

### CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Freitas Family Two-Lot Subdivision & Rezone Project  
County File #MS18-0008 & RZ19-3249
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:** 2350 Norris Canyon Road, San Ramon  
APN: 211-210-029 & -075
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** R. Ross Avedian  
P/A Design Resources, Inc.  
3021 Citrus Circle, Suite 150  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
6. **General Plan Designation:** AL, Agricultural Lands & SL, Single-Family Residential Low Density
7. **Zoning:** A-4, Agricultural Preserve District
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant proposes to subdivide a 69.32-acre parcel into two new parcels. These two new parcels are proposed as Parcel A and Parcel B, with 38.38 acres and 30.96 acres of total area, respectively. Additionally, the applicant proposes to rezone the proposed Parcel B from Agricultural Preserve District (A-4) to Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20) The proposed project also includes a variance to allow proposed Parcel A to have a total area of 38.38 acres, where the A-4 district requires a minimum of 40 acres. No development is proposed as a part of this project.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject site is an approximately 69.32-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of Norris Canyon Road and Ashbourne Drive in the unincorporated San Ramon area. The subject property is located within both the Agricultural Lands (AL) and the Single-Family Residential Low Density (SL) General Plan Land Use designations, as well as the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) Zoning District. The land to the northeast, west and south of the property are established open space and agricultural lands, and the area adjacent to the southeast of the subject property is the Norris Canyon Estates development. The property and its surrounding area slope moderately with many peaks throughout the rolling hills. Within the local area, Interstate 680 is located approximately 1.8 miles east of the property, the County line with Alameda County is located at the northeast corner of the property, and the City of San Ramon is approximately 0.65 miles northeast.

Existing Site Condition: The subject 69.32-acre property is bisected by Norris Canyon Road, but it is a single parcel. San Catanio Creek is adjacent to the south of Norris Canyon Road and runs parallel to it. The northern half of the property contains a single-family residence in the northeast corner with associated accessory structures and improvements, while the southern half is vacant. The property slopes moderately, with overall elevation changes upwards of 300 feet from its lowest to highest points. There is a large number of trees on both sides of the road in the northern, central and southeastern areas, and it is presently accessed by a driveway from Norris Canyon Road at the intersection with Ashbourne Drive.

**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 Environmental Health Division
- San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District

**11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, 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 letter was sent to Wilton Rancheria staff on May 29, 2019 as a notice of opportunity to request consultation for the proposed project, but no response was received. However, staff has included mitigation measures to ensure the proposed project will have no significant impacts to tribal cultural resources.

### 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                               |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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, 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 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                |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</b>  |                                |                                       |                                     |                          |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | <input 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 with mitigation)*

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 corner of Norris Canyon Road and Ashbourne Drive in the unincorporated San Ramon area. This property is located adjacent to the Norris Canyon scenic ridge, as outlined in the Contra Costa County 2005-2020 General Plan. Figure 5-4 designates Norris Canyon Road as a scenic route. As such, this property is located within the vicinity of a designated scenic ridgeway to the south and the scenic route of Norris Canyon Road, as designated in the Contra Costa County 2005-2020 General Plan. The proposed project does not include the construction of any new buildings or structures and will not negatively affect the scenic qualities of the scenic ridge or any scenic vistas from Highway 4. The existing residence located in the northeast corner of the subject property is located at the lowest elevation of the subject property, so this residence would not affect the scenic ridgeline to the south. Overall, no development is proposed as a part of this project that could affect the scenic qualities of the adjacent scenic ridgeline. However, the potential for future development on the proposed Parcel B could detract from scenic qualities of the surrounding area and pose a potentially significant impact. As such, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure to reduce the potential for negative impacts on a scenic vista. Implementation of the mitigation

measure below would reduce the potential environmental impacts associated with the establishment of the proposed facility to a less than significant level.

#### Mitigation Measures

***Aesthetics-1 (AES-1):*** Prior to recordation of the parcel map, the project sponsor shall identify a building envelope on Parcel B, subject to the review and approval of CDD. This building envelope shall be limited to two acres in total area and shall be located in such a way as to minimize visual impacts as viewed from Norris Canyon Road.

***Aesthetics-2 (AES-2):*** Prior to the submittal of building permits on Parcel B, the project sponsor shall submit the proposed plans for the review and approval of CDD. In addition to architectural plans for the development, the plans shall include screening elements to minimize visual impacts from neighboring properties and visual impacts as viewed from Norris Canyon Road.

- 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 with mitigation)*

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. The subject property is located at the corner of Norris Canyon Road and Ashbourne Drive in the unincorporated San Ramon area. The property slopes moderately, with overall elevation changes upwards of 300 feet from its lowest to highest points, and there is a large number of trees on both sides of the road in the northern, central and southeastern areas. As detailed in section 1.a above, the subject property is located within the vicinity of a designated scenic ridgeway to the south and the scenic route of Norris Canyon Road, as designated in the Contra Costa County 2005-2020 General Plan. As such, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measure AES-1 to reduce the potential for negative impacts on a scenic vista. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential environmental impacts associated with the establishment of the proposed facility to a less than significant level.

