

FINAL CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Green Valley Road Rezone and Two-Lot Minor Subdivision
(County File CDRZ23-03271 and CDMS23-00005)

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: Syd Sotoodeh, Senior Planner
(925) 655-2877
syd.sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us

4. Project Location: 1921 Green Valley Road in the Alamo area
(Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 194-070-015 & 194-070-018)

5. Project Sponsor/ Applicant Name and Address: Benoit McVeigh
dk Engineering
1931 San Miguel Drive
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

6. General Plan Designation: SL, Single-Family Residential, Low Density (SL)

7. Zoning: A-2, General Agricultural District (A-2)

8. Description of Project:

The applicant is requesting approval of a vesting tentative map to subdivide the subject 2-acre property into two parcels, resulting in a 0.95-acre (gross) Parcel A and a 1.05-acre (gross) Parcel B. The project proposes one approximately 25-foot-wide private access and utility easement (PAUE). Access to both lots would be from Green Valley Road through an existing driveway within the new private access easement. The project proposes to remove and replace the existing driveway. The new and wider driveway will split from the PAUE to provide direct access to a proposed residence on Parcel B. The driveway to the existing residence on Parcel A will remain as-is.

Site improvements also include three bioretention filters, a concrete ditch, and trench inlets/drains for stormwater control/drainage. Six retaining walls are proposed, ranging between zero and approximately nine feet in height. It is anticipated that the project will entail ± 330 cubic yards (CYS) of cut and ± 540 CYS of fill for a net 210 CYS of grading for site and residential improvements, primarily on proposed Parcel B.

New development for proposed Parcel B includes demolishing a barn and constructing a new 3,496-square-foot, two-story, single-family residence with a 553-square-foot garage, 315-square-foot main floor deck, and 383-square-foot lower floor concrete patio in approximately the same location as the barn. New development proposed for Parcel A consists of the installation of two bioretention filters for stormwater control. No changes to the existing residence or driveway on Parcel A are proposed.

The applicant also requests a rezone of the property from A-2, General Agricultural District to R-40, Single-Family Residential district. The applicant has requested the following variances to the requirements of the R-40 zoning district for the construction of two retaining walls over three feet in height:

- 0-foot front setback (where 25 feet is required) and 8-foot side yard (where 20 feet is required) for “Wall No. 1”; and
- 5-foot front setback (where 25 feet is required) for “Wall No. 3”.

In addition, the applicant is requesting an exception from the requirements of Title 9, Chapter 96-10, of the County Ordinance Code related to the undergrounding of existing overhead utility services along the subject property’s Green Valley Road frontage. Water, sewer, electrical, and other utilities extending to the proposed residence on Parcel B would be installed underground. Trenching for those utilities, as well as drainage improvements, would be performed as part of grading.

The applicant also requests approval of a tree permit for project-related impacts to code-protected trees located on the subject property, including the removal of eight trees (three valley oaks, one coast live oak, three coast redwoods, and one ash with a combined diameter of 149 inches), and work including construction, trenching or grading within the driplines of four trees (one valley oak and three coast live oaks with a combined diameter of 79 inches). Up to seventeen non-code-protected trees (thirteen valley oak, two coast redwood, one black walnut, and one fan palm) located within the public right-of-way may also be removed or potentially altered due to work within their driplines. Project impacts to the trees include being located within the footprint of site improvements, the new residential structure, or accessory structures such as retaining walls.

On November 5, 2024, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan. The subject Minor Subdivision and Rezoning applications were deemed “complete” for processing on October 7, 2024. Therefore, the County General Plan 2005-2020 applies and is cited throughout this Initial Study.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The subject property is located on Green Valley Road in the Alamo area of the County, approximately 1/4-mile north of Stone Valley Road and approximately 1-3/4 miles northeast of I-680. Access to I-680 is at either Stone Valley Road or El Cerro Boulevard. Developments in the surrounding unincorporated area are located within a variety of single-family residential zoning districts (R-10, R-15, R-20, R-40, or R-100), Planned Unit (P-1) districts, and General Agriculture (A-2) districts. Nearby town centers include Alamo (e.g., Alamo Plaza) approximately 3 miles to the west and downtown Danville approximately 2 miles to the south.

The surrounding area of Alamo is predominantly developed with single-family residences. The subject property is bounded by Green Valley Road on the east and single-family residences on the north, south, and west. Other land uses in the vicinity include schools such as Monte Vista High School and Los Cerros Middle School, Monte Vista swimming pool and sports complex, and Oak Hill Park, all approximately 1/2-mile south of the project site. The Green Valley trail head with public hiking access to the Summit Trail at the base of Mt. Diablo is located approximately 962 feet north of the subject property. The nearest water body is the West Branch of Green Valley Creek approximately 378 feet west of the project site. As designated by the U.S.

Census Bureau urban area reference map, the subject property is located within the Concord-Walnut Creek urban area, however, there is an element of suburban/rural character due to open hillsides and very low-density residential development to the west, and small roads and lanes of residential areas in the vicinity that typically lack sidewalks and often lack curbs.

