

Shravan Sundaram

From: Brand, Kristopher <kbrand@brentwoodca.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 9:36 AM
To: syd.sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us; Shravan Sundaram;
County.Administrator@cao.cccounty.us; Supervisor_Burgis;
SupervisorCarlson@bos.cccounty.us; john_gioia@bos.cccounty.us;
supervisorandersen@bos.cccounty.us; bos5@bos.cccounty.us; =yCouncil Members
Subject: East County Service Center Proposal Public Comment
Attachments: Screenshot 2026-02-03 183605.png; Screenshot 2026-02-04 130150.png

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message is directed to the Contra Costa County Planning Department's proposal of the East County Service Center project in Brentwood, CA.

Is this project intending to invoke the statute within SB743's guidelines?

[cid:84c4d9fb-5a5e-45d4-a611-333aef833d6a]

Is this project intending to seek a CEQA exemption based on the infill opportunity zone definition in Govt Code 65088.1?

[cid:0afac172-6b31-42ed-a8ca-6522bf497fa9]

Can you demonstrate how the 1/4 mile distance from a transit stop as measured via the pedestrian right-of-way, consistent with the checklist provided in Appendix N?

[cid:f8af22f3-8302-4d5e-a64b-a073c58ffcd3]

How are 424 parking spaces considered consistent with VMT reduction attribute when both the County and City county require ~600 total spaces for ~120,000 sq/ft office building? Does the county plan to leverage on-street parking as part of the total number of spaces?

[cid:d11f0a12-b922-4a5b-a37d-0901da68bd43]

Is there an approximate distribution of current employees within the County system? More specifically, since Employment and Human Services intends to support 311 (75% of total) employees at this location, is there a sense of which areas these employees commute from and/or their approximate distance?

[cid:43cee9db-24c2-4689-8454-14048baf08e6]

The net loss in affordable housing can be calculated by RHNA impact. Since the Brentwood Boulevard Specific Plan aims to fill vacant space with 70% homes, particularly on smaller lots, meaning higher density. How does this not result in a loss of affordable units? Since the County

would be reducing the opportunity for Brentwood to make it's RHNA targets, how can the city be compensated based on this lost opportunity?

[cid:e72d36b7-acd6-4f5f-97e8-a2106233f2b0]

Since the County does not have specific thresholds for exterior noise standards, whose "substitute thresholds" are being used? Why are the Brentwood noise standards not deferred to if the county does not have them? For the Nighttime City Standard, how does the county believe the proposed mitigations may address these levels particularly impacting residential properties directly adjacent? Similar building heights like the nearby hotel would be impacted at higher elevations compared to the street.

[cid:359f75fa-0a5f-4cf1-9131-993ef1a0986d]

In Brentwood, only Fire Station 92 contains a ladder truck. This only supports infrastructure rescue up to 40 ft (the current Brentwood upper build limit). "Would this project result in physically altering of governmental facilities?" How does the county plan to implement appropriate fire protection without said equipment? What costs would be associated with retrofitting existing Fire Protection to include support for a 50+ ft building?

For transportation CEQA guidelines conflicts (Section 15064.3), the County has marked "Less than significant Impact." Given the definitions of both high-transit corridor (a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours) and major transit stop (The intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 20 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods), neither of these definitions are met based on the project's presentation. The average time interval during peak hours for the nearby transit stops is 30 minutes at best. How does the county believe this is not true based on the state law definitions?

[cid:3881004a-64d4-487d-9c1f-b8fce079f868]

[cid:2607c49a-dc3e-4f9d-8d6b-b5d4c410fe62]

Which buildings will the 150 existing workers be re-directed from to Brentwood?

The current proposal included in the RFQ mentions the "Full Requested Growth" with respect to the new jobs being advertised. Where is this funding originating and when is it planned to be fulfilled?

[cid:f2b6a027-644d-48bb-b13c-ada46837a66a]

CCTA Implementation Guide Appendix F, lists a few phrases:

"In many instances, a city boundary would be a reasonable study area; in cases where a project is located at the edge of a city or in an unincorporated area, or if the project is very large such that it is likely to affect travel patterns in neighboring cities, then a subregion of the County or even the entire County might be a more appropriate study area". This project is located on the near edge of developed space of Contra Costa County. If the county is using a Bay Area region-wide average, how does this reflect the nature of this building's position versus a more developed area. What areas comprise the "Bay Area region-wide" average?

[cid:88595921-6778-40c0-a002-122e6b968b8e]

Below is the listed peak AM hour vehicle/hour as it relates to several intersections around the proposed project. Originally, a study was completed for the Goddard School in 2020 (pre-pandemic). Adjacent to that are the numbers listed by the county's report in the proposal. How is the influx of this many workers would make these numbers grow so minimally?
[cid:aa300043-5b37-4568-8eed-65863d82b4b3]

This project will make the County the third largest employer in the whole city; after BUSD and LUHSD. The shared VMT numbers indicate the overall increase in VMT is <1% from this project. How is this possible given the massive influx of new employees commuting, in their individual vehicles (upwards of 93%), across the county to Brentwood instead of their former offices in Antioch or Martinez?
[cid:f882f666-e5a9-4254-ac2a-6b14679c2e89]
[cid:30578c28-ff9f-4d8e-805d-fc854e78c8ae]

I'm having trouble finding the source of Travel Analysis Zone #30325 data. Can you provide the source of this information?

"Projects that consist of Local-Serving Uses can generally be presumed to have a less-than-significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary". ? Brentwood has some of the highest median incomes in East County, therefore, it's much less likely for our residents to need services from this facility compared to Antioch, Oakley, or Pittsburg. Not to mention the unincorporated areas will result in much longer trips to reach this destination. Due to the burden of proof being on the disapproval, has the county looked at the how the East County Project could service upwards of 300,000 people in East County, therefore becoming much larger than "local serving"?

Brentwood was recently made infamous by becoming the "longest commute in the nation" city. Yet, the county has elected to choose a number that is, from my perspective, not representative. As mentioned above, the top three current employers in Brentwood are state agencies (school districts and the city itself). Thus, ~60% of the top 17 employers in the city are represented in this population (approximately 2300 workers). Since Brentwood's gross population is only about 5.5% of Contra Costa County, if the County hired statistically equally across all East County cities, <20 Brentwood residents would likely be hired to work here. Has the county considered the likely possibility that the overwhelming majority of employees to this facility will not be Brentwood residents and 93% of those will drive by themselves?

The current definitions of occupied space and relation to building and parking lot space has impacts referred to as "Heat Islands" particularly in areas like Brentwood that experience many days over 100 degrees Fahrenheit during the summer. Below is a rough calculation based on the variables described in this document. These numbers indicate a significant impact to the passive heat that exists in the area, effectively adding to the total heat reflection for the residents in the area.

[cid:bcc92bb1-7cfc-4f52-b78b-66878f279b31]

[cid:ec80c520-ea00-4f5a-968c-ec288c1e216e]

In all the presented pictures of the design and mock-ups, there is never a presentation of the South facing elevation. Due to the nature of sunlight reflection and the above concerns listed in the "heat island" effect focused on the South, it would be critical to characterize this impact with specifics. Why is that?