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

The 69.32-acre subject property contains a single-family residence in the northeast corner of the lot, but is otherwise undeveloped. The property is surrounded by agricultural land, open space, and single-family residential development, and the surrounding terrain is characterized by moderately steep, rolling hills. There is no development proposed as a part of this project. However, mitigation measures AES-1 and AES-2 require the project sponsor to establish a building envelope on Parcel B and install screening elements on all sides of the property to reduce the potential for visual impacts stemming from the proposed project. 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)*

There is no development proposed as a part of this project. However, Parcel B has the potential for future development of one single-family residence with associated accessory structures and agricultural buildings. After the construction of such buildings, their finishes may 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 single-family residential developments along Norris Canyon Road, which maintain a single-family residential and agricultural nature to their development. Lighting of the home, 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 around the building, thus creating a minimal, if any, impact on the surrounding area. Accordingly, the impact on day or nighttime views would be less than significant.

|   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p><b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES:</b> <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i></p> |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
| <b>Would the project:</b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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”. Approval 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? (Less than significant)*

The project site is within the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) Zoning District with both the Agricultural Lands (AL) and the Single-Family Residential Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designations. The 38.38-acre northern portion of the site, proposed as Parcel A, is under a Williamson Act contract, but the southern 30.96-acre portion, proposed as Parcel B, is not under contract. The northern portion is under Williamson Act contract #16-70. As this portion of the site is already under Williamson Act contract and is not being rezoned, the project would have no effect or conflict with the existing zoning or 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)? (Less than significant)*

The project site contains areas of forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g), which defines forest land as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” The proposed project involves the subdivision of the subject 69.32-acre property into two parcels and the rezoning of the southern 30.96-acre Parcel B from A-4 to A-20, with no development included as part of the

project. As both the existing and proposed zoning districts are exclusively for agricultural and associated single-family residential uses, the forest land contained on the subject property would not be negatively impacted by the proposed project. Approval 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? (Less than significant)*

The project site contains areas of forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g), which defines forest land as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” The proposed project involves the subdivision of the subject 69.32-acre property into two parcels and the rezoning of the southern 30.96-acre Parcel B from A-4 to A-20, with no development included as part of the project. As both the existing and proposed zoning districts are exclusively for agricultural and associated single-family residential uses, the forest land contained on the subject property would not be negatively impacted by the proposed project. Approval of the project would not result in the conversion or loss of forest resources.

- 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project involves the subdivision of the subject 69.32-acre property into two parcels and the rezoning of the southern 30.96-acre Parcel B from A-4 to A-20, with no development included as part of the project. As both the existing and proposed zoning districts are exclusively for agricultural and associated single-family residential uses, the project would not contribute to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

|  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>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.</b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| <b>Would the project:</b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| 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 (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <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) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 consists of rezoning and subdividing the subject property into two new parcels, with no development proposed at this time. Currently, there is one residence located in the northeastern portion of the subject property, and after the proposed subdivision there would be the potential for the development of a residence on the proposed Parcel B for a total of two. Two single-family residences would not exceed either the operational screening criteria of 325 dwelling units or the construction-related screening criteria of 114 dwelling units as established in the 2017 Air Quality Guidelines. Furthermore, this proposed subdivision would be located within an established residential and agricultural area where properties are large, and neighboring residences are significant distances from each other. Also, 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 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). The potential to develop two single-family residences would not exceed either the operational screening criteria of 325 dwelling units or the construction-related screening criteria of 114 dwelling units as established in the 2017 Air Quality Guidelines. Furthermore, this proposed subdivision would be located within an established residential and agricultural area where properties are large, and neighboring residences are significant distances from each other. 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.

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

Occupancy of the two potential 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. Two single-family residences would not exceed either the operational screening criteria of 325 dwelling units or the construction-related screening criteria of 114 dwelling units as established in the 2017 Air Quality Guidelines. Furthermore, this proposed subdivision would be located within an established residential and agricultural area where properties are large, and neighboring residences are significant distances from each other. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact on sensitive receptors.

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

The proposed single-family residences would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. As there is no development proposed as a part of this project, there would be no additional impacts generated by this project. Furthermore, the establishment of single-family residential development is not a use normally associated with the generation of objectionable odors. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact in terms of odors.

| 4. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 with mitigation)*

The subject property is currently vacant. Pursuant to Figure 8-1 (Significant Ecological Area and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plans Species Areas) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not identified as a Significant Ecological Resource area. However, in correspondence received from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on August 17, 2018, the riparian area created by San Catanio Creek is suitable habitat for the Alameda Whipsnake, a State-designated protected species.

Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. As there is suitable habitat for the Alameda Whipsnake and an abundance of trees and grassland areas, there is a potential for future development to 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. However, implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

## Mitigation Measures

**Biology 1 (BIO-1):** *Prior to the submittal of building permits or any ground disturbance activities, the project sponsor shall employ a biologist familiar with State- and Federally-protected wildlife and plant species native to the Contra Costa County area shall conduct a preconstruction survey to assess the site's biological resources. This study shall identify all protected wildlife and plant species and provide mitigation measures to preserve these resources. These mitigation measures shall be implemented by the project sponsor and be monitored by the consulting biologist throughout construction of the project.*

**Biology 2 (BIO-2):** *The following general avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented throughout the construction activities to avoid potential impacts to sensitive biological resources.*

1. *All staging, maintenance, and storage of construction equipment will be performed in a manner to preclude any direct or indirect discharge of fuel, oil, or other petroleum products into waters of the U.S./State. No other debris, rubbish, creosote-treated wood, soil, silt, sand, cement, concrete or washings thereof, or other construction-related materials or wastes will be allowed to enter into or be placed where they may be washed by rainfall or runoff into waters of the U.S./State. All such debris and waste shall be picked-up daily and properly disposed of at an appropriate site.*
2. *All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps will be disposed of in closed containers and removed at least once a day from the project site.*
3. *No firearms will be allowed on the project site except for those carried by authorized security personnel, or local, State, or Federal law enforcement officials.*
4. *Project personnel shall not have dogs or cats in the project area.*
5. *Project personnel will not be permitted to smoke in the project area.*
6. *No pesticides of any kind will be used on the project site at any time during project implementation.*
7. *No equipment will be operated in areas of flowing or standing water. No fueling, cleaning, or maintenance of vehicles or equipment will take place within any areas where an accidental discharge to waters of the U.S./State waters may occur.*
8. *All equipment including excavators, trucks, hand tools, etc., that may have come in contact with invasive plants or seeds of these plants, shall be carefully cleaned before arriving onsite and shall be carefully cleaned before removal from the site to prevent spread of these plants.*

9. *Disturbance or removal of vegetation will not exceed the minimum necessary to complete construction.*
10. *To minimize harassment, injury, death, and harm in the form of temporary habitat disturbances, all project-related vehicle traffic will be restricted to established roads, construction areas, equipment staging, parking, and stockpile areas.*
11. *Along the length of the onsite portion of San Catanio Creek, the work area will be delineated with orange silt fencing in order to minimize impacts to habitat beyond the work limit. This fencing will remain in place until all ground moving operations have ceased. Orange cyclone fencing, or other materials that can entrap small amphibians and reptiles and other small wildlife species, will not be used.*
12. *For each onsite tree proposed for preservation, a root protection zone will be established, extending from the trunk to the dripline (the outer extent of the tree canopy). This root protection zone will be fenced off from the work area with construction fencing in order to protect the preserved trees from inadvertent damage due to ground moving, compaction, and/or limb removal within the footprint of the dripline.*

- 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)***

The proposed project will remain outside of the onsite portion of San Catanio Creek and its associated riparian canopy. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Additionally, the project sponsor is required by Mitigation Measure AES-1 to establish a building envelope on Parcel B. This building envelope will be reviewed by staff to ensure that it does not directly impact the riparian area of San Catanio Creek. Additionally, it is anticipated that project authorization in the form of an incidental take permit would be required from CDFW for any development in the vicinity of San Catanio Creek. Overall, the project would have a less than significant impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

- 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)*

As discussed above, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species without the implementation of mitigation measures. Accordingly, mitigation measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2** have been included to mitigate the impacts to a level considered less than significant.

- 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. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. If development on Parcel B encroaches within the drip line or proposes to remove a code-protected tree, the development would be required to obtain a separate tree permit, and approval of the proposed project would include conditions of approval for the restitution of any tree approved to be removed, protection of remaining trees where work may occur within the drip lines of the trees, and all of the tree protection measures from the project's arborist report. Additionally, pursuant to Section 914-14.012 and 914-14.014 of the County Ordinance the development would be required to meet a minimum setback distance away from San Catanio Creek so as to protect the biological resources contained within the creek. As a result of CDD staff applying the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance and creek structure setback requirements to a potential proposed project, there would be no significant conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- 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. The unincorporated San Ramon area where this project is located is outside of the covered area for the HCP/NCCP, and therefore, the proposed project would not affect the HCP/NCCP.

| <b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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) 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 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 a “highly sensitive area.” 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. 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).**

## 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 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.

| <b>6. ENERGY – Would the project:</b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not have a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Currently, no development is proposed as a result of the proposed subdivision. However, if development is proposed in the future, the project sponsor would be required to comply with conditions of approval regarding construction activity restrictions that outline best management practices to ensure that construction activities are conducted in the most efficient and least impactful way possible (e.g. limiting idling time for vehicles and equipment).

- b) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (Less than significant)*

Although no development is proposed as a result of the proposed subdivision, the proposed project will be required to meet all energy efficiency standards outlined in the most recent California Building Code when designing any proposed buildings and submitting for building permits. Meeting or exceeding these energy efficiency requirements would ensure that the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

| <b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</b>  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) 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"/> |

**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. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Calaveras fault, which is mapped approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the project site. Because the site is not within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, the risk of fault rupture is generally regarded as very low. As a result, the potential impact from surface fault rupture would be less than significant.