The subject property is an approximately 2-acre, irregularly shaped lot located within a General Agricultural (A-2) zoning district. The property is one legal lot comprised of two tax parcels, created as Parcel "C" of minor subdivision MS66-0089 (43LSM13, filed June 190, 1966), and is developed with a single-family residence, driveway, and barn. Located within the foothills of Mt. Diablo and situated at the bottom of a low hill that is part of a series of low ridges and small canyons to the west, the subject property has fairly steep topography rising approximately 140 feet from the eastern property line to the western property line with an average slope of approximately 53 percent. The elevation ranges from approximately 525 feet to 670 feet above sea level. The area of the project site where the barn is located has been leveled, with slopes less than 15 percent. Nineteen mature, code-protected trees (measuring more than 6.5-inches in diameter) on the subject property and seventeen mature, non-code-protected trees in the public right-of-way along the frontage of the subject property were inventoried by the project arborist.

10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement). Please be advised that this may not be an exhaustive list and that approval may be required from other public agencies not listed here:

- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District
- Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (Central San)
- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

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

A Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was sent on October 31, 2024, to Wilton Rancheria, Cultural Preservation Department and on November 1, 2024, to the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation. Pursuant to Section 21080.3.1(d), there is a 30-day time period for the Wilton Rancheria or the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation to either request or decline consultation in writing for this project.

On December 12, 2024, the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation requested consultation, resulting in email correspondence received from the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation on January 27, 2025, indicating that due to the proximity of this project to Green Valley Creek, the project area may be sensitive for Tribal Cultural Resources. As of the writing of this Initial Study, the Wilton Rancheria has not responded to the Opportunity to Request Consultation.

As a courtesy, the County will provide a copy of this environmental document for the Tribes' comments.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would have been potentially affected by this project, but have been mitigated in a manner as to not result in a significant effect on the environment:

<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Syd Sotoodeh
Senior Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

January 2, 2026

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

(On November 5, 2024, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan. This project was deemed “complete” for processing on October 7, 2024. Therefore, the County General Plan 2005- 2020 applies and is cited throughout this Initial Study.)

Figure 9-1 of the Open Space Element of the County General Plan 2005 – 2020 identifies major scenic ridges and waterways within the County. According to Figure 9, there are no scenic waterways within the vicinity of the project site. The subject property is located within the foothills of Mt. Diablo and situated at the bottom of a low hill that is part of a series of low ridges and small canyons spanning to the northwest of the project site. These ridges are unnamed; however, they are identified in Figure 9 as an area of scenic ridges. The proposed project site for the construction of a new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B is approximately 650 feet below the top of the nearest scenic ridge, which is developed with several existing single-family homes, at least one of which is visible from the Green Valley Road public right-of-way and adjacent single-family residential neighborhood. The area of the property above the existing driveway is very steep, rising approximately 120 feet in elevation from the east to the west, limiting development to the lower-lying, eastern area of the property. As such, after demolition of an existing barn, the project would construct one new residence on proposed Parcel B that is designed to utilize the relatively flat area of the property. There are no changes proposed to the existing residence that would remain on proposed Parcel A. Due to the proposed location of the new residence at the lower elevation on the lot adjacent to an established single-family residential neighborhood, the presence of many mature trees in the area, and the nearest ridge being

developed with single-family residences, views of the project site from any nearby public trails or other scenic ridges would be marginal. Thus, the project would have a negligible impact on views of or from a nearby scenic ridgeway and would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (No Impact):*

Interstate 680, an officially designated State Scenic Highway, is located approximately 1.8 miles southwest of the property at its nearest location. As such, the subject property is not visible from this Scenic Highway. Thus, the project which involves the removal of mature trees, minor grading for an improved driveway, and construction of one new residence on proposed Parcel B would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway area.

c) *In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As designated by the U.S. Census Bureau urban area reference map, the subject property is located within the Concord-Walnut Creek urban area and is therefore considered to be within an urbanized area. The Transportation and Circulation Element (Figure 5-4) of the County General Plan identifies County-designated scenic routes in the County.

According to Figure 5-4, the nearest County designated scenic route within the project vicinity is Stone Valley Road. Generally, a scenic route corridor includes the land adjacent to the scenic route and extends to the landscape visible from the route. Stone Valley Road is located approximately 1,720 feet (0.3 miles) south of the project site. As such, the subject property is not visible or distinguishable from any portion of the scenic route and the project would have no impact on County-designated scenic resources.

