

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Commercial Rezone in Pacheco
County File #RZ18-3247
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:** Adrian Veliz, Planner II (925) 674-7798
4. **Project Location:** 101 Aspen Drive, Pacheco CA 94553
APN: 125-120-105
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Tim Griffith
101 Aspen Drive
Pacheco, CA 94553
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within an Office (OF) General Plan land use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is currently located within a Single Family Residential (R-6) Zoning District.
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is seeking to rezone the subject property from a Single-Family Residential (R-6) to a Limited Office (O-1) zoning district. No grading or construction activities are proposed within this application. Due to the development standards of the proposed O-1 district, the project also includes a request for approval of variances to allow a primary setback (Aspen Drive) of 15 feet (where 20 feet is required), a minimum side yard of 3 feet (where 15 feet is required), and a lot area of 6,272 square feet (where 15,000 square feet is required) for the existing improvements and lot configuration.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject property is a 6,272 square-foot parcel located at the northwestern corner of the intersection of Aspen Drive and Center Avenue. Pacheco Boulevard, a major thoroughfare serving the area is located approximately 400 feet east of the project site. Adjacent parcels are zoned for Single-Family Residential use to the north, west and south, while eastern adjacent parcels are zoned Retail Business (RB). Adjacent General Plan land use designations include Office (OF) to the west, Public and Semi-Public (PS) to the north and south, and Open Space (OS) to the east. The subject property abuts a vacant lot to the east, for which the County is currently processing a proposed residential development. Surrounding land uses include a church to the north and a fire station to the south. Additionally, a Contra Costa Water District canal is located to the east, opposite Aspen Drive.

Existing Site Condition: The subject site is a relatively flat lot that has been previously developed with a two-story office building and associated off-street parking. A six-foot fence exists along the western and northern property lines. No development or grading activities are proposed with this application.

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement:**

N/A

- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

A Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was sent to the Department of Environmental Resources for Wilton Rancheria on March 27, 2019. No response from Wilton Rancheria has been received as of the completion of this report.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <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 type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

 Adrian Veliz
 Planner II
 Contra Costa County
 Department of Conservation & Development

 Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

| Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **No Impact:** The project site is not proximate to scenic routes, highways, ridges or waterways, as identified in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the 2005-2020 County General Plan. The subject property has been previously developed with an existing two-story office building and no new construction is proposed with this application for a rezone. Thus, the project will have no impact resulting in adverse effects on a scenic resource.

- b) **No Impact:** As mentioned above, there are no scenic routes, highways, ridges or waterways in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There are no trees or rock outcroppings present on the property. Additionally, the office building on site was recently constructed and is of no historic significance. Therefore, the project will have no impact on trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- c) **No Impact:** The project is within an urbanized area of Contra Costa County. There are no applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality in this area. Additionally, the project will not result in any physical change in the appearance of the subject property. Therefore, the project could not have any impact in this respect.

- d) **No Impact:** The project does not involve installing any new light sources. No change in the composition of the existing building exterior (e.g. new paint, new siding, or new roofing) would result from the project. Therefore, the project could not have impacts resulting in new sources of light or glare.

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

| 2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – 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) **No Impact:** Neither the project site, nor its surroundings, are within an agricultural zoning district. According to the California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map of Contra Costa County (2016) the subject property and its surroundings are designated as “urban built-up land”. Therefore, the project could not result in the conversion of farmland of any type to a non-agricultural use.
- b) **No Impact:** There are no parcels zoned for agricultural use in the vicinity of the project site. The subject property is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project could not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.
- c) **No Impact:** There are no forest lands, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production on or near the subject property. Therefore, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for such lands.
- d) **No Impact:** As mentioned above, there are no forest lands on or near the subject property. Thus, none will be converted to a non-forest use as a result of the project.
- e) **No Impact:** The project involves a change in land use limitations that does not involve any physical change to the subject property or the improvements thereupon. Additionally, there is no farmland on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not change the existing environment such that it could result in conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

| 3. AIR QUALITY – 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) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

