the Public Resources Code. As there are no buildings or structures on-site listed on Contra Costa County’s Historic Resources Inventory, on California’s Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic places, nor any building or structure that qualifies to be listed, the project site would not be considered a historical resource, and there would be no potential impact for the proposed project resulting in an adverse change of a historical resource. Thus, the proposed gas station reconstruction would have no impact on visible tribal cultural resources.

- ii) *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. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (Less than significant with mitigation)*

The proposed project was distributed to Wilton Rancheria of the Department of Environmental Resources. As discussed in “cultural resources” Sections 5.b, 5.c, and 5.d of this Initial Study, there is a possibility that buried archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact on tribal cultural resources. As a result, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures **CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3**. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from accidental discovery 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Less than significant)*

Wastewater generated by the proposed project would originate from the 29 new townhomes that would be constructed within the new subdivision. The project site is served by the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD). DDSD has received the project application comment request and has stated that wastewater services is available for the proposed project with the submittal, review and approval of DDSD. By meeting the development standards of DDSD, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by existing DDSD facilities without expansion of the wastewater treatment system. Thus, no significant impacts related to the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region would be expected.

- b) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would incrementally increase wastewater flows, as described above. The project site is served by the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD). DDSD has received the project application comment request and has stated that wastewater services is available for the proposed project with the submittal, review and approval of DDSD. By meeting the development standards of DDSD, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by existing DDSD facilities without expansion of the wastewater treatment system. Furthermore, as described above, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by existing DDSD wastewater facilities.

- 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? (Less than significant)*

As discussed in the "hydrology and water quality" section of this Initial Study, the applicant has submitted a preliminary "Storm Water Control Plan" that has been reviewed by the Public Works

Department (PWD). PWD has recommended that the application be deemed complete and has recommended conditions of approval regarding storm water management. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impact on water quality from project operation would be less than significant.

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

The project site currently receives water service from the Golden State Water District (GSWD). The project shall be submitted to and reviewed by GSWD, and, by meeting the development standards of GSWD, the proposed project could be expected to be accommodated by existing water facilities without expansion of the existing system. Accordingly, the impact of providing water service to the proposed project would be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project 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? (Less than significant)*

The project site is served by the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD). DDSD has received the project application comment request and has stated that wastewater services is available for the proposed project with the submittal, review and approval of DDSD. By meeting the development standards of DDSD, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by existing DDSD facilities without expansion of the wastewater treatment system.

- f) *Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would generate construction solid waste and post-construction residential solid waste. Construction waste in Contra Costa County is diverted away from landfills and recycled through the three established transfer stations in the County. Construction on the project site would be subject to the CalGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program administered by the CDD at the time of application for a building permit. The Debris Recovery Program would eliminate the construction debris headed to the landfill by diverting materials that can be recycled to appropriate recycling facilities.

With respect to residential solid waste, the receiving landfill is the Keller Canyon Landfill, located at 901 Bailey Road in Bay Point. Keller Canyon is estimated to be at 15 percent of capacity. Residential waste from the proposed project would incrementally add to the operational waste headed to the landfill; however, the impact of the project-related residential waste is considered to be less than significant. A portion of the residential waste is expected to be recycled, and would thereby reduce the residential waste headed to the landfill.

- g) *Would the project comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (No impact)*

The proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste. The project includes multi-family residential land uses that would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that would not conflict with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. Furthermore, compliance with CalGreen's solid waste requirements, such as the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, the project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into 29 new residential lots and the subsequent construction of 29 new townhomes. With the incorporated project mitigations and due to the relatively small scale of the proposed project, location in an area that has been previously built-out, and the fact that the proposed improvements have been designed to integrate with existing improvements and environmental conditions, the potential for the proposed project to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, threaten wildlife, or eliminate

examples of California history is less than significant. Where mitigation measures are proposed in this Initial Study, the measures will be conditions of approval of the proposed project and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures.

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

The proposed project would not create substantial cumulative impacts. The project site is located within the Urban Limit Line in an area that is primarily single-family residential development, but also multi-family residential development and public/semi-public land, such as a school, trails, parks and open spaces to be used by the local residents. The proposed project would be consistent with the existing residential and related development surrounding it. In addition, there will be no significant increase in the demand for public services such as water, sewage disposal, or solid waste disposal that would require new or expanded infrastructure improvements that could impact the environment. In other words, the proposed project is of a nature and scale that has minimal impacts in areas such as population, traffic, public utilities, and aesthetics, which can often cause an impact to the environment when viewed cumulatively over various projects.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less than significant)*

This Initial Study has disclosed impacts that would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. All identified mitigation measures will be included in the conditions of approval for the proposed project, and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures. As a result, there would not be any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

In the process of preparing the Initial Study Checklist and conduction of the evaluation, the following references (which are available for review at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, 30 Muir Rd., Martinez, CA 94553) were consulted:

1. Project Application and Plans
2. Agency Comments
3. Contra Costa County General Plan (2005-2025)
4. Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title 8)
5. Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory (December 2010)
6. Office of Historic Preservation: California Register of Historical Resources (Webpage)
<http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/listedresources/>
7. County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Data Layers
8. 2014 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map (Webpage)
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2014/con14.pdf>
9. Contra Cost County ECCC HCP/NCCP
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance.*
11. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan.*
12. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Air Quality Guidelines; Updated May 2017.*
13. CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2)
14. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - "Cortese List" (Webpage)
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/>
15. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Webpage)
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/>
16. California Emergency Management Agency. *Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning: Richmond Quadrangle/San Quentin Quadrangle, Mare Island Quadrangle, Benicia Quadrangle.*
17. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
18. CalRecycle (Webpage)
<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Government/default.htm>
19. CalRecycle, Facility/Site Summary Details: Keller Canyon Landfill (07-AA-0032) (Webpage)
<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail/>
20. Contra Costa County, 2010 Census (Webpage)
<http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/5342/Demographics>

21. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, *Fire Stations* (Webpage)
<http://www.cccfpd.org/station-address.php>
22. Contra Costa County Sheriff, *Patrol Division* (Webpage)
<http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/208/Patrol-Division>
23. Contra Costa Library (Webpage)
<http://ccclib.org/>
24. Contra Costa Health Services (Webpage)
<http://cchealth.org/eh/land-use/>
25. Clean Water Act (Webpage)
<http://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-clean-water-act>
26. Federal Clean Air Act (Webpage)
<http://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview>
27. Mount Diablo Unified School District (Webpage)
<https://www.mdusd.org/>
28. U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife (Webpage)
<http://www.fws.gov/>
29. United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Webpage)
<http://www3.epa.gov/>

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Mitigation Monitoring Program
- 2) County Parcel Page
- 3) Printout of Subject Property and Surrounding Zoning Districts
- 4) Printout of Subject Property and Surrounding General Plan Designations
- 5) Aerial View of Subject Property and Vicinity
- 6) Project Plans