The project site is located within an A-2, General Agricultural (A-2) zoning district and an established neighborhood. As part of the project, the applicant requested a rezone from A-2 to an R-40, Single-Family Residential (R-40) zoning district, which is consistent with the SL, Single-Family Residential – Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designation for the subject property. No aspect of the project would change the allowed single-family residential land use on the lot pursuant to the County General Plan land use designations. As proposed, the minor subdivision would result in two lots that are consistent with the R-40 zoning district requirements for minimum lot area and average width. The surrounding area of the subject property is predominantly developed with single-family residences, including an existing residence that would remain on Parcel A as proposed by the project. Approval of a tree permit and review of project plans have also been requested for the demolition of an existing barn and construction of site improvements including an improved driveway, retaining walls, and a new single-family residence that would be located on proposed Parcel B in the same location as the existing barn. Although the existing visual character of the subject property would change with the new residential development, the proposed height and setback of the new home is consistent with the requirements of the R-40 zoning district. In addition, this type of visual change is consistent with the Single-Family Residential – Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designation of the subject property, as a single-family residence is permitted by-right for each new lot and the project complies with the

allowed density. The applicant has requested a tree permit for the removal of up to eight code-protected trees due to their location within the project site. If approved, the applicant would be required to submit a tree planting plan prior to the issuance of the first building permit as restitution for the removal of trees, ensuring planting of replacement trees on the site. The extent to which the project may affect public views would be reduced through recommended conditions of approval for the restitution of any tree approved for removal through planting replacement trees. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and impacts would be 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 Impact)*

Due to the residential nature of the project, minimal glare would be introduced in the area. New sources of external light associated with the proposed single-family home may illuminate the surrounding properties. There would be a change in ambient nighttime light levels on the project site. The extent to which project lighting would spill off the project site would be reduced through recommended COAs including requiring outdoor lighting to be oriented down onto the project site and to be shielded where necessary to avoid glare and contain lighting within the subject property. As such, the project would have a less than significant impact on day or nighttime views in the area due to new sources of substantial light or glare.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County Code. “Title 8 – Zoning.”

https://library.municode.com/ca/contracosta_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 3: Land Use Element.” 2005 – 2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30913/Ch3-Land-Use-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 5: “Transportation and Circulation Element.” 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 9: Open Space Element.” 2005 – 2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30919/Ch9-Open-Space-Element?bidId=>

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

U.S. Department Of Commerce, Economics & Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. U.S. Census Bureau TIGERweb Geography Division map, Accessed March 5, 2025.
<https://tigerweb.geo.census.gov/tigerweb/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, b, e) *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, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract, or 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 Impact)*

The subject property is located within a General Agricultural District (A-2) zoning district and Single-Family Residential – Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designation. The property is not under a Williamson Act Contract with the County. According to the California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder map, the western area (approximately half) of the subject property is within an area deemed to be "Grazing Land" which is considered to contain vegetation that is suited to livestock grazing. However, there is no evidence that the subject property is utilized for such agricultural uses. The eastern area (approximately half) of the subject property along the Green Valley Road frontage is within an area deemed to be "Urban and Built-Up Land" which is considered to be occupied by or suitable for urban structures with a building density of at least one unit per 1.5 acres. Typical developments in the Urban and Built-Up Land category include residential uses such as the project proposes. Neither category is considered to be prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. As proposed, no development will occur within the western area of the property. The applicant has requested a

rezone from A-2 to a Single-Family Residential (R-40) zoning district which is compatible with the existing SL General Plan land use designation. Thus, although the proposed subdivision may result in the rezoning of the property to a R-40 district, and development of the resulting Parcel B with a single-family residential use, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use and would have a less than significant impact due to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

c, d) *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 result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The Arborist Report prepared for the project (Traverso Tree, 11/30/2023) inventoried a total of 36 trees, including twenty valley oaks, four coast live oaks, two black walnuts, eight coast redwoods, one ash tree, and one fan palm. Approximately half are located within the public right-of-way (Green Valley Road) with the rest on the subject property. The subject property is located within a General Agricultural District (A-2) zoning district and Single-Family Residential – Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designation. Although the A-2 zoning district allows forestry as a permitted use, the project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), which is “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 subject property is not considered timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526, nor is the property zoned for Timberland Production as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g). California Public Resources Code Section 4526 defines timberland as “land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.” California Government Code 51104(g), under the Timberland Productivity Act, defines timberland as privately owned land, or land acquired for state forest purposes, which is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, and which is capable of growing an average annual volume of wood fiber of at least 15 cubic feet per acre.

The subject 2.004-acre property may be capable of supporting a 10 percent native tree cover of any species; however, it is surrounded by existing suburban development, including single-family residences, and would not be suitable for management as forest land, recreation, or other public benefits, and the property does not contain any wetland, creek, or other water resources. The property is hilly with slopes up to and exceeding 26% which would not be suitable for timber projection. In addition, as stated in the Contra Costa County General Plan, no land in the County is used for timber harvesting. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland, and there would be a less than significant impact resulting from the loss of forest land, or conversion of forest land, due to non-forest use.

Sources of Information

California Department of Conservation. "California Important Farmland Finder." 2022.
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 3: Land Use Element." 2005 – 2020.
<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30913/Ch3-Land-Use-Element?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County Code. "Title 8 – Zoning."
https://library.municode.com/ca/contracosta_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO.