a-d) **Less Than Significant Impact:** 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* “provides a comprehensive strategy to improve air quality, protect public health, and to protect the climate”. The potential air quality impacts for this project were evaluated using the BAAQMD 2017 CEQA guidelines screening criteria. Pursuant to these guidelines, if a project does not exceed the screening criteria size it is expected to result in less than significant impacts to air quality. If approved, newly permitted uses within the proposed O-1 district would include administrative/professional offices, art studios, home cablevision facilities, prescription drug sales, and animal hospitals. The 2017 BAAQMD operational criteria pollutant screening size for these uses ranges from 61,000 to 439,000 square feet, in terms of project area. The 2017 BAAQMD maximum construction-related screening size for the uses permitted within the O-1 district is 277,000 square feet. The 6,272 square-foot parcel could not accommodate a development that would exceed the respective screening criteria. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on air quality.

| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a-d) **No Impact:** The subject property and existing office building are located on Center Avenue in Pacheco, which is an urbanized area of the County. The project does not involve grading or construction activities that could disturb wildlife, or habitat that may exist at the site. Therefore, the project is expected to have no impact on fish, wildlife, or plant species.

- e) **No Impact:** There are no trees on the subject property, therefore, the project will have no impact relating to tree resources. The project will have no impacts on the applicability of the County's Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance.

- f) **No Impact:** The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP) was adopted by the County in October of 2006. The purpose of this plan is to provide a framework to protect natural resources while streamlining the environmental permitting process for impacts to covered special status species within the rapidly expanding region of Eastern Contra Costa. The proposed project site is not located in the eastern region of the county and thus, is not within an area of Contra Costa County that is covered by the ECCC HCP/NCCP.

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

| 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

a-c) **No Impact:** The project site is in a heavily urbanized area of central Contra Costa County and has been developed with a two-story office building. The existing building was recently constructed and is of no historical significance. If approved, the rezone would primarily affect the use of interior space within the existing building. Additional impacts originating from differing setbacks/minimum lot sizes between the existing and proposed zoning districts would be administrative in nature and could not result in an impact on cultural resources. The project would not result in any physical change to the environment. Therefore, the project has no potential to result in an adverse impact to a historical resource, archaeological resource, or to disturb human remains that may yet to be discovered at the site.

| 6. ENERGY – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The intent of the rezone is to allow an existing office building to be utilized by a wider array of office uses than those allowed under its current single-family residential zoning. No construction is proposed with this project. Allowed uses within the proposed O-1 district typically consist of administrative activities which are not associated with the consumption of large amounts of energy resources. The subject property is presently entitled for medical and/or dental office uses that are substantially similar to those permitted within the proposed O-1 district. The immediate effect of the proposed rezone would be the allowance of administrative-type offices¹, in addition to those for which the subject property is presently entitled. A comparison of the greenhouse gas and air pollutant screening criteria, described in the *2017 Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines*, suggests that medical offices

¹ Prior approval of a new Land Use Permit and additional CEQA review is required for other permitted uses in the O-1 district such as art studios, cablevision facilities, prescription drug sales, and animal hospitals, etc.

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

are typically more energy intensive than a traditional administrative office use (higher energy consumption begets higher emissions). Thus, in some cases, a rezone from an R-6 to an O-1 district can result in a significant increase in the demand for energy resources. In this specific case, considering present entitlements for a substantially similar use, and the immediate land use implications of the rezone, the change in allowed uses arising from the proposed O-1 zoning district would not significantly affect energy consumption upon the subject property.

- b) **No Impact:** In December 2015, a Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors in order to identify and achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by the year 2020 as mandated by the State under AB32. The design and operation strategies set forth in the CAP for reducing GHG emissions include measures such as installing energy efficient appliances that would also reduce the project’s consumption of energy resources during operation. Since the project does not propose construction or grading activities, these policies are not applicable. If approved, the primary effect of the rezone would be the allowance of a larger array of office and commercial uses, and would not affect any policies or regulations for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, the project will not conflict with the implementation of the County’s 2015 Climate Action plan.