[cid:60621dcb-6cde-4b2d-885a-6dc81f6c49bc]

[Title: City of Brentwood]<<https://urldefense.com/v3/http://www.brentwoodca.gov/>;!!OZEuhTV5Po1-xdhMVz0!ETc9e81P5tq5hnB5cyIpvYNz59gNX9sNookr8kTrcG4novq4QPepPn6BIKe2rspNVojTKBeMm-mXeLkuLcxJX1gzqPfp-uG6kw\$>Kristopher Brand, Vice-Chairperson Planning Commission
150 City Park Way
Brentwood, CA 94513
Phone: 925.516.5405
Fax: 925.516.5407
<mailto:adrummond@brentwoodca.gov>kbrand@brentwoodca.gov<mailto:krbrand@brentwoodca.gov>

[Title: Like us on facebook]<https://urldefense.com/v3/http://www.brentwoodca.gov/contact/social_media.asp;!!OZEuhTV5Po1-xdhMVz0!ETc9e81P5tq5hnB5cyIpvYNz59gNX9sNookr8kTrcG4novq4QPepPn6BIKe2rspNVojTKBeMm-mXeLkuLcxJX1gzqPdVGS9RA\$>

Comment on East County Service Center – Location and Circulation Considerations

From Jeremy Jones <jpjones0408@gmail.com>

Date Mon 2/23/2026 10:26 AM

To Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

To Whom It May Concern,

I am submitting this comment in my private capacity as a Brentwood resident. Although I serve as a Planning Commissioner for the City of Brentwood, this comment reflects my personal views only and does not represent a formal position or action of the Planning Commission or the City of Brentwood.

After reviewing the Initial Study and related materials for the East County Service Center, I would like to raise several concerns related to project location, circulation impacts, and overall consistency with the City's adopted planning framework.

Location and Regional Access

The proposed site is located on the far eastern side of Brentwood, while the City is effectively served by one primary freeway corridor, Hwy 4, located on the western side of the city. As proposed, most visitors and many employees traveling from outside Brentwood will exit Hwy 4 and travel across City arterials, including Sand Creek Road, Brentwood Boulevard, Lone Tree Way, and Balfour Road to reach the site.

This creates a structural cross-town travel pattern for a regional facility intended to serve residents from across East Contra Costa County. The City's Circulation Element calls for providing a transportation system that facilitates efficient movement within and through the city, and for maintaining performance standards on designated regional transportation corridors such as Brentwood Boulevard and Sand Creek Road.

Given that this project would rely heavily on those same corridors to carry regional traffic from the freeway to the site, I respectfully request clarification as to how the location of this facility supports maintaining adopted performance standards and long-term circulation efficiency.

Baseline Conditions and Peak Period Congestion

Brentwood already experiences recurring morning and afternoon congestion driven by commuter traffic, school drop-off activity across multiple campuses, and seasonal recreational travel. These are established, real-world conditions affecting east-west corridors and Brentwood Boulevard.

The General Plan directs that the circulation network be maintained and improved to support full buildout and that it consider the context of surrounding land uses. In light of this direction, I respectfully request clarification regarding:

- Whether morning traffic counts incorporated school-related peak conditions;
- Whether employee arrival patterns were evaluated in relation to existing commuter peaks; and
- Whether corridor-level and cumulative impacts were assessed beyond the intersections immediately adjacent to the project site.

While intersection improvements may address localized conditions, the broader question is whether the addition of permanent regional demand across the City's east-west corridors is consistent with long-term circulation planning assumptions.

Proportional Share of Circulation Impacts

The General Plan requires that development address its proportional share of impacts to the City's circulation network. Because regional users must travel across multiple City-maintained arterials to access the site, it would be helpful to understand how impacts to the broader network have been evaluated and addressed, not solely project-frontage intersections.

Logical and Orderly Development Relative to Infrastructure

The Land Use Element calls for new development to occur in a logical and orderly manner and to be subject to the ability to provide urban services. Although this is a County-owned project, it is still new development within City limits and relies on City transportation infrastructure.

The question, therefore, is whether placing a high-traffic regional public facility on the opposite side of town from Hwy 4 aligns with the concept of logical and orderly development relative to transportation service capacity.

Public Service and Emergency Response

The General Plan also provides that development should occur only where the capacity of public services such as fire and police is adequate. Peak-period congestion can affect emergency response reliability. Given the facility's public-serving function, I respectfully request clarification regarding whether peak-hour congestion impacts have been considered from a police and fire response standpoint.

Neighborhood Compatibility and Operational Impacts

The site is located near residential neighborhoods. Beyond traffic metrics, long-term compatibility considerations include lighting, parking lot activity, early morning employee arrivals, rooftop mechanical equipment, backup power systems, and general operational noise.

The General Plan emphasizes that circulation and land use decisions should consider surrounding land uses and protect neighborhood quality of life. I encourage careful evaluation of these operational elements to ensure long-term compatibility with nearby residential areas.

Long-Term Considerations

Finally, I encourage consideration of the long-term implications of this siting decision. The placement of a regional institutional facility in this location may influence future land use expectations and circulation demands. It is important that such decisions remain aligned with the City's adopted planning framework and infrastructure planning assumptions.

I am not questioning the need for public services. However, the location of this facility relative to freeway access, established peak-period congestion, designated regional corridors, and adopted planning policies raises reasonable planning and environmental review questions. I respectfully request that these issues be clearly addressed in the environmental record to ensure that cumulative and systemwide impacts have been fully evaluated.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,
Jeremy Jones
Brentwood Resident

Comments on the Environmental Document for the East County Service Center

From Marisol Valles <marisolvalles@gmail.com>

Date Mon 2/23/2026 12:15 PM

To Syd Sotoodeh <Syd.Sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us>; Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>; County Administrator <County.Administrator@cao.cccounty.us>; Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Carlson <supervisorcarlson@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor John_Gioia <John_Gioia@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Candace Andersen <SupervisorAndersen@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Scales-Preston <BOS5@bos.cccounty.us>

Cc CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov <CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Greetings,

I want to provide the Supervisors with comments on the environmental document for the East County Service Center.

Additional traffic studies are needed. That area is already congested; what adjustments would be needed to improve, rather than deteriorate, the quality of life for residents in the surrounding area? In addition, what is the cost to the city to help mitigate the traffic? Will you help the city cover the additional traffic-related expenses this building generates?

Parking is a major concern. If about 400 people will be at the building, but there is limited parking, and it's not near major transit centers, how will you ensure the residents aren't affected?

Can someone provide additional information and research on the cancer-causing part of the report? This is extremely concerning due to the many residents and businesses in the area.

A cause of this new building that no one has mentioned is the area's gentrification. This is the Latino community, and with increasing rents, they will be displaced.

The best place for this building is not in this area. This area is not near a major highway or transit hub. Move it to the Innovation Center area, where this would fit in perfectly. The Innovation Center is off the highway, with plenty of parking, and a transit center is planned for this location.

It is really sad to read that this report starts with the premise that who cares what Brentwood's municipal code states or what the zoning is for this area, since the County owns the land. It is very disturbing that the people we vote into office to represent our best interests do not care what our city has planned. Shame on you to bully your way into making our city less of. But as always, our own representative, Diane Burgis, doesn't think of her residents; she only thinks of herself and her donors.

Thank you,
Marisol Valles

County Service Center

From susanrharper@comcast.net <susanrharper@comcast.net>

Date Tue 2/17/2026 2:36 PM

To Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>; Eric Angstadt <Eric.Angstadt@cao.cccounty.us>

Cc Susan Harper <susanrharper@comcast.net>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear Shravan and Eric,

I have several comments on the planned building of the Contra Costa Service Center which I hope you will take to heart.

Based on the comments from residents about this project, it seems they are mixed. As with any project there are **pros and cons**, so it would seem that the you and your team would want to be **good partners** with the city and be courteous enough to provide a **live forum** for there to be an **honest exchange** for all sides to ask questions and present their opinions. If the county thinks this is a good idea, why wouldn't you want to come out and say why and address some of the mitigations you present in the Mitigated Negative Declaration you have submitted related to the project such as in a **town hall**?

I for one find some discrepancies in the traffic impact of having 400+ employees at the new location with the impact report only looking at the method of VMT "vehicle miles travelled" which addresses emission from vehicles vs the method of LOS "Level of Service" which measures congestion, delays, intersection capacity and motorist convenience. Let's deal with this upfront as it is not something that be changed after the fact.