Traverso Tree, Consulting Arborist. "Arborist Report for 1921 Green Valley Road, Alamo." 20 November 2023; Received on 14 February 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		Less Than Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Contra Costa County is within the San Francisco Bay air basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) pursuant to the *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final 2017 Clean Air Plan*. The purpose of the *Clean Air Plan* is to bring the air basin into compliance with the requirements of Federal and State air quality standards and to protect the climate through the reduction of criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases. BAAQMD has prepared CEQA Guidelines to assist lead agencies in air quality analysis, as well as to promote sustainable development in the region. The potential air quality impacts for this project were evaluated using the BAAQMD 2022 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. If a project exceeds the screening criteria levels, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable impact on a region's ability to attain national ambient air quality standards for six common air pollutants (criteria pollutants). Pursuant to these guidelines, if a project does not exceed the screening criteria size it would not need to perform a detailed assessment of the project's criteria air pollutants and

precursor emissions and is expected to result in less than significant impacts to air quality. According to the Single Land Use Construction and Operational Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Screening Levels (Table 4-1) for single-family residential development, the operational screening size is 421 dwelling units, and the construction-related screening size is 254 dwelling units.

As proposed, the two-lot subdivision will result in the construction of one new single-family residence on new Parcel B and associated development on the project site including improvements to an existing driveway and new retaining walls. One new dwelling unit would be well below the BAAQMD operational or construction-related screening criteria for this type of project. The project site is not located in a Community Air Protection Program Community pursuant to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and is therefore not subject to a community emissions reduction program or plan (CERP). Therefore, the subdivision of land and proposed development of the project would not be in conflict with the Clean Air Plan or obstruct its implementation. Nor would the project be in conflict with a community emissions reduction plan.

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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As mentioned above in subsection-a, the proposed two-lot subdivision is not expected to exceed the threshold for criteria pollutant screening size for new single-family residences as determined by the BAAQMD. Thus, the project would not result in significant emissions of criteria air pollutants during the construction period or during project operation.

Based on a maximum score of 100 where a high score reflects a higher pollution burden as compared to other census tracts in California, the CalEnviroScreen score for the subject property and surrounding vicinity is one (1). In addition, the healthy places index score for the vicinity is 99, where a high score indicates healthier community conditions. Although the proposed project could contribute incrementally to the level of criteria air pollutants in the atmosphere, the project would have a less than significant impact on the level of any criteria pollutant.

c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The project site is located within an established area of Alamo that is generally developed with single-family residential uses with schools and a community sports, parks, and trail heads all less than $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile from the subject property. Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD's 2022 CEQA Guidelines identifies the quantifiable air quality thresholds of significance for determining whether project-level operational and construction-related activities would have significant environmental impacts, including those related to substantial pollutant concentrations. As mentioned above in subsection-a, the proposed two-lot subdivision with development of a new single-family residence on resultant Parcel B does not exceed the threshold for criteria pollutant screening size for new single-family residential lots or single-family residences as determined by the BAAQMD. Thus, it is expected that the project would not result in substantial emissions of pollutant concentrations during operation or construction activities. However, although temporary, during grading and construction activities, the project could have an adverse environmental impact on sensitive receptors due to fugitive dust emissions. Consequently, staff will recommend as a condition of approval that the applicant be required to implement the following *Basic Best Management*

Practices for Construction-Related Fugitive Dust Emissions (BAAQMD, Table 5-2) throughout the grading and construction phase of the project:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
7. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
8. Unpaved roads providing access to sites located 100 feet or further from a paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch layer of compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.
9. The property owner or site contractor shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's General Air Pollution Complaints phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

As a result, the project would have a less than significant potential of exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations including fugitive dust emissions.

d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The BAAQMD's CEQA guidelines indicate that odor impacts can occur from the siting of a new odor source (e.g., wastewater treatment plant), or from the siting of a new sensitive receptor (e.g., residents) near an existing odor source. The subject property is not located in an area with existing uses that typically produce odors (e.g., landfills or treatment plants). The future development of Parcel B would be within an established residential area, at a location and density that is compatible with the single-family residential General Plan land use designation on the subject property. Once constructed, the project would not produce any major sources of odor during operation. Diesel powered equipment and vehicles may be used on the site which may create temporary, localized odors during grading and construction of site improvements and the new residence on Parcel B. Although the proposed project could contribute incrementally to temporary odors due to diesel emissions during grading or construction, the project would not adversely affect a substantial number of people and would have a less than significant impact due to odor emissions.

Sources of Information

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. "California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines." Adopted 20 April 2022, revised 20 April 2023. <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. "Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final, 2017 Clean Air Plan." Adopted 19 April 2017. http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en.

California Air Resources Board. "Community Air Protection Program Communities." Website. Accessed June 2024. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/capp-communities>

California Emissions Estimator Model [Caleemod]. "1921 Green Valley Road, Alamo; Health and Equity Metrics." February 2025

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 3: Land Use Element." 2005 – 2020.
<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30913/Ch3-Land-Use-Element?bidId=>.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:

On October 31, 2023, Monk & Associates (M&A) biologists conducted a general survey of the subject property to search all habitats on the site, record all plant and wildlife species observed, and examination of the project site to determine if there could be any areas within the site that would be regulated waters of the U.S. and/or State level. M&A subsequently prepared a *Biological Resources Analysis* (Analysis; November 27, 2023) for the project proposing a minor subdivision, rezone, and development of one new single-family residence. Preparation of the report included a review of pertinent information available in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's (NCPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plant of California (2001) for records of special-status plant and/or animal species (threatened, endangered, rare) in the region of the project site. In addition, M&A researched all known record locations for special-status species to determine if any could occur on the project site or within the area. If approved, development of the two-lot minor subdivision would result in the removal of eight code-protected trees from the property and potential project impacts to four code-protected trees due to grading and trenching for utilities, and construction of retaining walls, driveway improvements, and a new single-family residence on resulting Parcel B. The project may also result in potential impacts due to the removal or work within driplines of seventeen non-code-protected trees located within the public right-of-way.