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

| 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause 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? | <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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <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 direct or indirect 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"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo (A-P) zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Concord fault, which is mapped approximately 1 mile east of the project site; however, because the site is not within the Concord A-P zone, the risk of fault rupture is generally regarded as very low. Additionally, since no development is proposed as part of this rezone, the project will have no direct impacts that could potentially result in a fault rupture. However, due to the increase number and intensity of allowed uses, the project may result in a marginal change in the number of employees/customers who visit

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

the project site on any given day. This would amount to an indirect impact that could expose an increased number of people to hazards related to a ruptured fault. However, due to the project site’s location one mile away from the Concord fault, the potential project-related impact from surface fault rupture remains less than significant.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less Than Significant Impact: *Figure 10-4 Estimated Seismic Ground Response* of the General Plan Safety Element identifies the site in an area rated “moderate” damage susceptibility. The risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building code and the County Grading Ordinance. Because no development is proposed as part of this rezone, the project will have no direct impacts that could potentially result in seismic ground shaking. All future tenant improvements are subject to plan-check review by the County Building Inspection Division to ensure compliance with applicable building codes. Since the project could somewhat affect the number of employees/customers who visit the project site on a given day, the project may indirectly expose an increased number of people to hazards relating to seismic activity. However, the extent of this indirect impact is constrained by the relatively small parcel area and fixed occupancy within the existing office building. Therefore, project-related effects pertaining to seismic ground shaking would expectedly be less than significant.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the County General Plan, Safety Element *Figure 10-5 Estimated Liquefaction Potential*, the project site is in an area of the County with generally moderate to low liquefaction potential. Additionally, no new buildings or structures are proposed with the project, thus precluding any potential direct impacts relating to seismic ground failure or liquefaction. Since only minor changes in daily visitors to the project site would expectedly result from the proposed rezone, the project has less than significant potential to indirectly expose people to such hazards. Therefore, the project-related impact from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would be considered less than significant.

iv) *Landslides?*

No Impact: According to the Safety Element of the County’s General Plan, the subject property is not located in an area where landslide deposits are prevalent. In addition the subject property is not proximate to any significant slopes that may increase the potential for landslide hazards. Furthermore, the project site is flat, and the proposed rezone does not involve any construction or grading activities. Therefore, the project could not result in any impact, directly or indirectly, which would expose people to hazards relating to landslides.

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

- b) **No Impact:** The project does not involve any new construction, grading, or other activity which would affect the existing drainage pattern for the project site or the vicinity. Therefore, the project is not expected to have any impact leading to erosion or loss of topsoil.
- c) **Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the County General Plan, Safety Element *Figure 10-1 Generalized Geology of Contra Costa County* the subject property is within an area with a geological unit consisting of “Quaternary Alluvium”. This geological unit is characterized as consolidated and unconsolidated sediments with potential issues relating to expansive clays, hillside earthflows and unstable cut slopes. According to *Figure 10-4 (Estimated Seismic Ground Response)*, sound structures on firm dry alluvium typically perform satisfactorily. Since the existing two-story office building was recently constructed per 2016 California Building Code standards and the proposed project will only change the zoning of the subject property and not the building design, the project represents a less than significant risk of exposing people to geologic hazards resulting from landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the United States Geological Service Soil Survey of Contra Costa County (1977), the subject property is located on Omni Clay Loam soil, which can be highly expansive. Since the project does not involve the construction of any new buildings or structures and the existing two-story office building was recently constructed per 2016 California Building Code standards, the project has a less than significant potential to result in direct or indirect risks relating to its location on potentially expansive soils.
- e) **No Impact:** The parcel is served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. No alternative wastewater disposal systems are existing or proposed. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts regarding the soil’s inability to support a private waste disposal system.
- f) **No Impact:** Given that the project does not involve ground disturbing activities, the project is expected to have no potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or unique geologic feature.

| 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The potential Greenhouse Gas (GHG) impacts for this project were evaluated using the BAAQMD 2017 CEQA guidelines screening criteria. Pursuant to these guidelines, if a project does not exceed the screening criteria size (in square-feet) it is expected to