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

Figure 10-4 (Estimated Seismic Ground Response) of the General Plan Safety Element identifies the project site to be 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 allow the structural engineer 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. For these reasons, 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 with mitigation)*

Figure 10-5 (Estimated Liquefaction Potential) of the General Plan Safety Element divides land in the County into three liquefaction potential categories: “generally high,” “generally moderate to low,” and “generally low”. It is used as a “screening criteria” during the processing of land development applications, on a project-by-project basis. By intent, the map is conservative on the side of safety. The project site is in an area of generally low liquefaction potential on the Liquefaction Potential Map, and risks are considered relatively low; however, the County Peer Review Geologist, Darwin Myers Associates (DMA), cautions that hazard maps included in the Safety Element of the General Plan are not a substitute for a site-specific geotechnical investigation.

In September 2000, Berlogar Geotechnical Consultants (BGC) completed a feasibility geologic investigation of the project site. For this investigation BGC logged 2 borings and 22 test pits on the Freitas property. The investigation confirmed the presence of undocumented fill on the proposed parcel located south of San Catanio Creek, and BGC mapped the approximate distribution of fill. Near the channel, in the narrow valley bottom area, BGC encountered stream channel and overbank deposits. The BGC report characterizes these deposits as predominantly sandy clays and clayey sand are described as medium stiff to stiff. The preliminary opinion of the project geotechnical engineer is that these surficial deposits are relatively thin in most areas, and that liquefaction does not present a significant development constraint. DMA reviewed the two BGC investigations, and notes that a primary product of the BGC investigation is an original geologic map of the site indicating that essentially all of the proposed parcel south of San Catanio Creek is underlain by bedrock at shallow depths. This evidence suggests that there are feasible building sites underlain by non-liquefiable bedrock. However, the driveway/ roadway that would serve as access a building site(s) may traversing lands adjacent to the creek corridor posing an unknown (but potentially significant) risk of liquefiable sands.

The 2003 BGC report evaluated the proposed parcel that is north of the San Catanio Creek corridor. Within this area the focus of the investigation was evaluation of a large, deep-seated

landslide. This upland area does not present a risk of liquefiable soils. DMA reviewed the reports for BGC and concluded that risks associated with liquefaction would be less than significant for the northern proposed parcel. However, for the southern parcel, DMA concluded there would be a potentially significant impact due to liquefaction. Consequently the applicant is required to implement mitigation measure **Geology 1 (GEO-1)** in Section a) (iv).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure Geology 1 would reduce the impact from liquefaction to a less than significant level.

iv) *Landslides? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

In 1975 the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) issued photointerpretive maps of Contra Costa County showing the distribution landslide and other surficial deposits. The USGS landslide mapping is presented on Figure 10-6 of the General Plan Safety Element. This map, which was prepared by an experienced USGS geologist, indicates that there is geomorphic evidence of landslide deposits on or both of the proposed parcels.

In its 2000 investigation, BGC found that the terrain features that were interpreted as landslides by the USGS on the southern proposed parcel was instead due to differential weathering and erosion of the steeply dipping bedrock of Miocene age. The assessment of BGC was based chiefly on the results of exploratory test pits which were broadly distributed across the southern parcel.

In 2003 BGC performed a geotechnical investigation of the parcel north of San Catanio Creek. That investigation included the logging of three borings. Most of the ground surface slopes to the south at 20% (toward the creek). Based on reconnaissance data, a large landslide (600 ft. wide by 900 ft. long) was confirmed on the northeast portion of the site. BGC advanced two rock cores through the landslide debris. Based on the subsurface data, laboratory tests and engineering analysis, BGC concluded the there was a potential building site in the northeast portion of the northern parcel, and BGC provided recommendations for remediation of the landslide area. In summary, the two BGC investigations focused on potential geologic risks associated with future development of a single-family residence(s) within their study area, which included both of the proposed parcels that are the subject of MS18-0008. Their conclusions and recommendations of BGC are intended to provide general recommendations to guide the owner/ future developer. Further geotechnical analysis would be required prior to the construction of a single-family residence on the proposed parcels. Upon review of the two BGC investigations, DMA concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact due to landslides. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures, **Geology 1, Geology 2 and Geology 3.**

## Mitigation Measures

**Geology 1 (GEO-1):** *At least 60 days prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit a geology, soil, and foundation report that meets the requirements of Subdivision Ordinance Section 94-4.420 for review by the County Peer Review Geologist, and review and approval by the CDD. Improvement, grading, and building plans shall carry out the recommendations of the approved report. This report shall include evaluation of: (i) based on adequate subsurface exploration, laboratory testing and engineering analysis, the required investigation shall include evaluation of potential hazards and provide appropriate recommendations to mitigate any significant hazards that are confirmed to be present (i.e. landslide, liquefaction, slope creep, expansive and corrosive soils). Detailed design recommendations shall be provided, including (ii) clearing and grading (iii) residential driveway design, (iii) residential foundation design, (iv) drainage, (v) C.3 basin design/ construction, (vi) undergrounding of utilities (particularly within landslide areas), and (vii) operative California Building Code seismic design parameters.*

**Geology 2 (GEO-2):** *During site grading, drainage and foundation-related work, the project geotechnical engineer shall provide observation and testing services to ensure that the construction is in compliance with recommendations in the approved geotechnical report. The project geotechnical engineer shall provide recommendations for any modification to approved plans that are deemed necessary based on the actual field conditions encountered during grading. Written approval from the Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division shall be obtained prior to any modification. Documentation of the observation and testing services, as well as other project details shall be presented in a final geotechnical report, to be submitted to the County and kept on file.*