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 Impact With Mitigation Incorporated)*

Special-status Plants: In their analysis, M&A indicated that with the exception of landscaping around the existing residence, the entire project site can be characterized as non-native annual grassland with an assortment of trees that were either planted years ago (e.g., coast redwoods) or voluntarily and naturally established (primarily oaks). M&A found that no special-status plants have been mapped on or adjacent to the subject property, although 16 special-status plant species are known to occur in the region. The project site where construction of the residence would occur is a barn and former horse pasture and is highly disturbed due to past activities as a horse pasture and regular weed control (whacking or mowing) activities now that horses are no longer kept on the property. M&A indicates that although some special status plant species known from the area would have been flowering in October of 2023, during their site visit, no special-status plants were observed onsite. In addition, M&A indicates that the project site does not support the specialized habitats including rocky serpentine or alkaline soils necessary for growth of special-status plant species such as uncommon jewelflower (*Streptanthus albidus* ssp. *peramoenus*), Congdon's tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *congdonii*), or San Joaquin spearscale (*Extriplex*

joaquiniana). Nor does it support the type of micro-habitats such as rock outcrops, marshes and swamps, or chaparral needed for Mount Diablo jewel flower (*Streptanthus hispidus*), slender-leaved pondweed (*Stuckenia filiformis* ssp. *alpina*), Hall's bush mallow (*Malacothamnus hallii*), Mount Diablo manzanita (*Arctostaphylos auriculata*), or Diablo helianthella (*Helianthella castanea*). As such, no impacts to special-status plants are expected from development of the proposed project.

Special-status Wildlife: M&A found that foraging raptors and passerine birds, nesting passerine birds, western bumble, and special-status bats could be impacted by the proposed project.

- *Foraging or Nesting Raptor/Passerine Species.* In their analysis, M&A indicated that the subject property's grassland areas do provide suitable foraging habitat for a variety of birds including House Finch, Lesser Goldfinch, California Scrub-jay, and Northern Flicker, as raptors such as Red-tailed Hawk, all of which M&A observed during their site survey. M&A indicates that all of the trees on the project site are too small to support large raptor stick nests; therefore, trees on the project site would not provide suitable nesting habitat for raptors. Common song birds (passerine birds) could nest on the project site. All of these birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (50 CFR 10.13) and their eggs and young are protected under California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5. Any project-related impacts to these species would be considered a significant adverse impact. Potential impacts to these species from the proposed project include disturbance to nesting birds and possibly death of adults and/or young. In the absence of survey results, it must be concluded that impacts to nesting raptors and songbirds from the proposed project would be potentially significant pursuant to CEQA. This impact could be mitigated to a level considered less than significant.
- *Western Bumblebee.* On June 12, 2019, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) voted to accept a petition from the Xerces Society to consider listing four subspecies of bumble bee under CESA, one of which has a current range that include the project site, the western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis*). A recent court decision determined that the California Fish and Game Commission has the authority to list insects. Candidacy was reinstated for these bumble bee species on September 30, 2022. As candidate species, they receive the same legal protection afforded to endangered or threatened species (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2074.2 & 2085).

No documented observations of western bumblebee occur within the project site. However, until recently, few people have been surveying for bumblebee species. The proposed project could constitute a potentially significant impact on western bumble bees because no focused surveys have been conducted to date, the site is within the range for this species, and the annual grassland habitat onsite with small mammal burrows provide potentially suitable underground nesting habitat. Should western bumblebee colonies or overwintering queens be present in underground nests in project construction areas, work activities related to the proposed project could adversely affect these species and their habitats.

- *Pallid Bat and Townsend's Big-eared Bat.* The barn proposed for demolition and the trees proposed for removal may provide roosting and maternity habitat for special-status bats including the pallid bat and the Townsend's big-eared bat. These bat species are

designated by the State as “species of special concern.” In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15380) which protects “rare” and “endangered” species as defined by CEQA (species of special concern meet this CEQA definition), impacts to these bat species would be considered a potentially significant adverse impact. Potential impacts to special-status bats from the proposed project include loss of maternity and/or roosting habitat, death of individual adult bats and/or young. This impact could be mitigated to a less than significant level following Mitigation Measure BIO-3.