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

result in less than significant impacts to air quality. If the proposed rezone is approved, previously unpermitted uses, such as administrative offices, broadcasting studios, home cablevision facilities, animal hospital, and prescription drug sales that are accessory to a medical office, would then be permitted on the subject property. The BAAQMD screening guidelines for Operational GHG indicate that such projects have a screening size ranging from 10,000 square feet (Pharmacy w/o Drive through) to 53,000 square feet (General Office). Given the fact that the underlying General Plan land use designation (Office) has a maximum floor area ratio of 1.5, any future land use established on the 6,272 square-foot subject property could not exceed the screening size for any use permitted within the O-1 district. Consequently, the proposed rezone would expectedly have less than significant GHG related environmental impacts.

- b) If approved, administrative offices would be the only new land use which could be established without additional discretionary entitlements. According to BAAQMD CEQA guidelines and the significance thresholds applied to land use categories, administrative office uses are also the least GHG intensive use permitted within the O-1 district. The property is presently entitled for medical offices, which have a markedly smaller GHG screening size (22,000 s.f.) than that of general offices. The difference in screening criteria suggests that medical office buildings have a greater potential to adversely affect air quality than administrative offices. The immediate effect of the rezone would be the allowance of administrative office tenants within existing square-footage that could otherwise be used only for the more intense medical office uses. The change in allowed uses could also potentially reduce GHG emissions originating from the subject property. Therefore, due to the nature of the project, the physical limitations of the site, and the reasonable expectation that sites' GHG emissions would be reduced relative to its current entitled use; the project is not expected to conflict with the *2017 Clean Air Plan*.

| 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **No Impact:** If approved, the rezone would make office space within an existing building available to a wider array of land uses. Newly permitted land uses within the O-1 district would include administrative/professional offices, art studios, cablevision facilities, prescription drug sales, and animal hospitals. Amongst those uses permitted in the O-1 district, only administrative and professional offices could be established here without additional discretionary review. Thus, the immediate effect of the proposed rezone would not include the allowance of a newly permitted use that is typically associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of large quantities of hazardous materials. If a future tenant proposes a land use involving such hazardous materials, it would trigger a Land Use Permit and further environmental review at that time. Therefore, the project will have no impacts that create a public hazard related to hazardous materials.

- b) **No Impact:** The permitted uses within the proposed Limited Office (O-1) zoning district include professional offices, administrative, executive, editorial and business offices; none of which typically require significant quantities of hazardous materials for their daily operation. This may not be the case for additional uses permitted in the O-1 district only upon the approval of a Land Use Permit. However, such uses would require additional CEQA review to ensure the proposal does not present a hazard to the public. Thus, the proposed rezone to an O-1 district would not result in a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident condition involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment.

- c) **No Impact:** Schools in the vicinity include Hidden Valley elementary and College Park High School which are each approximately one mile away to the west and south respectively. Given the distance to the nearest schools and the fact that the project would not allow the immediate establishment of uses that typically involve the routine use, handling, or transportation of hazardous materials, the rezone could not adversely affect nearby schools in this respect.

- d) **No Impact:** Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC), the subject property is not identified as a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the project will have no impact creating a significant hazard, to the public or the environment, related to hazardous material sites.

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

- e) **No Impact:** The subject property is located approximately ½ mile west of Buchanan Field, a public airport. The project site, however, is outside of Buchanan Field’s Safety Zones according to the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility (ALUC) Plan, *Figure 3C Buchanan Field Airport Safety Zones*. Because the project does not involve the aboveground storage of fuel or other hazardous materials, and does not involve new construction or new sources of light, the project is not expected to have any impact resulting in an aviation-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

The ALUC indicates that the project site is within “Height Exception Overlay Zone 2”, which limits building heights to a maximum of 45 feet. The development standards for both the existing and proposed zoning districts limit building height to 35 feet, and thus, do not conflict with the Height Exception Overlay District. Therefore, the rezone would have no impact in this respect.