Other points brought up in the document are remote workers, public transit, etc. yet TriCounty transit has changed their schedule and we hear about BART's proposed cutting of the Antioch and other stations. The project quotes that East Contra Costa County is one of the **fastest growing regions in the county**. This greatly affects the city of Brentwood and its service provided such as the fact that **this project is under the protection of the Brentwood Police Dept.**

Many problems could be dealt with positively if this building was in another part of the city. Let's leave the proposed location open for **affordable housing** which you agree is a great need here.

Ignoring the residents by not being willing to have an open and honest live discussion is not a good move for **partnership building** and quite frankly insulting to the residents.

Thanks for your attention to this,
Sue Harper
Brentwood Resident and active voter

East County Service Center - technology way and sand creek

From Sweeta Barez <sweetabarez39@gmail.com>

Date Wed 2/4/2026 7:42 AM

To Syd Sotoodeh <Syd.Sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us>; Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hello,

Im a resident living next to this planned service center. We have a private children school across from this planned center. This is not acceptable to have a probation office and security station. This center does not belong here. It's going to add to the congestion of horrendous traffic here. This doesn't feel safe to my small community across the street that I live in. This will bring in all sorts of problematic people into our neighborhood/community.

Thank you

Sweeta Barez

ECSC Is a Great Idea and Good for Brentwood Businesses

From Matthew Gonzales <MAGonzales61@hotmail.com>
Date Mon 2/23/2026 4:50 AM
To Syd Sotoodeh <Syd.Sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us>
Cc Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

I just wanted to share my thoughts on the 120,000 square feet county building that is being proposed at Technology and Sand Creek. I believe it is a great idea for tourism and local business in Brentwood. The quality of the surrounding area will become apparent because of this major investment from Contra Costa County and new businesses and buildings will very likely pop up nearby, both on Sand Creek and O' Hara as well as right next door to serve both the community and this new work force that would be coming to Brentwood.

County positions usually pay well and provide good benefits which would bring new job opportunities to citizens of Brentwood, both young and old, many of which require college education and can be considered white collar, serving the public. The city is concerned about tourism, this would bring a lot of tourism year-round, which would help out nearby small businesses and attract new investment into Brentwood.

I hope the city council will work with Contra Costa County on this project and make it happen, I am a nearby homeowner and I'd be very happy to see this major investment come to fruition.

Brentwood homeowner and Citizen,
Matthew G

Shravan Sundaram

From: Mendoza, Jovita <jmendoza@brentwoodca.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 2:13 PM
To: syd.sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us
Cc: Shravan Sundaram; County.Administrator@cao.cccounty.us; Supervisor_Burgis; SupervisorCarlson@bos.cccounty.us; john_gioia@bos.cccounty.us; supervisorandersen@bos.cccounty.us; bos5@bos.cccounty.us; Duffey, Harold; Nolthenius, Erik; Morris, Alexis
Subject: Comments regarding Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the East County Service Center Project (CP #25-39, Project No. WH429A)
Attachments: Letter to Contra Costa County - East County Service Center MND.pdf

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Ms. Sotoodeh and the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to CEQA (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), I am submitting the following comments challenging the adequacy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the East County Service Center Project.

Under CEQA's "fair argument" standard, an EIR must be prepared whenever substantial evidence supports a fair argument that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. The threshold is low and doubts must be resolved in favor of environmental review.

The MND fails this standard in multiple respects.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the East County Service Center Project does not satisfy CEQA's requirements for substantial evidence, reasoned analysis, or full disclosure.

Given the size, scale, employment density, subsurface drilling, and regional transportation implications of this project, preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report is legally required.

The County's assertion that it is not required to comply with the Brentwood Municipal Code or BBSP zoning designations because the site is County-owned does not eliminate the obligation to fully analyze environmental impacts under CEQA. Regardless of whether the City has discretionary approval authority, the residents of Brentwood—who will experience the traffic, visual, noise, public safety, and neighborhood character impacts—are entitled to a complete and transparent environmental review.

Ownership does not negate impact. The building will sit within the City of Brentwood, adjacent to established neighborhoods, schools, and local streets. The daily operational effects—employee commutes, visitor traffic, parking overflow, lighting, height, massing, and public safety demand—will be borne by Brentwood residents. CEQA exists to ensure those community-level impacts are studied, disclosed, and mitigated where feasible.

The fact that the project site carries Planned Development (PD-42) and Brentwood Boulevard Specific Plan (BBSP) zoning designations, even if referenced as “informational,” underscores that the site is within an adopted planning framework designed to protect community character and quality of life. Dismissing those standards as irrelevant for approval purposes does not excuse the County from evaluating whether the project conflicts with them or from disclosing the resulting consequences to the public.

At minimum, Brentwood residents deserve a full Environmental Impact Report that transparently evaluates how this project affects them. Jurisdictional technicalities should not be used to avoid meaningful environmental review when the real-world impacts will occur within the City’s neighborhoods.

The County should:

- * Rescind the Mitigated Negative Declaration
- * Prepare a Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- * Conduct full EIR review including alternatives analysis

Respectfully submitted,
Jovita Mendoza
City Council Member

I. The County Improperly Avoids Local Plan and Zoning Consistency

The MND states that because the site is County-owned, the project “is not required to comply” with the City of Brentwood General Plan or zoning designations

This conclusion is legally incomplete.

While counties may assert land use authority over their own facilities, CEQA still requires analysis of consistency with local planning documents under the Land Use and Planning checklist (§2.11). The MND does not meaningfully analyze:

- * Consistency with the Brentwood Boulevard Specific Plan (BBSP)
- * Impacts to planned high-density residential allocations
- * Effects on RHNA/Housing Element capacity

The project occupies land designated in part for high-density residential under the BBSP framework. Converting planned residential opportunity to 120,000 square feet of office space may reduce realistic housing capacity. The MND summarily dismisses this without housing yield analysis.

Failure to analyze housing capacity impacts violates CEQA’s requirement for reasoned analysis supported by substantial evidence.

The assumed land uses in the Mixed-Use COIR category are 10% of gross acreage Commercial

- * 10% of gross acreage Office
- * 10% of gross acreage Industrial
- * 70% of gross acreage High Density Residential (11-20 dwelling units per acre)

The county is failing to deliver the state required housing and will be downzoning, which is against the state guidelines. “The Housing Accountability Act (HAA), Government Code section 65589.5, establishes limitations to a local government’s ability to deny, reduce the density of, or make infeasible housing development projects, emergency shelters, or farmworker housing that are consistent with objective local development standards and contribute to meeting housing need.”

An EIR is required to evaluate:

- * Whether project reduces planned density,
- * Whether project conflicts with the Housing Accountability Act

II. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis Is Incomplete and Potentially Misleading
Section 2.17 concludes no significant VMT impact. However:

- * The project will employ approximately 441 staff members
- * The MND states that most employees are expected to drive
- * The project provides only 409 parking spaces, including fleet and visitor spaces

The MND does not:

- * Provide origin-destination modeling of employee commutes
 - * Compare existing employee commute distances to the proposed site
 - * Demonstrate a 15% reduction below baseline per CAP goals
 - * Analyze whether Brentwood-specific VMT baselines (lower than county averages) were used
- Under CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, VMT must be analyzed with substantial evidence. Conclusory statements that impacts are “less than significant” are insufficient.

Because the project relocates approximately 150 employees and consolidates additional departments, the change in commute patterns may increase per-employee VMT. The MND provides no modeling demonstrating otherwise.

This alone triggers the fair argument standard requiring an EIR.

III. Parking Supply and VMT Conclusions Are Internally Inconsistent and Unsupported

The MND states the project will include:

- * 441 total employees
- * 409 total parking stalls
 - * 286 staff stalls
 - * 79 visitor stalls
 - * 44 fleet stalls

At the same time, Section 2.17 states that “most employees would drive to the project site.”

This creates multiple analytical problems.

A. Staff Parking Alone Is Insufficient

Of the 409 total stalls:

- * Only 286 are designated for staff.
- * 441 employees will work on-site.