- *Alameda Whipsnake.* According to M&A’s analysis, the project site is located approximately 1 mile outside of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) critical habitat Unit 4 designated for Contra Costa County. Rock outcrops are an important feature of Alameda whipsnake habitat as they provide opportunities for retreat and promote lizard populations. Alameda whipsnakes are also typically found in chaparral and coastal sage scrub communities and are known to venture up to 500 feet into adjacent grassland, oak savanna, oak-bay woodland, and riparian habitats. The snake primarily inhabits the inner coast range in western and central Contra Costa County and the nearest CNDBB record of the species is located approximately 1.7 miles northeast of the project site (Occurrence No. 125; 1998). M&A indicated that since the project site is a developed area that would be re-developed due to the demolition of a barn and grading for a new residence, it is not considered undisturbed land that supports wildlife such as Alameda whipsnake. In addition, neither the project site nor the surrounding area within approximately 150 feet provide the type of habitats, such as rock outcrops, for the snake. As such, M&A’s analysis concluded that the Alameda whipsnake is unlikely to occur on the project site; therefore, no impacts to this species are expected.

Potential Impacts: Based on the above, the *Biological Resources Analysis* indicates that there is the potential for special-status animal species to occur within the project site due to both observance of these species on the site, nearby and/or recent occurrences listed in the CNDBB, or suitable habitat for the species as summarized above. In addition, the barn and trees within and bordering the project area could be used for nesting by a variety of passerine and other avian species, or bats. Thus, the removal of trees from the subject property and development of the project could have an adverse environmental impact on nesting or foraging birds, raptors, western bumblebees, or bats.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would bring potential project-related impacts on biological resources to less than significant levels:

BIO-1: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Surveys – To avoid impacts to nesting birds, a nesting survey should be conducted **no more than 15 days prior to the commencement of demolition, construction, or tree removal, whichever is first**, if this work would commence between February 1st and August 31st. The nesting survey should include an examination of the barn onsite and all trees onsite and within 200 feet of the entire project site (i.e., within a zone of influence of nesting birds), not just trees slated for removal. The zone of influence includes those areas outside the project site where birds could be disturbed by earth-moving vibrations and/or other construction-related noise.

If birds are identified nesting on or within the zone of influence of the construction project, a qualified biologist should establish a temporary protective nest buffer around

the nest(s). The nest buffer should be staked with orange construction fencing. The buffer must be of sufficient size to protect the nesting site from construction-related disturbance and should be established by a qualified ornithologist or biologist with extensive experience working with nesting birds near and on construction sites. Typically, adequate nesting buffers are 50 feet from the nest site or nest tree dripline for small birds and up to 300 feet for sensitive nesting birds that include several raptor species known within the region of the project site but that are not expected to occur on the project site. Upon completion of nesting surveys, if nesting birds are identified on or within a zone of influence of the project site, a qualified ornithologist/biologist that frequently works with nesting birds should prescribe adequate nesting buffers to protect the nesting birds from harm while the project is constructed.

No construction or earth-moving activity should occur within any established nest protection buffer prior to September 1 unless it is determined by a qualified ornithologist/biologist that the young have fledged (that is, left the nest) and have attained sufficient flight skills to avoid project construction zones, or that the nesting cycle is otherwise completed. In the region of the project site, most species complete nesting by mid-July. This date can be significantly earlier or later and would have to be determined by the qualified biologist. At the end of the nesting cycle, and fledging from the nest by its occupants, as determined by a qualified biologist, temporary nesting buffers may be removed, and construction may commence in established nesting buffers without further regard for the nest site.

BIO-2 Pre-construction Western Bumblebee Surveys – To avoid “take” of western bumblebee, a qualified entomologist shall conduct a take avoidance survey for active bumblebee colony nesting sites in any previously undisturbed area prior to the start of construction, if the work will occur during the flying season (March through August). Survey results, including negative findings, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department (CDD) **prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, or the start of ground-disturbing activities, whichever is first**. Surveys shall take place during the flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground. The surveys shall occur when temperatures are above 60 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), on sunny days with wind speeds below 8 miles per hour, and at least 2 hours after sunrise and 3 hours before sunset as these are the best conditions to detect bumblebees. Surveyors shall conduct transect surveys focusing on detection conditions to detect bumblebees. Surveyors shall conduct transect surveys focusing on detection of foraging bumblebees and underground nests using visual aids such as binoculars. At a minimum, a survey report shall provide the following:

- If no western bumblebees or potential western bumblebees are detected, no further mitigation is required.
- If potential western bumblebees are seen but cannot be identified, the applicant shall obtain authorization from CDFW to use nonlethal netting methods to capture bumblebees to identify them to species.
- If protected bumblebee nests are found, a plan to protect bumblebee nests and individuals to ensure no take of western bumblebee species shall be developed

by a qualified entomologist and submitted to the (CDD) for review. The County shall approve the plan prior to implementation.

BIO-3: Pre-construction Bat Surveys – In order to avoid impacts to roosting pallid bat or Townsend’s big-eared bat, building and tree removal should only be conducted during seasonal periods of bat activity: between August 31 and October 15, when bats would be able to fly and feed independently, and between March 1 and April 1st to avoid hibernating bats, and prior to the formation of maternity colonies. Then a qualified biologist, one with at least two years of experience surveying for bats, should do preconstruction surveys for roosting bats **no more than 14 days prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit, or the start of tree removal, whichever is first**. If the qualified biologist finds evidence of bat presence during the surveys, then he/she should develop a plan for removal and exclusion, in conjunction with the CDFW.