- f) **No Impact:** The proposed O-1 zoning district would allow for a wider array of commercial uses within the existing building, versus the few that are allowed within the R-6 district. If approved, the project would not result in a physical change to the subject property or its surroundings. Thus, there is no potential for the project to interfere with transport or access along any roadways or waterways that may be a part of an emergency response plan. Additionally, the project does not involve the removal or alteration of any existing structures or mediums of mass communication which may be utilized to execute an emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, the project will have no impact on any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- g) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The subject property is located within the service area of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD). The Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division (CDD) generally refers requests for new land uses to the respective Fire District for review and comment to ensure that the proposed project meets applicable fire codes. In a memo dated January 9, 2019, Fire Protection District staff did not indicate that the project represents a significant risk of wildfire. Additionally, the project site is in a heavily developed area of the County that is not adjacent to any wildlands. Furthermore, the project site is located directly across the street from CCCFPD Fire Station #9; ensuring that any fires originating on the subject property can receive a prompt response from the fire district. Lastly, the types of new land uses allowed within the proposed zoning district (offices, studios, pharmacy, etc.) are not typically associated with an increased risk of fire beyond that which already exists at the site. Therefore, the proposed rezone is not expected to expose people or structures to significant risks relating to wildland fires.

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

| 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The subject property and its immediate surroundings are within the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District’s service area, and are served by an existing storm drain system located within the Center Avenue right-of-way. Since the project does not involve any new construction or grading activities, it will have no effect on the property’s existing drainage pattern. The daily operation of permitted uses within the O-1 zoning district do not typically involve commercial, manufacturing, or processing activities which would have the potential for generating byproducts or other waste which would pose a significant risk for violating waste discharge requirements or impacting water quality at the property. Wastewater discharged from the existing office building is likely to originate primarily from employee break areas, restrooms, or the maintenance of existing landscaping. Therefore, the project will not significantly impact water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) **No Impact:** The permitted uses within the proposed O-1 zoning district are primarily commercial in nature. The subject property is within the service area of the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), which currently provides public water service to the subject property. No wells exist on the subject property and none are proposed. Since the subject property has been previously

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

developed with a two-story office building already being served by CCWD, it is likely the subject property will continue to obtain water from a public source. Additionally, the proposed rezone does not involve the creation of new impervious surface. Thus, there is no potential for the rezone to interfere with groundwater recharge by displacing pervious surface. Therefore, the project will have no impact that may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

- c) **No Impact:** The project does not involve any construction or grading activities. Consequently it could not have any impact on the existing drainage pattern in any respect.
- d) **No Impact:** The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain. The Pacheco area is not included in tsunami inundation areas identified by the California Geological Survey (CGS) hazard maps. According to the Safety Element of the County General Plan, the project site is not located in a hazard zone for mudflows. A seiche is a water wave in a standing body of water such as a large lake or reservoir that is caused by an earthquake, a major landslide, or strong winds. This hazard does not exist within the Pacheco area as there are no large lakes or reservoirs in the area. As such, there would be no risk of pollutants being released from the site due to inundation through flooding, tsunamis, mudflows, or seiche, therefore, there would be no impact in this regard.
- e) **No Impact:** The subject property is currently served by the Contra Costa Water District. No new impervious surface would result from the proposed rezone. The proposed project would change the number of allowed uses on the subject property as well as applicable development standards, but would have no effect on any applicable water quality standards. Since the project site does not draw water from underground sources and will cause no physical change to drainage patterns on the property, it will have no significant impact on groundwater sustainability or with the treatment of water entering nearby storm drain systems. As such, there is no potential for impacts of this type.

| 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The subject property is located at the intersection of Aspen Drive and Center Avenue. Pacheco Boulevard, a major thoroughfare in the area, is located approximately 400 feet east of the project site. The project’s Aspen Drive frontage is along a zoning district boundary. Generally, nearby properties located west of Aspen Drive are zoned for residential use, while those to the east are within a Retail-Business (R-B) zoning district. A two-story office building exists on site, which was previously entitled by Contra Costa County for the

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

operation of medical/dental offices. Abutting single-family residential zoned parcels to the north and south have been developed with a church and fire station respectively. The County is currently processing an application to develop the vacant western abutting property with multi-family residential townhomes. Thus, since no adjacent parcels are currently used for residential purpose, the proposed rezone would not physically divide an established community by implementing zoning for commercial uses in the middle of a residential community.