That leaves a deficit of 155 staff spaces if most employees drive.

Even if some employees carpool, bike, telework, or stagger shifts, the MND provides:

- * No commute mode split assumptions,
- * No employee travel demand management (TDM) plan
- * No telework policy commitments
- * No staggered shift analysis

If even 75% of employees drive alone (a conservative assumption in suburban East County), that would require approximately 331 staff spaces — already exceeding the 286 provided.

If 85–90% drive (consistent with suburban mode share patterns), required staff parking rises to 375–397 spaces.

The MND contains no data supporting the conclusion that only 286 staff stalls are adequate.

B. Visitor Parking Is Also Potentially Insufficient

The project provides 79 visitor stalls.

The building houses approximately 10 County departments and is intended as a centralized public service hub for one of the fastest-growing regions in the County.

The MND does not provide:

- * Estimated peak daily visitor volume,
- * Peak hour visitor distribution,
- * Overlapping arrival patterns,
- * Historic visitor data from the departments being consolidated

Given 120,000 square feet of public-serving administrative space, 79 visitor stalls may be insufficient during peak periods.

If visitor demand exceeds supply, overflow parking may occur on surrounding streets or in nearby commercial areas, creating secondary circulation impacts not analyzed.

CEQA requires analysis of indirect transportation impacts.

C. Fleet Vehicles Reduce Public Availability Further

The MND designates 44 stalls for fleet vehicles.

Fleet stalls are not available to employees or visitors.

This reduces the practical shared parking pool.

Therefore, from a total of 409 stalls:

- * 44 are reserved fleet
- * 79 are visitor
- * Only 286 are staff

If visitor demand exceeds 79 stalls, visitors will encroach on staff parking.

If staff exceed 286 vehicles, they will encroach on visitor parking.

If both exceed allocations simultaneously, spillover occurs.

- * The MND does not analyze:
- * Shared parking modeling
- * Peak stacking scenarios
- * Combined employee/visitor peak overlap

Without peak demand modeling, the parking adequacy conclusion is unsupported.

D. Parking Deficit Undermines VMT Conclusions

The County simultaneously argues:

1. Most employees will drive
2. Parking is intentionally reduced below standard ratios
3. VMT impacts are less than significant

These conclusions conflict.

If most employees drive, VMT reductions are unlikely.

If parking is insufficient, spillover circulation increases vehicle trips, cruising, and idling — increasing localized VMT and emissions.

If the County intends parking constraint to reduce driving, it must demonstrate enforceable TDM measures and projected mode shift. It has not done so.

CEQA prohibits relying on speculative behavioral changes without enforceable mitigation.

E. School and Adjacent Uses Not Analyzed

The site is adjacent to residential neighborhoods and near a school.

Parking spillover may create:

- * Drop-off conflicts
- * Increased curbside congestion
- * Safety hazards during school peak hours

The MND does not evaluate:

- * School-hour overlap with employee commute
- * Visitor peak during school dismissal times
- * Curb conflict analysis

Failure to analyze foreseeable secondary traffic effects renders the transportation section incomplete.

F. Municipal Code Parking Ratio Comparison

The MND acknowledges that standard office parking would require approximately 600 stalls (1 per 200 square feet of gross floor area for 120,000 SF).

The project proposes 409 stalls, approximately 191 fewer than standard.

If the County asserts reduced parking is environmentally beneficial, it must provide:

- * VMT reduction modeling
- * Mode shift evidence
- * Transit frequency compliance
- * TDM commitments

Absent that, the reduced parking space appears inconsistent with the assumption that most employees will drive.

This internal inconsistency supports a fair argument that transportation impacts may be significant.

IV. Construction Health Risks Exceed Thresholds

Table 2-4 identifies that unmitigated construction health risks exceed applicable cancer risk thresholds for residential and student receptors

This is critical.

The site is adjacent to residential neighborhoods and near a school.

When an Initial Study acknowledges threshold exceedances, the agency must demonstrate:

- * Mitigation reduces impacts to below thresholds
- * Mitigation is enforceable and specific
- * Residual risks are clearly quantified

The MND does not clearly demonstrate that mitigated risks fall below the Air District's significance thresholds for sensitive receptors.

Under CEQA, where mitigation effectiveness is uncertain or requires monitoring to determine success, an MND is inappropriate.

The existence of threshold exceedances creates a fair argument of significant impact.

V. 400-Foot Geothermal Wells Require Deeper Hydrology Review

The project includes approximately 60 geothermal wells drilled to depths of up to 400 feet

The MND states that no dewatering will be required.

However, the document does not:

- Analyze potential impacts to groundwater basins
- Evaluate well interference
- Assess risk of subsurface contamination migration

- Address seismic/geotechnical risks associated with 400-foot boreholes.

Given California’s groundwater management requirements under SGMA, drilling 60 deep wells warrants hydrogeologic modeling beyond a cursory checklist analysis. This level of subsurface disturbance on a 7.86-acre site supports the fair argument standard for preparation of an EIR.

VI. Heat Island and Impervious Surface Increase Not Adequately Analyzed

The project introduces:

- * 160,000 square feet of asphalt
- * 43,000 square feet of concrete
- * 42,000 square feet of plaza paving

That is a substantial impervious surface conversion.

The MND claims tree planting will mitigate aesthetic effects, but provides no quantitative:

- * Surface temperature modeling
- * Urban heat island analysis
- * Net canopy coverage comparison

Given the County’s Climate Action and Adaptation Plan commitments, a conclusory finding of less-than-significant impact is unsupported.

VII. Height Exceeds Local Zoning – No Visual Impact Analysis at Scale

The building height is approximately 58 feet, while the local Planned Development zone allows 40 feet

Although the County asserts exemption from City standards, CEQA requires analysis of visual compatibility and massing impacts.

The MND dismisses scenic impacts largely because Mount Diablo is distant. It does not evaluate:

- * Neighborhood shadow impacts,
- * Scale relative to adjacent residential uses,
- * Nighttime lighting spillover in detail.

Given residential adjacency, a fair argument exists that the building mass and height may significantly affect visual character.

VIII. Cumulative Impacts Analysis Is Minimal

The MND repeatedly relies on statements that the project is in an “urbanized area.”

CEQA requires analysis of cumulative impacts when:

- * The project contributes to regional traffic growth
- * It increases regional office development
- * It consolidates public services in a growth corridor

The document does not meaningfully analyze cumulative VMT, air quality, or growth-inducing impacts.

VIII. Height Exceeds Local Zoning – No Visual Impact Analysis at Scale

The building height is approximately 58 feet, while the local Planned Development zone allows 40 feet

Although the County asserts exemption from City standards, CEQA requires analysis of visual compatibility and massing impacts.

The MND dismisses scenic impacts largely because Mount Diablo is distant. It does not evaluate:

- * Neighborhood shadow impacts,

- * Scale relative to adjacent residential uses,
- * Nighttime lighting spillover in detail.

Given residential adjacency, a fair argument exists that the building mass and height may significantly affect visual character.

IX. Cumulative Impacts Analysis Is Minimal

The MND repeatedly relies on statements that the project is in an “urbanized area.” CEQA requires analysis of cumulative impacts when:

- * The project contributes to regional traffic growth
- * It increases regional office development
- * It consolidates public services in a growth corridor

The document does not meaningfully analyze cumulative VMT, air quality, or growth-inducing impacts.

X. Failure to Meet High-Quality Transit Corridor Standards Under SB 675, SB 743, and Plan Bay Area 2050

The MND relies on proximity to transit service to support its conclusion that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) impacts would be less than significant. However, the project does not meet the statutory or regional definition of a “high-quality transit corridor,” and the analysis fails to demonstrate measurable VMT reduction performance.

A. The Project Does Not Qualify as Being Located in a High-Quality Transit Corridor

California statutory definitions used in CEQA and infill screening thresholds define a “high-quality transit corridor” as:

“A corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.”