If building or tree removal must occur outside of the seasonal activity periods mentioned above (i.e., between October 16 and February 28/29, or between April 2 and August 30), then a qualified biologist, one with at least two years of experience surveying for bats, should do preconstruction surveys **no more than 14 days prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit, or the start of tree removal, whichever is first**. If roosts are found, a determination should be made whether there are young. If a maternity site is found, impacts to the maternity site will be avoided by establishment of a non-disturbance buffer until the young have reached independence. The size of the buffer zone should be determined by the qualified bat biologist at the time of the surveys. If the qualified biologist finds evidence of bat presence during the surveys, then he/she should develop a plan for removal and exclusion, when there are not dependent young present, in conjunction with the CDFW.

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? (No Impact)*

M&A’s Analysis indicates that there is no riparian habitat or sensitive natural community on the project site that has been identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community

c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (No Impact)*

M&A’s Analysis indicates that there are no wetlands, creeks, streams or other jurisdictional waters located on the project site. The project site is too steep, and the soil is too friable for seasonal wetlands to develop. Precipitation flows overland, down the steep hill east towards Green Valley Road, to Green Valley Creek then San Ramon Creek, eventually flowing into the San Francisco Bay. Therefore, there is no likelihood of the project having a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands due to the proposed development of a new residence.

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 Impact)*

According to M&A's Analysis, wildlife corridors are linear and/or regional habitats that connect to other natural vegetation communities within a landscape that may be fractured by urbanization and other development. These types of corridors can provide avenues for animals (generally wide-ranging) to travel or migrate to breed, or due to environmental changes and natural disasters. Wildlife corridors may also facilitate the recolonization of older habitats. To be successful, the wildlife corridor must be accessible to wildlife for foraging, breeding, retreat, dispersing, etc.

M&A's Analysis indicates that there are no wildlife nursery grounds onsite or any significant regional wildlife corridors on the project site. In addition, the project site is essentially surrounded with existing residential development, including the ridge directly to the west and uphill of the project site. Although common wildlife species occur on the subject property and in the area (e.g., deer as observed during M&A's site visit), there is only a very small and localized wildlife corridor to the west and north, around existing houses and up to the East Bay Regional Park District open space approximately 0.5 miles to the west. Finally, the project site for the proposed new residence is in the same location as an existing barn, which already constrains wildlife movement on the site. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on nursery sites and would not adversely interfere with wildlife movement corridors.

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 Impact)*

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (Tree Ordinance) provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal and alteration while allowing for reasonable development of private property and tree maintenance. The subject property contains a number of mature trees, including valley or coast live oaks, coast redwoods, black walnut, fan palm, and ash, all of which are considered protected trees under the Tree Ordinance due to their size and their presence on a property that is further subdividable if the requested rezone to an R-40 zoning district is approved. The project proposes to remove a portion of these code-protected trees, or to alter code-protected trees by working within their driplines for site improvements or development of proposed Parcel B. Thus, due to the anticipated grading, trenching, and construction activities as part of the proposed project on the subject property, a tree permit has been requested as part of the minor subdivision application for the removal of eight code-protected trees and for the alteration of four code-protected trees due to potential drip line encroachment. As conditions of approval, staff will recommend that restitution in the form of replacement of any tree approved for removal, protection of remaining trees where work may occur within the drip lines of the trees, and implementation of the tree protection measures as recommended in the project's arborist report be required. Additional trees that are less than 6.5-inches in diameter or that are located within the public right-of-way may also be removed for construction or maintenance of the property, however, these trees are not protected pursuant to the Tree Ordinance. Project impacts to the trees include being located within the footprint of site improvements, the new residential structure, or accessory structures such as retaining walls. As a result of CDD staff applying the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance to the proposed project, the project would have a less than significant potential for conflict with any applicable policy or ordinance 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)*

The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP) was adopted by the County in October of 2006. The purpose of this plan is to provide a framework to protect natural resources while streamlining the environmental permitting process for impacts to covered, special status species within the rapidly expanding region of Eastern Contra Costa. The subject property is located outside of the HCP/NCCP urban development area and thus HCP ordinance no. 2007-53 does not apply to the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any conservation plan.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County Code. "Title 8 – Zoning."

https://library.municode.com/ca/contra_costa_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

Monk & Associates, Inc. "Biological Resource Analysis, 1921 Green Valley Road." 11 November 2023.

Traverso Tree, Consulting Arborist. "Arborist Report for 1921 Green Valley Road, Alamo." 20 November 2023.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant			No Impact
		With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact		
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 pursuant to §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 a resource identified as significant in a historical survey meeting the requirements of the Public Resources Code. According to

comments received from the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for this project (July 12, 2023), the Office of Historic Preservation has determined that any building or structure 45 years or older may be of historical value. The available property records indicate that the existing residence was built in 1969 and the existing barn in approximately 1970. The barn is proposed for demolition in order to construct one new single-family residence on resulting Parcel B. The existing residence on resulting Parcel A is proposed to remain and will be undisturbed by this project. However, neither the subject property nor any of the existing structures located on the parcel are listed in the California Register of Historic Resources or in the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory. Nor are they associated with historically or culturally significant events. Thus, the subdivision of the subject property and development of Parcel B would not cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated)*

According to the letter from staff of the NWIC (July 12, 2023), there is no record of any previous cultural resource studies for the proposed project area. However, CHRIS indicates that the project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites. As shown on Figure 9-2 (Archeological Sensitivity Map) of the Contra Costa County General Plan (2005-2020), the surrounding area to the west of the subject property is identified as having medium archeological sensitivity. However, the project site and the surrounding area to the east is a largely urbanized area that are excluded from archaeological sensitivity surveys although there may also be significant archaeological resources within these areas.