**Geology 3 (GEO-3):** *Prior to recording the Parcel Map, the applicant shall submit a deed disclosure related to the potential ground failure hazards (liquefaction and landslide), and shall include complete bibliographic citation to the 2000 and 2003 Geologic Feasibility Investigations of Berlogar Geotechnical Consultants, indicate where a copy of these reports can be accessed. Submit a draft of the proposed language to be used in the Deed Disclosure for review and approval by CDD. This review shall be for the purpose that the language used adequately characterizes the hazard posed by ground failure and adverse soils conditions. Following approval of the language, that applicant shall record the deed disclosure and shall provide a copy of the recorded deed disclosure to the CDD.*

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from ground failure (liquefaction and landslides) to a less than significant level.

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

According to the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, the soil series mapped in the project vicinity is Los Gatos loam (LhF, 30-50% slopes). This soil series consists of well-drained soils underlain by soft interbedded shale and sandstone. The *typical profile* for this soil is 32 inches deep. The erosion potential is rated *moderate to high* where the soil is tilled and exposed. During the grading and construction period for the future single-family residence, rural driveway and C.3 basins, areas of construction activity would have exposed Los Gatos loam, resulting in a potentially significant impact due to soil erosion. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure, **Geology 4 (GEO-4)**.

Mitigation Measure

**Geology 4:** *At the time of application for a building or grading permit, whichever occurs first, a construction period erosion and sedimentation control plan that is in compliance with applicable construction period requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be included in the submitted construction drawings, and implemented during construction.*

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact of soil erosion during construction to a less than significant level.

- 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 with mitigation)*

As discussed in Section 6.a.iii and 6.a.iv above, the risk of ground failure is considered to be a potentially significant impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures **Geology 1, 2, and 3** above. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from ground failure to a less than significant level.

- 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 with mitigation)*

With regard to its engineering properties, the Los Gatos loam is considered to be moderately expansive and moderately corrosive. Expansive soils expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out. This continuous change in soils volume causes structures to move unevenly and crack. Corrosive soils tend to damage concrete and/or uncoated steel that is in contact with the ground. Thus, there is a potentially significant impact due to expansive soil. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement

mitigation measures **Geology 1 and 2** above. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of expansive and corrosive soils 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? (Less than significant)*

The future single-family residences on Parcel A and B would have a on-site septic system. The septic system would be reviewed and permitted by the Contra Costa County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division. The Environmental Health Division would review and inspect design plans for the septic system to prevent contamination of nearby surface and groundwater.

- f) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

With respect to paleontological and geologic 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.

| <b>8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the project:</b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 subdivision of the subject property into two new parcels with the potential for a net increase of one new single-family residences has the potential to 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 56 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 two-lot subdivision, has the potential to 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.

| <b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) 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"/>            |
| g) 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 a potential new residence on Parcel B would be typical of residences (e.g. cleaning and gardening products), and there is already an existing residence on Parcel A. 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 a potential new residence on Parcel B 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 no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. The closest school is Twin Creeks Elementary, which is located approximately 1.1 miles northeast of the subject property. Additionally, there is no development proposed as a part of this project. Therefore, 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 16 miles north 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) *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 two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. The subject property is located on Norris Canyon Road, which is a major road in the San Ramon area. Norris Canyon Road also connects to two other major roads in the nearby area, including Bollinger Canyon Road and San Ramon

Valley Boulevard, all three of which connect to Interstate 680. These roads and I-680 would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area. 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 San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD) for comments. The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. If development is proposed in the future, the project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- g) *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 SRVFPD. The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. If development is proposed in the future, the construction drawings would have to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD, ensuring that the new development, 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.

| <b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> |

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (Less than significant)*

The installation of new impervious surface, grading and excavation proposed in this project is 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.

Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has stated that review of a 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) *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Less than significant)*

Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has stated that review of a final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impact on groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project 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:*

- i) *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. 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. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has stated that review of a final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that erosion or on- or off-site siltation impacts from project operation would be less than significant.

- ii) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has

stated that review of a final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impacts related to surface runoff from project operation would be less than significant. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would result in a less than significant impact.

- 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has stated that review of a final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of the PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impacts related to polluted runoff from project operation would be less than significant. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would result in a less than significant impact.

- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows? (Less than significant)*

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. The proposed development will be completely contained within the boundaries of Flood Zone X. 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.