(See Gov. Code §21155(b); also reflected in CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 and regional practice.)

Plan Bay Area 2050 reiterates this standard, identifying high-quality transit access as:

“A bus stop with peak service frequency of 15 minutes or less.”

The project site is served by one bus line. The schedule for that line does not provide 15-minute peak service intervals during established peak commute hours.

Therefore, the project does not qualify as being located within a high-quality transit corridor.

Absent that designation, the project cannot rely on transit-proximity screening thresholds or assume VMT reductions consistent with SB 743 infill standards.

B. Peak Commute Hours Must Be Evaluated Consistently with Regional Definitions

Across Caltrans, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), counties, and cities, peak commute hours are generally defined as:

Morning peak: 7:00 AM – 9:00 AM

Evening peak: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

Tri Delta Transit planning documents define peak hours as:

AM Peak: 6:00 AM – 9:00 AM

PM Peak: 3:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Weekdays only (Monday–Friday)

Under either definition, the transit service serving the project site does not maintain fixed-route headways of 15 minutes or less during peak periods.

Without 15-minute peak headways, the site does not meet high-frequency transit standards.

If the County relies on transit availability to justify VMT reduction assumptions, it must demonstrate that the service meets statutory peak frequency requirements. It has not done so.

C. The MND Fails to Model Employee Origin Data

The report cites SB 743 and applies a VMT framework. However, it fails to:

- * Model employee home origins
- * Compare current workplace VMT to proposed site VMT
- * Demonstrate that per-employee VMT will be at least 15% below Brentwood baseline levels as required under Climate Action Plan Measure CT-1

Without origin-destination modeling, the document cannot conclude that VMT will decrease.

Relocating approximately 150 employees from other County facilities and consolidating additional staff may increase average commute distances depending on employee home locations.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 require substantial evidence to support VMT findings. Conclusory statements are insufficient.

D. The Project Does Not Meet SB 743 Infill Screening Criteria

SB 743 shifted transportation analysis from Level of Service (LOS) to VMT and allows screening of certain infill projects located in transit-rich areas.

However, a prerequisite to infill screening is location within:

- * A high-quality transit corridor, or
- * A transit priority area

Because the project site does not meet the 15-minute peak headway definition of a high-quality transit corridor, it does not qualify for streamlined VMT screening under SB 743 guidance.

Accordingly, the County must provide full VMT modeling rather than relying on generalized regional assumptions.

E. Insufficient Transit Frequency Undermines Mode Shift Assumptions

Reliable and frequent public transit service is a prerequisite for meaningful mode shift.

Where peak service exceeds 15-minute intervals:

- * Transit becomes less competitive with driving
- * Reliability decreases
- * Commuters default to single-occupancy vehicle trips

The IS/MND states that most employees are anticipated to drive. This statement, combined with insufficient peak transit frequency, undermines any assumption that transit availability will materially reduce VMT.

Without enforceable Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures and high-frequency transit access, there is no substantial evidence supporting a less-than-significant VMT conclusion.

F. Fair Argument Standard Is Met

Because:

- * The site does not meet high-quality transit corridor standards
- * Transit headways exceed 15 minutes during peak commute hours
- * Employee origin data were not modeled
- * Per-employee VMT reduction targets were not demonstrated
- * SB 743 infill screening criteria are not satisfied

Substantial evidence supports a fair argument that the project may result in significant VMT impacts. Under CEQA, this requires preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

XI. Public Services – Police Protection Analysis Is Conclusory and Unsupported

Under CEQA, a project must be evaluated to determine whether it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need for new or expanded governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times.

The MND acknowledges that the project would substantially increase the daytime population at the site and could result in increased demand for police protection. However, it concludes — without analysis — that no additional officers or facilities would be required.

The document provides no:

- * Police Department consultation letter
- * Officer-to-population ratio analysis
- * Response time data
- * Call volume projections
- * Evaluation of cumulative service demand

The Brentwood Police Department is reportedly operating below authorized staffing levels at 10.5 headcount, and in need of an additional patrol beat. The open headcount does not include any on-leave employees. If the department is already below staffing targets, adding a 120,000-square-foot public service facility with approximately 441 employees and daily visitors may exacerbate service demands.

The MND's assertion that the facility "would not be expected to attract crime" is speculative and unsupported by data.

CEQA prohibits conclusory findings without substantial evidence. Because the County did not analyze whether maintaining acceptable service ratios would require additional officers or expanded facilities, a fair argument exists that the project may necessitate physical expansion of public safety infrastructure.

Under CEQA's fair argument standard, preparation of an EIR is required.

XII. Architectural Style Non-Compliance with the Brentwood Boulevard Specific Plan – CEQA Deficiency

The Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the East County Service Center fails to adequately analyze the project's inconsistency with the Brentwood Boulevard Specific Plan (BBSP), particularly regarding architectural standards, building height, massing, and required architectural character.

Under CEQA, agencies must evaluate whether a project conflicts with adopted land use plans and policies enacted to avoid or mitigate environmental impacts. The BBSP is not aspirational—it establishes mandatory development standards and corridor-specific architectural expectations intended to transform Brentwood Boulevard into a traditional boulevard with distinctive, front-facing buildings and cohesive architectural identity

The project's proposed height of approximately 58 feet exceeds the BBSP's 40-foot maximum for applicable districts. Beyond height, however, the BBSP requires distinctive architecture along Brentwood Boulevard, including defined entrances such as porticos or arcades, varied roof forms, articulated wall planes, and architectural elements that avoid box-like massing. The proposal instead presents a large, institutional structure with limited façade articulation and minimal pedestrian-scale detailing, which appears inconsistent with the Specific Plan's boulevard vision.

The BBSP specifically discourages large, undifferentiated building forms and calls for architectural variation, prominent corner treatments, and visually engaging façades that reinforce pedestrian activity. The MND does not analyze whether the project's modern institutional style aligns with the corridor's required architectural character or whether its scale and design undermine the Plan's goal of creating a cohesive and distinctive streetscape.

Additionally, the Plan calls for compatibility in architectural style and transitions where non-residential uses abut residential neighborhoods. The MND does not evaluate whether the proposed building's massing, height, lighting, or façade treatment creates visual incompatibility or adversely affects neighborhood character.

By concluding that visual and land use impacts are less than significant without meaningfully evaluating architectural style compliance, the MND omits required analysis under CEQA's land use and aesthetic impact standards. Architectural style, building form, and corridor character are central components of the BBSP's adopted regulatory framework. Failure to analyze conflicts with those standards constitutes a deficiency in the environmental review.

These unresolved inconsistencies support a fair argument that the project may result in significant visual and land use impacts, requiring preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report.

Attaching City of Brentwood comments for reference

FURTHER JUSTIFICATION FOR MY OBJECTION TO ADOPT A PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION for the East County Service Center Project

From NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>

Date Mon 2/9/2026 1:29 PM

To CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov <CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov>; webCityClerk <cityclerk@brentwoodca.gov>; Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor John_Gioia <John_Gioia@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Candace Andersen <SupervisorAndersen@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Carlson <supervisorcarlson@bos.cccounty.us>; planning@brentwoodca.gov <planning@brentwoodca.gov>; Shraavan Sundaram <shraavan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

 1 attachment (6 MB)

Questionable County Supervisors Spending - Supervisor Board Meeting Set 2_3_26 - Urgent_.eml;

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Project Title: East County Service Center Project

County File Number: CP#25-39

Project Number: WH429A

Communication Issues and Lack of Trust to Support Opposition Re: Mitigated Negative Declaration for the East County Service Center Project.

Another reason for my distrust in adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration is a lack of transparency and disregard of the public. I feel that if they reject the request for a formal EPA study, they will simply file a waiver without a care in the world.