- b) **No Impact:** The subject property is within an Office (OF) General Plan land use designation. According to the *Land Use Element* of the County General Plan, the existing zoning district is incompatible with the underlying OF designation. The proposed rezone would eliminate this incompatibility. Approval of the proposed rezone would result in the existing structure setbacks and yards, as well as the lot size being at variance with certain development standards of the O-1 zoning district, but these variances are not attributable to new construction or a physical change in the project site or its environment. The project does not conflict with the General Plan OF designation, specific area policies for the Center Avenue area of Pacheco, or any other regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

| 12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <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-b) **No Impact:** According to the County General Plan Conservation Element *Figure 8-4 Mineral Resource Areas*, the subject property is not located within an area identified as a significant mineral resource area. Staff is unaware of any additional studies which indicate the presence of mineral resources on or near the subject property. There are no mineral resource recovery sites on or near the subject property. Therefore, the proposed project has no potential for resulting in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

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

| 13. NOISE – Would the project result in: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** No grading or construction activity is proposed as part of this application. If approved, the allowed offices and commercial uses would not expectedly create a significant new source of noise within the existing building. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts resulting in the generation of a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact:** None of the office and commercial uses allowed in the O-1 district would expectedly result in groundborne noise or vibration. Since no construction or grading activity would occur in relation to the proposed rezone, the project has less than significant potential for adverse impacts in this regard.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is approximately ½ mile west of the Buchanan Field airport which contributes to relatively heightened noise levels in its immediate vicinity. According to *The Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Figure 3-B Composite Noise Contours*, the project site is not within an area expected to be subjected to significant aircraft-related noise exposure. Additionally, the proposed rezone would allow uses such as administrative/professional offices, art studios, home cablevision facilities, prescription drug sales, and animal hospitals to be established on the subject property. If approved, none of the potential new uses would be of the type or scale such that it would expectedly expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact in this respect.

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

| 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site and its surroundings are within an urbanized area of Contra Costa County. Major infrastructure supporting nearby development such as roads, electrical, water, sanitary and drainage utilities are existing. No new construction or grading is proposed on the subject property and the project does not require the extension of any roads or other infrastructure. The proposed rezone would allow for the repurposing of an existing building without increasing its square-footage. Thus, if approved, the rezone is not expected to result in a significant increase in employees relative to the current permitted use of the building due to its fixed capacity and employee/gross acre standards applicable to the subject property’s OF General Plan land use designation. Therefore, the project will have no significant impact leading, directly or indirectly, to a substantial population growth.

- b) **No Impact:** Although the proposal would remove the subject parcel from its current single-family residential zoning district, this would not displace any existing people or housing as the site has never been used for residential purposes. If the rezone is denied, the existing office building would continue to be used for medical/dental offices. Therefore, the project would have no impact on existing housing that would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

| 15. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Fire Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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:

- a) **No Impact:** The County General Plan requires fire stations to be located within 1 ½ miles of developments in urban, suburban and central business district areas. The project is already conforming to this policy as the nearest fire station is located directly across the street from the project site. In a project comment letter dated January 9, 2019, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District staff gave no indication that additional fire station area would be required to accommodate the project. Thus, the proposed rezone will have no impact requiring the construction of new fire protection facilities.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The County General Plan requires 155 square feet of sheriff station area and support facilities per 1,000 population. The proposed rezone is not expected to induce a significant increase in population for the area. Thus, approval of the project will not necessitate any expansion of such facilities.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact:** Since the project is not expected to induce a significant population increase for the area, approval of the project will not necessitate the construction of new schools in the vicinity.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The Growth Management Element of the County’s General Plan calls for three acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 population. To reiterate, the project will not result in substantial population growth in the area. Therefore, approval of the project has less than significant potential to result in impacts that necessitate the establishment of new neighborhood parks.