- d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (Less than significant)*

Seiche, tsunami, and mudflow events are generally associated with large bodies or large flows of water. The subject property is not located in close proximity any of the County's large water bodies. Additionally, 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. The subject property is also located within Flood Zone X, which is not a Special Flood Hazard Area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and there is no proposed development included in this project. As such, the project will not require floodplain permits or flood-related improvements. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact related to the risk of releasing pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

- e) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area or conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. 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. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. PWD has stated that review of a final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Conformance of the proposed project with this PWD requirement would ensure the project does not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.

| <b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/>            |

**SUMMARY:**

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

The subject site is an approximately 69.32-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of Norris Canyon Road and Ashbourne Drive in the unincorporated San Ramon area. The subject property is located within both the Agricultural Lands (AL) and the Single-Family Residential Low Density (SL) General Plan Land Use designations, as well as the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) Zoning District. The surrounding area consists of various types of agricultural and residential uses. The proposed project consists of rezoning the southern portion of the property to Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20) and subdividing the subject property into two new parcels. The subject property is already surrounded by agricultural and residential properties, and there is no development proposed as a part of this project. The proposed subdivision would maintain the established community 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)*

The subject property is located within both the Agricultural Lands (AL) and the Single-Family Residential Low Density (SL) General Plan Land Use designations, as well as the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) Zoning District. The surrounding area consists of various types of agricultural and residential uses. Currently, the subject property is a 69.32-acre property bisected by Norris Canyon Road into two separate APNs but remains one developable parcel. San Catanio Creek is adjacent to the south of Norris Canyon Road and runs parallel to it. The northern half of the property contains a single-family residence in the northeast corner with associated accessory structures and improvements, while the southern half is vacant. The applicant proposes to rezone APN 211-210-029 from Agricultural Preserve District (A-4) to Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20), and subdivide the 69.32-acre subject property into two new parcels. These two new parcels are proposed as Parcel A and Parcel B, with 38.38 acres and 30.96 acres of total area, respectively. The proposed project also includes a variance to allow proposed Parcel A to have a total area of 38.38 acres, where the A-4 district requires a minimum of 40 acres.

The intent of the AL land use designation is to preserve and protect lands capable of and generally used for the production of food, fiber, and plant materials. The title is intended to be descriptive of the predominant land -extensive agricultural uses that take place in these areas, but the land use title or description shall not be used to exclude or limit other types of agricultural, open space, or non-urban uses such as landfills, except as noted below in the descriptions of Agricultural Core, Delta Recreation and Resources, Watershed, Parks and Recreation, and Open Space. This land use designation includes most of the privately-owned rural lands in the county, excluding private lands that are composed of prime soils or lands located in or near the Delta. Most of these lands are in hilly portions of the county and are used for grazing livestock or dry grain farming. After the proposed rezoning and subdivision of the property, the two parcels would remain consistent with the AL designation. According to its Williamson Act contract, the proposed Parcel A would continue to be utilized for cattle grazing and dry farming, and would thus remain in compliance with the intent and purpose of the Agricultural Preserve District (A-4). Parcel B, although not in a Williamson Act contract, would be in the Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20). The purpose of the A-20 zoning district is to provide and protect areas for agricultural uses by preventing the establishment of urban and any other incompatible land uses thereon, and the land uses allowed are all agricultural in nature.

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 unincorporated San Ramon area is outside of the covered area for the HCP/NCCP, and therefore, the proposed



project would not affect the HCP/NCCP. 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.

| <b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Figure 8-4 in 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 Figure 8-4 in the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

| <b>13. NOISE – <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) *Would the project result in 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project involves rezoning the southern portion of the subject 69.32-acre property and subdividing it into two new parcels. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. If development is proposed on Parcel B, 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 project proponent is required to implement the noise mitigation measure **Noise-1** to bring potential noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

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

1. *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.*
2. *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.*
3. *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.*
4. *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)*

b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Less than significant)*

Residential and agricultural 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) *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? (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 in Contra Costa County is Buchanan Field, which is located approximately 16 miles north of the subject property. Additionally, there are no established private airstrips in Contra Costa County. Thus the proposed project is not considered to be located within an area where airport operations present a potential hazard.

| <b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – <i>Would the project:</i></b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 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) *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 includes the rezoning and subdivision of the subject property into two new parcels, which would have the potential to directly increase the unincorporated San Ramon area population by an estimated three people, based on the Census 2010 estimate of 2.77 people per household for Contra Costa County. Currently, the property contains a single-family residence in the northeastern corner, so the net increase in population would be approximately three people with the potential to develop one more residence. 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 three people to the unincorporated San Ramon area would be less than significant.

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

The subject property currently contains a single-family residence in the northeastern corner and is surrounded by residential and agricultural uses. The proposed project involves the rezoning of the subject property from Agricultural Preserve District (A-4) to Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20) and subdividing the existing parcel into two new parcels. This would not cause a reduction in the number of housing units in the area. Rather, the project proposes to create the potential for one additional living unit in the unincorporated San Ramon area. Therefore, the project would not have a negative effect on existing people or housing.

|  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>15. Public Services –</b> <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 San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD). The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. Currently, no development is proposed as part of this project. However, prior to submittal of building permits for any future development, the project plans would be need to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. 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 Valley Station, located approximately 10.5 miles driving distance to the north 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. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property, which would directly increase the unincorporated San Ramon area population by an estimated three 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 San Ramon area are provided by the San Ramon Valley Unified School District. These students attend Twin Creeks Elementary School, Iron Horse Middle School, and California High School. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. For a new residence, 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. Although no development is

proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property, which would directly increase the unincorporated San Ramon area population by an estimated three 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 a less than significant impact from this project on the use of the local public parks and recreational facilities by residents of the San Ramon area.

e) *Other public facilities? (Less than significant)*

Libraries: Contra Costa Library operates 25 facilities in Contra Costa County. The closest facility is the San Ramon Library, which is approximately 8.5 miles driving distance to the east 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 no impact created by the operation of the proposed facility 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 no impact created by the operation of the proposed facility on the use of public health facilities by residents of the Contra Costa County.

| 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) *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 two-lot subdivision 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 unincorporated San Ramon 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 two-lot subdivision 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.

| <b>17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i></b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 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"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? (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 two-lot subdivision has the potential to generate an estimated two AM and two 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 unincorporated San Ramon area.