For example, on 1/30/26, I emailed the board requesting reports, assuming reports have been submitted prior to the 2/3/26, meeting. Though, it was two-fold and convoluted. There was silence as to what I was seeking where a simple phone call or email clarifying my attempt to gather information would have sufficed. The single email to show up at the next meeting was not sufficient. Who would assume that a government would not adopt anything based on a slide screen show presentation. (see attached)

After several discussions on the record, another supervisor clarified that no such document exists and nothing is being concealed. If Diane had simply told me this, I wouldn't have felt as if they were hiding information. I felt disregarded and pushed aside during the 2/3/25, county board meeting, I raised her failure to respond to my emails and noted that her only reply was a non-reply. She stated on the record "we sent you everything that was available".

Her statement is a straight up lie because the email just told me to show up at the 2/10/26 meeting. I kept pressing her about this so-called email that was supposedly sent to me that could verify her statement, "we sent you everything that was available", and she shut me down.

She made it look as if I was lying when, in fact, she was the one lying. I asked them to forward to me this "so called email" "addressing all my concerns because I never received it. To date, I still have not received this email. Either she is relying on incompetent staff, or she simply has instructed her staff to ignore anything that challenges what she is attempting to

pull off. If Burgis can prove that they sent such an email (other than the one to show up at the 2/10/26 meeting), I will make a public statement of apology.

Also, who has more reason to lie? Why would I keep insisting on a response, if I had received one. The professional response Burgis should have given was "let me look into this and get back to you", instead of trying to embarrass me and making me look like a fool on the record. The flagrant disrespect shown to me at a public meeting was appalling. This furthers the distrust of our county government.

I'm upset because I have no experience with local government, and it's crucial for elected officials to guide constituents and keep them informed about decisions that impact them. For instance, I recently discovered that Jovita Mendoza is not my city representative, though I assumed she was because she reached out to me regarding Valley Green traffic issues. This shows officials should help newcomers understand government procedures.

Please accept my email to be a part of the official record for the Brentwood City Council meeting scheduled to be held on 2/10/26, Item H.2.

Thank you,

Tracy Kasamoto

788 Valley Green Dr.

Brentwood, CA

Item H.2 ECSC MND City Council meeting 2-10-2026 public comment

From RON P. <rtp6697@gmail.com>

Date Tue 2/10/2026 2:35 PM

To Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>; cityclerk@brentwoodca.gov <cityclerk@brentwoodca.gov>; RON P. <rtp6697@gmail.com>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

Report Suspicious

Good evening Mayor and Council.

I'm writing to urge the City of Brentwood to formally challenge the County's Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed East County Service Center and request preparation of a full Environmental Impact Report.

This is a 120,000-square-foot regional government campus with more than 400 employees, multiple law-enforcement and legal departments, and daily public traffic. That scale of development inside Brentwood city limits will have real impacts on traffic, road capacity, public safety response, infrastructure, and long-term growth patterns.

An MND is typically used for projects with minimal impacts. Given the size, operational intensity, and regional draw of this facility, there is substantial evidence that impacts may be significant. Under CEQA, that is the threshold requiring a full EIR.

Even though the County is the lead agency, this project sits inside Brentwood. Our residents will experience the traffic, service demands, and land-use consequences. The City has both the right and the responsibility to submit formal comments, challenge the adequacy of the MND, and request a full environmental review that analyzes traffic, cumulative East County growth, and consistency with Brentwood's General Plan. Traffic is already a nightmare on Sand Creek Road, between Brentwood Blvd. past the Streets Of Brentwood, leading Westbound to the Hwy. 4 Bypass area. Furthermore, the new Sand Creek Sports Complex is under construction and future traffic to this area WILL BE IMPACTED!

I respectfully ask this Council to direct staff and the City Attorney to formally request a full EIR and ensure Brentwood's interests are fully protected before this project moves forward.

Thank You,

Ron

Brentwood Resident

New county building on Technology Way

From suzmariecook@aol.com <suzmariecook@aol.com>

Date Sun 2/22/2026 6:13 PM

To supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>

Cc =yCouncil Members <Councilmembers@brentwoodca.gov>

CAUTION – EXTERNAL SENDER

Dear Supervisor Burgis,

I have recently become aware of a new building project of county offices On Technology Way and have several questions regarding the new East County Service Center. Although the services to be provided are of importance, I have concerns about the location and the increase in traffic and air pollution on Sand Creek Road which is already a heavily travelled thorough fare. Regarding employees, are these new hires or employees transferring from another location in Contra Costa County? I also noticed that these 441 staff members will be allotted only 289 parking stalls. Where are the remaining employees going to be parking? This sounds like a recipe for confusion and disaster. Unfortunately, we citizens are not very inclined to carpool or use public transportation, which is limited in this area. I have learned there is another location near the Costco which is available, has easy access from Highway 4 and could accommodate more parking. I know the site being considered is already owned by the county, but maybe other concerns need to override this convenience. I have lived in Brentwood since 2020 and one of the prime reasons for relocating here from Pleasant Hill, was less traffic and congestion, but that important benefit seems to be dying quickly. Thank you for serving our county and please consider locating the service center in a better location.

Thank you,

Suzanne Cook

Objection to the inadequate Mitigated Negative Declaration

From NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>

Date Mon 2/23/2026 4:56 PM

To Syd Sotoodeh <Syd.Sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us>; Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>; County Administrator <County.Administrator@cao.cccounty.us>; Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Carlson <supervisorcarlson@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor John_Gioia <John_Gioia@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Candace Andersen <SupervisorAndersen@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Scales-Preston <BOS5@bos.cccounty.us>; Harold <HDuffey@brentwoodca.gov>; enolthenius@brentwoodca.gov <enolthenius@brentwoodca.gov>; Alexis <amorris@brentwoodca.gov>; HDuffey@brentwoodca.govduffey <HDuffey@brentwoodca.govduffey>; enolthenious@brentwoodca.gov <enolthenious@brentwoodca.gov>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

Report Suspicious

Objection to the mitigated negative declaration and the lack of evidence that would prove the conclusions. It was just conclusions by the person who wrote the document. Basically, to make it look like all is well when it just is written to accommodate the Boards goals. The document has literal lies and data based on no real study.

During the 2/10/26, city council meeting Alexis Morris literally acknowledged that the document was not truthful and said she didn't even read it all. I want to know why this inaccurate report without even reading it or consulting with the county about the discrepancies. Alexis said that public comments only pertain to the MND. How can we possibly do that when it's inaccurate.

The County seems to think it is not required to discuss this project with any department within the city or the public about any of the hazardous materials or use of resources that are meant for residents who pay taxes for these services. The Board is treating our concerns as if they are irrelevant. The board is saying we will do what we want regardless of the nightmare it will create on our city streets or how it will affect the neighboring properties.

There is no concern as to the traffic conditions and air quality resulting from this building. As we all are aware, Bart is expecting to close stations, which will result in most commuting employees being forced to drive. Based on what I can tell, I doubt that the tax measure will pass as many are tired of being taxed to death.

There are no concerns with respect to the neighboring properties that could be affected by cancer causing dust or car emissions from the excessive traffic. Not to mention the light, noise, block the view of those who surround it.

The county didn't try to comply with the city regulations as to height, architectural standards.

The county is completely ignoring the need for high density housing. If the county was so **"concerned about people"** they would work with the city to ensure that we have provided everyone with a chance to thrive in a healthy environment and not impact the quality of life of the residents of Brentwood, NOT ONLY JUST CARE ABOUT COUNTY EMPLOYEES. From a quick look into the backgrounds of a few board members, it appears that a few say they are concerned about protecting the environment at the same time, submitting this substandard MND shows how little they care about the people and the environment.

The county didn't even contact any Brentwood agencies to even see if we have the number of emergency response employees that would be required due to the influx of foot traffic. In the event the police or fire were to be called to assist people in or around this building, it would result in residents not having the support in an emergency. We pay taxes to protect us in a timely manner.