- e) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The need for other public facilities (e.g. Library, Hospital, Community Center, etc.) is generally tied to an anticipated increase in population. Since the project is not expected to result in a significant population increase for the area, the project will not necessitate the construction any other type of public facility. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact in this regard.

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

| 16. 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-b) **Less Than Significant Impact:** There is no reasonable expectation that the rezone would increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. No significant increase in population is expected to result from the rezone. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in impacts having adverse effects which would accelerate the deterioration of existing recreational area. No new recreational areas or expansion of existing areas are proposed with the project. Therefore, the rezone is not expected to result in any such impact.

| 17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** No element of the project proposal is typically associated with an expected impact to the performance of the circulation system serving the area. The project does not involve the construction of new buildings or other infrastructure. If approved, the number of employees working within the existing office building may change somewhat, but any growth in employment would be constrained by the fixed quantity of existing office space and relatively small parcel area. Consequently, if approved, the primary impact of the rezone would be the allowance of a wider array of commercial uses on the subject property. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the effectiveness or performance of the circulation system.

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

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would result in a wider array of uses being allowed on the subject property and does not involve any new construction. Consequently, the project has somewhat limited potential to result in a significant uptick in vehicle miles traveled, relative to its current use. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b)(1), projects within ½ mile of a major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor are generally presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. The project site is approximately 400 feet west of stops for three local transit routes traveling along the Pacheco Boulevard thoroughfare; County Connection Route numbers 18, 19, 28. Direct-route destinations from these nearby bus stops include Martinez Amtrak, Diablo Valley College, as well as Concord and Pleasant Hill BART stations. Based on the above, the project has less than significant potential for conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

- c) **No Impact:** The proposed rezone would increase the number and type of offices that could be located within an existing two-story building. Surrounding land uses are predominantly commercial to the east, and residential to the west. Since the project essentially amounts to a slight repurposing of an existing building that utilizes existing access/utility infrastructure, it has no potential to increase hazards due to a design feature of the roadway or other infrastructure.

- d) **No Impact:** In general, California Fire Code (CFC) requires unobstructed access to within 150 feet of all exterior walls of new construction. No new buildings are proposed with this application, however, the property in its current configuration is in compliance with this regulation as the entire parcel is within 150 feet of the Center Avenue or Aspen Drive rights-of-way. The proposed rezone would change the types of uses permitted here, but would not affect any codes, policies, or regulations pertaining to the provision of emergency access. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and provided comments dated January 9, 2019. The comments received did not express concern over the adequacy of emergency access. Therefore, the project would have no impact resulting in inadequate emergency access.

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

| 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is not listed on the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory. Comments received from the Wilton Rancheria tribal review of the project did not identify the site as being a significant Native American cultural resource. Thus, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on tribal cultural resources.

- b) **No Impact:** The California Register of Historical Resources was established under Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. A resource may be listed in the California Register if it is associated with significant events or persons in California history, embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period region, or method of construction, or if it has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. The project site is not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and none of the aforementioned criteria are known to apply to the project site. Therefore the project will have no impact on resources identified by the State of California as having significant cultural value.

| 19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **No Impact:** The project site is within the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, which currently provides sewer service to the area. Since the rezone would not physically alter the site or its surroundings, the project will not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded infrastructure of any type. Therefore, no environment effects relating to expansion of water, sewer, drainage, electrical, natural gas or telecommunication infrastructure would result from the project.

- b) **Less Than Significant Impact:** If approved, the change in allowed uses resulting from the rezone is not expected to significantly affect the demand for water resources on the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact in this respect.

- c) **No Impact:** The project was routed to the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District for agency comments. The County did not receive any comments from CCCSD. Additionally, the existing office building on site is relatively new construction which required CCCSD approval prior to the issuance of building permits. Thus, the relatively recent approval by CCCSD for an office building at this location, combined with no agency comments on the project, suggests no concern with capacity to serve both existing and projected demands. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on existing wastewater treatment capacity for the region.