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.

- b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) (Less than significant)*

In analyzing land use projects under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. The provisions of this section shall apply prospectively as described in section 15007. A lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on July 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide. As it is prior to this effective date, this project has been reviewed under existing County transportation standards. 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 applicant proposes to rezone the southern portion of the property and subdivide the 69.32-acre parcel into two new parcels, which would have the potential to generate an estimated two AM and two 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 have

- c) *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)*

Overall, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. The subject property is bisected by Norris Canyon Road, which is a major road in the San Ramon area. Norris Canon Road is designated as a two-lane arterial in the General Plan. Right-of-way acquisition and improvements to these standards were completed as part of the nearby Norris Canyon Estates subdivision in the early 2000's. No additional widening or improvements would be required relative to this subdivision. The proposed Parcel A contains an existing residence with full driveway improvements, but Parcel B's access from Norris Canyon Road is heavily restricted by San Catanio Creek, which parallels the road. However, Tract 7578, which abuts a portion of the eastern boundary of Parcel B, dedicated access and utility easements to Parcel B over Ashbourne Drive south of the creek to provide alternate access to Norris Canyon Road. Although there is no development proposed as part of this project, any future development would be required to meet the requirements of Title 9 of the County Ordinance and receive the approval of



the County Public Works Department. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

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

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. The subject property is located on Norris Canyon Road, which is a major road in the San Ramon area. Norris Canyon Road also connects to two other major roads in the nearby area, including Bollinger Canyon Road and San Ramon Valley Boulevard, all three of which connect to Interstate 680. These roads and I-680 would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area. 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 San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD) for comments. The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. If development is proposed in the future, the project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access with the SRVFPD comments integrated into the project and their approval of any future building plans.

|   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>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></b> |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
| 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**SUMMARY:**

*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)? (No impact)*

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.

- 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. 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 on May 29, 2019. As discussed in “cultural resources” Sections 5.b, 5.c, and 5.d of this Initial Study, the project site is already urbanized and has no discernable archaeological or paleontological features; however, 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, 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.

| <b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</b>  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) 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"/>            |
| e) 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 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project would incrementally increase wastewater flows. The project site is served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD). Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Any future development would be required to be reviewed and approved by CCCSD to ensure compliance with their wastewater standards. By meeting the development standards of CCCSD, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by CCCSD facilities without expansion of the wastewater treatment system. The project site is not served by a water service provider. As no development is currently proposed, it is not anticipated that new water facilities will be required to accommodate the project, as there would be no increased requirements for water service. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Any future development would be required to be reviewed and approved by CCEHD to ensure existing and/or proposed well water facilities meet CCEHD standards. Natural gas and electric power facilities are provided by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). These facilities would also be required to be reviewed by PG&E prior to building permits if development is proposed in the future. By having future development reviewed by respective agencies for compliance with development standards, there would be a less than significant impact.

As discussed in the "hydrology and water quality" section of this Initial Study, a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) is required for applications that will create and/or redevelop impervious surface area exceeding 10,000 square feet in compliance with the County's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014) and the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. As the proposed Parcel A is already developed and the southern parcel has nearby access rights to Ashbourne Drive (a private street) and public utilities, it is conceivable the potential new impervious surfaces resulting from development of Parcel B will fall below the 10,000 square-foot threshold to require a SWCP at this time. However, further development of the parcel may need to comply with the latest Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014) and the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant

Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. PWD has stated that review of the final SWCP is required prior to construction of improvements. Implementation of a PWD-approved SWCP would ensure that impact on water quality from project operation would be less than significant.

- b) *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 is not served by a water service provider. As no development is currently proposed, it is not anticipated that new water facilities will be required to accommodate the project, as there would be no increased requirements for water service. Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Any future development would be required to be reviewed and approved by CCEHD to ensure existing and/or proposed well water facilities meet CCEHD standards. Meeting CCEHD requirements regarding well water would ensure that sufficient water supply exists for the proposed project. Accordingly, the impact of providing water service to the proposed project would be less than significant.

- c) *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 proposed project would incrementally increase wastewater flows. The project site is served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD). Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Any future development would be required to be reviewed and approved by CCCSD to ensure compliance with their wastewater standards. By meeting the development standards of CCCSD, the proposed project is expected to be accommodated by CCCSD facilities without expansion of the wastewater treatment system.

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

Although no development is proposed as part of this project, the project would have the potential to construct one additional residence on Parcel B subsequent to subdividing the subject property. Future development 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.