I want to know what justification for the need of this building, and it only has 79 public parking spaces. That would indicate that there is not enough people that will actually need this building. For all the offices and only having 79 parking spaces it is ridiculous. The fact that the County has added additional space and costs were increased and yet only expecting so few people to go to the building is just mind blowing.

It is embarrassing that the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors care so little about Brentwood and its residents that they would prepare such an inadequate report with promises to "mitigate". Do we trust that given the county's failure to conduct a real report based on real studies and not bother working with our departments.

The fact that the county has declined to enter a MOU, it just horrific. Again, how little the board thinks of our city. We are being underserved by our County. Perhaps no agreement was made because you know how the impacts of environment and health issues will be.

All the factors that were addressed at the February 10, 2026 city council meeting were very alarming.

The county is showing how little they care about the residents of Brentwood; after professing it cares about people. You care about doing what you want and forget everyone else who challenges the board's goals.

Diane Burgis has completely failed in representing Brentwood.

Questionable County Supervisors Spending - Supervisor Board Meeting Set 2/3/26 - Urgent?

From No Name <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>
Date Thu 2/26/2026 9:09 AM
To burk@contracosta.news <burk@contracosta.news>

3 attachments (5 MB)
Agenda.pdf; County budget development.pdf; 2024.11.21.Contra_Costa budget projection.pdf;

Hello and happy Friday.
My name is Tracy Kasamoto, 788 Valley Green Dr, Brentwood, CA 94513 (925)348-1734
I apologize for the late notice. But I just found out some stuff!

I am new to following local governments. However, I have concerns about what the County Supervisors are up to. I moved here in 2022.

I feel that I have seen unnecessary spending on the County Service Building. Looking into that, I discovered that they will be seeking legislation to increase our tax cap and sales tax. After, planning a 130 million dollar building.

With the fast tracking of the proposed measure to be put on the ballot 6/2/26, and what seems to be a deviation from last year's fiscal year revenue fiscal steps it feels as if everything is urgent and rushed. Perhaps, to show the state why they should change the legislation to increase our tax cap and sales tax.

I have sent emails to all of the County Supervisors on 1/26 and 1/27, respectively, and no one has responded. A friend wrote last week. He has not heard back. I emailed senators, etc. Senator Calderon's office is the only one to respond to me. I talked to the County Clerk's Office today and they took my email to get back to me about the documents I need.

The following is the email that I sent to my friend about what I discovered:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	2/3/2026	9:00 AM	Antioch City Hall 200 H Street, Antioch, CA https://ccccounty-us.zoom.us/j/81863939331 Call in: 1 855-758-1310 <i>SPECIAL MEETING BOARD RETREAT</i>
----------------------	----------	---------	--

I was looking on the County's website for financial documents. I am trying to find data that will support the drafting of the new tax hike measure.

I found a Contra Costa Revenue Forecast report that was drafted November 2024, for the supervisors meeting April 2025. (see attached) I couldn't locate a similar forecast report for fiscal year 2026/2027. I called the County and they directed me to the calendar and said that the documents will be in the agenda packet. <https://contra-costa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=1348317&GUID=78E265B8-1B32-4716-9150-944F10A998A1&Options=info&Search=> I told her I want the written summary that was included in last year's forecast because it's not included in the agenda packet.

She said that it will be an oral presentation. I said I wanted to see the written report because I know there has to be a report for the board to review prior to presentation. There are zero chances that the Board will make any financial decision based on an oral presentation. Last year's report was drafted and submitted in November 2024, this new year's report should have been drafted in a similar time frame. (My question to myself was, why aren't we waiting until April like we did last year?)

Item	ACCEPT report from Beacon Economics entitled "Federal Deficits, Tech Bubbles and the California Outlook: Focus on Contra Costa County." (Christopher Thornberg, Beacon Economics)
------	---

I told her that I need it in order to have time to process the information to be able to comment with a better understanding. For Beacon to only provide verbal presentation at a meeting with only a two-minute public comment time is completely unacceptable. I also expressed my concern about about fast tracking the acceptance of the report and drafting a new tax measure

She took my email address and said that they will get back to me. I doubt I will hear from them!

I call bullshit. If they proceed in a different manner than any other year, I want to know why. What is the urgency?

I am going to submit a formal document request to the county for every written document (staff reports/analysis forecast, etc.) and it should be there as it was last year! I will submit my request, but it isn't enough time per the law. "The California Public Records Act (CPRA), Government Code § 7920.000 et seq., ensures public access to government records by requiring state and local agencies to disclose information about the public's business, unless legally exempt, promoting government transparency and accountability. Anyone can make a request for existing public records, which are broadly defined as any writing related to government business, though agencies aren't required to create new records or perform research, and certain personal or sensitive information (like personnel files, exam data) is protected. Requests should be made to the specific agency holding the records, and responses are generally expected within 10 days, with potential for extensions."

I reached out to the company who prepared the report through their website.

Re: FURTHER JUSTIFICATION FOR MY OBJECTION TO ADOPT A PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION for the East County Service Center Project

From RON P. <rtp6697@gmail.com>
Date Mon 2/9/2026 1:33 PM
To NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>
Cc CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov <CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov>; webCityClerk <cityclerk@brentwoodca.gov>; Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor John_Gioia <John_Gioia@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Candace Andersen <SupervisorAndersen@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Carlson <supervisorcarlson@bos.cccounty.us>; planning@brentwoodca.gov <planning@brentwoodca.gov>; Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

Report Suspicious

I agree with you.

On Mon, Feb 9, 2026 at 1:24 PM NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com> wrote:

Project Title: East County Service Center Project

County File Number: CP#25-39

Project Number: WH429A

Communication Issues and Lack of Trust to Support Opposition Re: Mitigated Negative Declaration for the East County Service Center Project.

Another reason for my distrust in adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration is a lack of transparency and disregard of the public. I feel that if they reject the request for a formal EPA study, they will simply file a waiver without a care in the world.

For example, on 1/30/26, I emailed the board requesting reports, assuming reports have been submitted prior to the 2/3/26, meeting. Though, it was two-fold and convoluted. There was silence as to what I was seeking where a simple phone call or email clarifying my attempt to gather information would have sufficed. The single email to show up at the next meeting was not sufficient. Who would assume that a government would not adopt anything based on a slide screen show presentation. (see attached)

After several discussions on the record, another supervisor clarified that no such document exists and nothing is being concealed. If Diane had simply told me this, I wouldn't have felt as if they were hiding information. I felt disregarded and pushed aside during the 2/3/25, county board meeting, I raised her failure to respond to my emails and noted that her only reply was a non-reply. She stated on the record "we sent you everything that was available".

Her statement is a straight up lie because the email just told me to show up at the 2/10/26 meeting. I kept pressing her about this so-called email that was supposedly sent to me that could verify her statement, "we sent you everything that was available", and she shut me down.

She made it look as if I was lying when, in fact, she was the one lying. I asked them to forward to me this "so called email" addressing all my concerns because I never received it. To date, I still have not received this email. Either she is relying on incompetent staff, or she simply has instructed her staff to ignore anything that challenges what she is attempting to pull off. If Burgis can prove that they sent such an email (other than the one to show up at the 2/10/26 meeting), I will make a public statement of apology.

Also, who has more reason to lie? Why would I keep insisting on a response, if I had received one. The professional response Burgis should have given was "let me look into this and get back to you", instead of trying to embarrass me and making me look like a fool on the record. The flagrant disrespect shown to me at a public meeting was appalling. This furthers the distrust of our county government.

I'm upset because I have no experience with local government, and it's crucial for elected officials to guide constituents and keep them informed about decisions that impact them. For instance, I recently discovered that Jovita Mendoza is not my city representative, though I assumed she was because she reached out to me regarding Valley Green traffic issues. This shows officials should help newcomers understand government procedures.

Please accept my email to be a part of the official record for the Brentwood City Council meeting scheduled to be held on 2/10/26, Item H.2.