- d-e) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed rezone would allow additional permitted commercial and office uses that typically would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste. No conflict is anticipated with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. The existing office building must comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste, regardless of its zoning designation. Therefore, the project is not expected to significantly impact either the generation of solid waste or compliance with applicable regulations, as they pertain to the existing office building.

| 20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| Environmental Issues | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

a-d) **No Impact:** The subject property is within an urbanized area that is not proximate to state responsibility areas or areas classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard.

| 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUMMARY:

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact:** As discussed throughout this study, the lack of ground disturbing activities, the highly urbanized environment, and lack of proximity to biologically significant areas, ensure the proposed rezone represents a less than significant impact on fish or wildlife species, plant or animal communities, or objects of historical significance.
- b) **No Impact:** If approved, the proposed rezone would affect permitted land uses for a 6,000 square-foot parcel that is presently entitled and developed for a substantially similar use to those allowed

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

in the O-1 district. The proposed O-1 district is consistent with the subject parcel’s underlying *Office (OF)* General Plan land use designation, the present R-6 zoning is not. The rezone would remedy this existing inconsistency between the zoning and General Plan land use designations. There are two residential development projects in the vicinity. One is an eight-lot residential development (County Files #GP16-0007, #RZ17-3237, #SD17-9466, and #DP17-3010) located on the western abutting property. The Board of Supervisors is scheduled to consider the proposed project in May of 2019. The other nearby project is a two-lot residential development (County Files #MS17-0004, and DP17-3029) on Center Avenue, approximately 400 feet west of the project site. This initial review for this project is still pending, and the application has been deemed incomplete. No Cumulative environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed project. As explained throughout this Initial Study, no physical changes to the site are proposed, and because of the site’s physical characteristics, the uses that could realistically be established under the proposed O-1 zoning district are substantially similar to the uses that could be established under the existing R-6 zoning district. Additionally, the rezoning of the subject site is intended to better align the zoning of the subject site with the existing improvements thereon, as well as the underlying OF General Plan land use designation. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the negligible impacts of this project would be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with past, current or probable future projects.

- c) **No Impact:** There is no reasonable expectation that the proposed rezone, the effects of which are substantially limited to allowed uses within an existing office building, could cause a substantial adverse effect 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. *Contra Costa County Zoning Ordinance (Title 8)*
2. *Contra Costa County Geographic Information (GIS) Data Layers*
3. *California Government Code / Public Resources Code*
4. *2005-2020 Contra Costa County General Plan:*
 - *Figure 5-4 Scenic Routes Plan, Transportation and Circulation Element;*
 - *Figure 8-1 Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas, Conservation Element;*
 - *Figure 8-4 Mineral Resource Areas, Conservation Element;*
 - *Figure 9-1 Scenic Ridges and Waterways, Open Space Element;*
 - *Figure 9-2 Archaeological Sensitivity, Open Space Element;*
 - *Figure 10-1 Generalized Geology of Contra Costa County*
 - *Figure 10-4 Estimated Seismic Ground Response, Safety Element;*
 - *Figure 10-5 Estimated Liquefaction Potential, Safety Element;*
 - *Figure 10-6 Geologic (Landslide) Hazards, Safety Element;*
 - *Figure 10-7 Slope Areas Over 26%, Safety Element*
 - *Figure 10-8 Flood Hazard Areas, Safety Element;*
5. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2016*, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/con16.pdf>
6. *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan*, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
7. *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May, 2017*, http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/_media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en
8. *Contra Costa County Clean Air Plan 2015*
9. *USGS Soil Survey of Contra Costa County (1977)*
10. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List California Department of Toxic Substances*
11. *Tsunami Inundation Maps – California Geological Survey*
12. *California Register of Historical Resources*
13. *Contra Costa County Historic Resource Inventory*

14. *Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan:*

- *Figure 3A Buchannan Field Airport Influence Area;*
- *Figure 3B Buchannan Field Airport Noise Contours;*
- *Figure 3C Buchannan Field Airport Safety Zones;*
- *Figure 3D Buchannan Field Airport Airspace Protection Surfaces;*

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Zoning Map**
- 3. Assessor's Parcel Page**