- e) *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 agricultural and residential land uses that would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that in 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.

| <b>20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**SUMMARY:**

*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? (Less than significant)*

The subject property is located within the State responsibility area and is classified as a “high” fire hazard severity zone by CalFire. The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. The subject property is located on Norris Canyon Road, which is a major road in the San Ramon area. Norris Canyon Road also connects to two other major roads in the nearby area, including Bollinger Canyon Road and San Ramon Valley Boulevard, all three of which connect to Interstate 680. These roads and I-680 would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area. 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 San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD) for comments. The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. If development is proposed in the future, the project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- 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? (Less than significant)*

The property slopes moderately, with overall elevation changes upwards of 300 feet from its lowest to highest points. The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. This proposed project does not involve the routine use or storage of combustible or flammable materials, nor does it involve activities normally associated with the ignition of wildfires. However, to ensure that the proposed facility does not pose a significant risk of exacerbating wildfire, the project requires the approval of SRVFPD prior to obtaining building permits for site improvements and beginning operation. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant potential to exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors.

- 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? (Less than significant)*

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the subject property into two new lots, but no development is currently proposed with this subdivision. The subject property is located on Norris Canyon Road, which is a major road in the San Ramon area. Norris Canyon Road also connects to two other major roads in the nearby area, including Bollinger Canyon Road and San Ramon Valley Boulevard, all three of which connect to Interstate 680. These roads and I-680 would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local area. 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 San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD) for comments. The SRVFPD submitted comments on the project application detailing requirements for emergency access, water supply, weed abatement, and SRVFPD review of building permit submittals, amongst other items. If development is proposed in the future, the project plans would need to be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. However, as no development is proposed, the proposed project currently does not 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, as there is already infrastructure in place for the existing development on-site.

- 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? (Less than significant with mitigation)*

As discussed in Geology Section 7(iv), the two BGC investigations focused on potential geologic risks associated with future development of a single-family residence(s) within their study area, which included both of the proposed parcels that are the subject of MS18-0008. The conclusions and recommendations of BGC are intended to provide general recommendations to guide the owner/ future developer. Further geotechnical analysis would be required prior to the construction of a single-family residence on the proposed parcels. Upon review of the two BGC investigations, DMA concluded that there would be a potentially significant impact due to landslides. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures **Geology 1, 2 and 3**. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the potential to 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 to a less than significant level.

| <b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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, 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 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, 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 applicant proposes to rezone APN 211-210-029 from Agricultural Preserve District (A-4) to Exclusive Agricultural District (A-20), and subdivide the subject 69.32-acre subject property into two new parcels. These two new parcels are proposed as Parcel A and Parcel B, with 38.38 acres and 30.96 acres of total area, respectively. The proposed project also includes a variance to allow proposed Parcel A to have a total area of 38.38 acres, where the A-4 district requires a minimum of 40 acres. No development is proposed as a part of this project. The subject site is an approximately 69.32-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of Norris Canyon Road and Ashbourne Drive in the unincorporated San Ramon area. The subject property is located within both the Agricultural Lands (AL) and the Single-Family Residential Low Density (SL) General Plan Land Use designations, as well as the Agricultural Preserve (A-4) Zoning District. The land to the northeast, west and south of the property are established open space and agricultural lands, and the area adjacent to the southeast of the subject property is the Norris Canyon Estates development. With the incorporated project mitigations and due to the relatively small scale of the proposed project, 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 has been designated for agricultural use, surrounded by both single-family residential development and agricultural land, and the proposed project would be consistent with the existing 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 significantly 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 aesthetics, biology, cultural resources, geology, noise, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire, 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, *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan*.
11. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines; Updated May 2017*.
12. CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2)
13. California Important Famlnd Finder (Webpage).  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>
14. California Department of Conservation. *Contra Costa County Tsunami Inundation Maps* (Webpage) <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/Contra-Costa>
15. CAL FIRE. *Contra Costa County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Area, As Recommended By CAL FIRE*. (Webpage)  
[https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6660/fhszl\\_map7.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6660/fhszl_map7.pdf)
16. CAL FIRE. *Contra Costa County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area, Adopted by CAL FIRE on November 7, 2007*. (Webpage)  
[https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6662/fhszs\\_map7.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6662/fhszs_map7.pdf)
17. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Webpage)  
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/>
18. 2019 California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
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 Sheriff, *Patrol Division* (Webpage)  
<http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/208/Patrol-Division>
22. Contra Costa County Waste Reduction and Recycling (Webpage)  
<http://www.cccounty.us/depart/cd/recycle/>
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. Darwin Myers Associates, 2019. *CEQA Analysis*.
27. Darwin Myers Associates, 2019. *Geologic Peer Review*.
28. Federal Clean Air Act (Webpage)  
<http://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview>
29. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - "Cortese List" (Webpage)  
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/>
30. Public Works Department, Engineering Services Division, 2019. Memorandum: *Subdivision MS18-0008, Staff Report & Conditions of Approval*.
31. San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, *Fire Stations* (Webpage)  
<https://firedepartment.org/our-district/district-overview/stations-facilities>
32. San Ramon Valley Unified School District (Webpage)  
<https://www.srvusd.net/>
33. United States Department of Fish and Wildlife (Webpage)  
<http://www.fws.gov/>
34. United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Webpage)  
<http://www3.epa.gov/>
35. West Contra Costa Unified School District (Webpage)  
<http://www.wccusd.net/>

## **ATTACHMENTS**

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