Thank you,

Tracy Kasamoto

788 Valley Green Dr.

Brentwood, CA

Re: OBJECTION TO ADOPT A PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION for the East County Service Center Project

From NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>

Date Sun 2/8/2026 8:26 PM

To CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov <CityCouncil@brentwoodca.gov>; webCityClerk <cityclerk@brentwoodca.gov>; syd.sotoodeh@dcd.ccco <syd.sotoodeh@dcd.ccco>; planning@brentwoodca.gov <planning@brentwoodca.gov>; Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Candace Andersen <SupervisorAndersen@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Carlson <supervisorcarlson@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor Scales-Preston <BOS5@bos.cccounty.us>; Supervisor John_Gioia <John_Gioia@bos.cccounty.us>; Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This email originated from outside of Contra Costa County. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email.

Report Suspicious

Sorry for the second email, I had Shravan Sundaram's email incorrect.

On Sun, Feb 8, 2026 at 8:19 PM NO NAME <tkasamoto1@gmail.com> wrote:

Project Title: East County Service Center Project

County File Number: CP#25-39

Project Number: WH429A

Environmental Concerns and Lack of Response

On January 26, 2026, I sent an email to Diane Burgis regarding the environmental impact statement/report for the East County Service Center Project. She ignored this email, as she has ignored many others.

My primary concern is the environmental impact this building will have. Past experiences in Humboldt County have shown that contamination from careless contractors and businesses can take years of litigation and remediation to resolve. Without an in-depth study, any mistakes made during the construction will be extremely difficult to remedy.

Objection to Mitigated Negative Declaration

I strongly object to any request to adopt a proposed mitigated negative declaration in-lieu of a full EPA study. This approach would not be sufficient to address the environmental risks associated with the project.

Concerns About Waivers and Public Input

I suspect that if the Board receives too much push back from the community, they will simply file a waiver and proceed with the project regardless of public opinion. This undermines the voice and interests of the people affected by the project.

Lack of Trust in Mitigation Promises and Project Transparency

Any promise to take mitigation actions holds no value for me. I do not trust the Board of Supervisors or their hired contractors, especially since the project cost has been increased from the original estimate of \$110 - \$130 million to now up to \$155 million, all without notifying the public. It is common knowledge that costs will likely rise further once construction begins, or that the Board may add more space for other purposes without public awareness. The Board's actions and lack of transparency does not invoke trust.

Concerns About Representation and Project Surprises

The promise to follow mitigation steps is as questionable as the promise burgis made to represent the constituents who elected her. Did Diane Burgis ignore me because I brought up a topic she is sensitive about? This project appears to contain many surprises, and I suspect more will arise before its completion. It is imperative to keep the Board accountable to prevent irreparable harm.

Communication Issues and Lack of Trust

At this point, I do not trust Diane Burgis. She has ignored several emails on various topics (of course they are saved). The only response I received simply directed me to attend the meeting on 2/10/26. (see attached)

Also, how do you submit a records request if you don't know the official name of the specific document? A simple phone call to talk to me would have been helpful. Even just to tell me I am doing everything wrong and direct me in the right direction. Providing me with any information as opposed to ignoring my emails. Since, I prefer all my communications in writing, I suppose it was for the best to have been ignored vs. telling me something that skims over the topic.

For your convenience, I have attached a copy of the email sent 1/26/26 to Burgis that went ignored.

Please accept my email and place it into the record as to Agenda Item H.2, at the Brentwood City Council meeting scheduled to occur on 2/10/26.

Thank you,

Tracy Kasamoto

788 Valley Green Dr.

Brentwood, CA

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **No Name** <tkasamoto1@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 2:15 PM

Subject: Opposi

Re: Proposed County Office Bldg in Brentwood

From Anne L. Grenier <ag4new@gmail.com>

Date Tue 2/17/2026 4:10 PM

To Supervisor_Burgis <supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us>

Cc Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>; Jovita Mendoza <jovita_mendoza@hotmail.com>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Dear Supervisor Burgis,

Thank you for your office response to my letter, but it is unfortunate to see that you did not respond to the concern I expressed about the increased Sand Creek Rd. traffic and Route 4 ramp traffic that a new 441 person county office will likely bring.

You mention a place at the bottom of the document link where public comment can be submitted but I do not see that. I see a public review section, but not a button to submit public comments. I am cc'ing Jovita Mendoza, our Brentwood city council member who alerted me to this project, in the event she can assist, and to make her aware of the local traffic concern I am sharing with you.

I do see the email contact for the county Environmental Analyst, so I have added that contact in the Cc line as well to apprise them of the concerns.

Lastly, I did not mention anything about a youth center in my email to you, so I don't understand your reference to that in your response (perhaps that was intended for a different email contact?)

In any case, thanks for the office response.

I reiterate: as a long time Brentwood resident residing right off Sand Creek Road, I object to building a large county office in our town due to its already clogged local traffic. The traffic near Sand Creek is already jammed, and I anticipate the new Sports Complex by the Streets will already exacerbate the heavy traffic trying to access both the shopping centers and the nearby on/off ramps to Rte 4.

Thank you.

A Concerned Brentwood Resident,
Anne Grenier

On Tue, Feb 17, 2026 at 1:35 PM Supervisor_Burgis <Supervisor_Burgis@bos.cccounty.us> wrote:
Good afternoon and thank you for reaching out to our office.

The County Administrator's Office presented at the City of Brentwood Council meeting on January 27th.

The California Environmental Quality Act Report is out for review and public comment.

Public comment is open from February 2, 2026 to February 23, 2026.

Please see the information on this project at the project webpage with the State, <https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2026011121>

At the bottom of this page there are contacts for you send your questions, concerns and/or positive comments to.

You also mentioned a Youth Center in Brentwood; there is one being built in Brentwood off Lone Tree Way and Windy Springs Lane. Please see the information on our County webpage, <https://www.wdbccc.com/youth-centers-initiative/>

I hope you will find this information helpful.

Office of Supervisor Diane Burgis

From: Anne L. Grenier <ag4new@gmail.com>
Date: Saturday, February 7, 2026 at 3:05 PM
To: Supervisor_Burgis <Supervisor_Burgis@bos.cccounty.us>
Subject: Proposed County Office Bldg in Brentwood

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender. Dear Supervisor Burgis,

[Report Suspicious](#)

My name is Anne Grenier, a Brentwood resident of 25 years who lives right off Sand Creek mid-way between Streets of Brentwood and your proposed location for a new county business office nearby.

I am very concerned about the impact this has on added traffic congestion in a community of already-clogged access to Route 4. With the addition of the Sports Complex off Sand Creek right near Streets of Brentwood, we'll already be fighting more traffic jams, on top of increased noise — all right along the well-traveled path to enter Rt 4. As you may know, Brentwood already suffers from Route 4 glutted with not enough lanes to accommodate traffic and this will just worsen it with more spill over traffic getting on and off Rt 4 from San Creek Road.

To add another location of this size with 441 county employees and their cars will just clog up both sides of Sand Creek which we don't need, especially those of us living right off Sand Creek Rd. Plus we don't need a high elevation building obstructing the view we have left of Mt. Diablo.

Please note as a resident of Brentwood 94513 area, I strongly object to this project proposal. I am also surprised and disappointed that the county would attempt to grab Brentwood land for this large building construction, without transparent communication to Brentwood residents to seek their input about how it affects our community before-hand.

Sincerely,

Anne Grenier
[1391 Bauer Rd](#)
[Brentwood, CA](#)
[94513](#)

Why here?

From Rachel Mitchell <lehcar1976@icloud.com>

Date Sun 2/22/2026 9:08 PM

To Shravan Sundaram <shravan.sundaram@pw.cccounty.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

I am a property owner here in Brentwood. How does this HELP our community? Specifically us as individual residents?

Thank you for your time

Sent from my iPhone