Potential Impacts: Upon approval of the project, the future development of the site would include ground disturbance which has the potential for uncovering previously unknown cultural resources.

The following mitigation measures will ensure that in the event cultural resources are discovered, the proper actions are taken to reduce the adverse environmental impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level:

CUL-1: If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during ground disturbance activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected. A qualified archaeologist 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 shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the finds and suggest appropriate mitigation(s) if deemed necessary.

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.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated)*

The project record does not have any prior cultural resource studies conducted at the subject property which indicate that human remains exist at the subject property.

Potential Impact: There is a possibility that human remains could be present, and that accidental discovery of human remains could occur.

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential to disturb any human remains, including those outside of formal cemeteries, to a less than significant level:

CUL-3: Should human remains be uncovered during grading, trenching, or other on-site excavation(s), earthwork within 30 yards of these materials shall be stopped until the County coroner has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the human remains and determine the proper treatment and disposition of the remains. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if the coroner determines the remains may be those of a Native American, the coroner is responsible for contacting the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by telephone within 24 hours. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, the NAHC will then determine a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) tribe and contact them. The MLD tribe has 48 hours from the time they are given access to the site to make recommendations to the land owner for treatment and disposition of the ancestor's remains. The land owner shall follow the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 for the remains.

Sources of Information

California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information System (NWIC).
“CDMS23-00005 & CDRZ23-03271 / APNs 194-070-016 & 194-070-018.” Agency Comment Response Letter. 12 July 2023.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 9: Open Space Element.” 2005 – 2020.
<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30919/Ch9-Open-Space-Element?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County. “Historic Resources Inventory.” Revised 2019. Accessed in 2024.
<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=>.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. ENERGY – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-b) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation, or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (No Impact)*

If approved, the project would result in the future construction of one new single-family residence on resulting Parcel B. On November 5, 2024, a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) was adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors in order to identify and achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by the year 2045 as mandated by the State under AB32, including encouraging the construction of new residences to be low-carbon or carbon-neutral and achieve higher levels of energy performance. Any future development of the project site will require compliance with all California Code Title 24 (CalGreen) building energy efficiency standards for single-family residences that are in effect at the time that building permit applications are submitted, including design standards and building components intended to conserve energy and any standards regarding the provision of solar energy. During construction, the project may require temporary electrical power. The General Contractor would be required to apply for a temporary power permit from the County and to comply with all applicable building standards for a temporary power connection. Therefore, there will be no impact on energy resources or state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency due to the two-lot minor subdivision or the construction or operation of a new single-family residence.

Sources of Information

California Building Code, 2022.

Contra Costa County. “Climate Action and Adaptation Plan.” Adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on 5 November 2024.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/84967/Contra-Costa-County-2024-Climate-Action-and-Adaptation-Plan-PDF?bidId=>.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 direct or indirect 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

A Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed minor subdivision was prepared by GFK & Associates, dated January 4, 2024 (GFK Investigation) on behalf of the project proponent. The findings in the GFK Investigation were peer-reviewed by the County Peer Review Geologist.

a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:*

 i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

 ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

(Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations Incorporated)

The provisions of the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act can be found in the California Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.8, Sections 2690-2699.6. This law is similar in many respects to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Mapping Act, which has been implemented by Contra Costa County for the past 50+ years. However, Seismic Hazard Zone (SHZ) maps issued by the CGS identify areas that are at risk of earthquake triggered landslides and earthquake triggered liquefaction. There are standards for the required reports. To ensure that SHZ reports comply with those standards, the state law requires that all reports are subject to peer review by a California licensed registered geologist or geotechnical engineer. The consultant-prepared report, along with evidence of peer review, is required to be provided to the CGS within 30 days of completion of the peer review. Accompanying each SHZ map is a Seismic Hazard Zone Report that explains the methodology used by the CGS. The report presents technical data on a) geology, b) groundwater, c) geologic probabilistic seismic hazard analysis model and its application to liquefaction and landslide hazard assessment d) results of materials testing, d) ground motion assessment, e) lists key references and f) describes the zoning techniques. The SHZ seismicity analysis on a peak ground acceleration having a 10% probability of being exceeded in a 50-year period. The project site is located within the Diablo Quadrangle according to the Diablo Quad SHZ Map, issued on February 22, 2024. According to the Diablo Quad SHZ Map (attached as Figure 5 to the Geology Peer Review for the project), the project site is within an Earthquake-Induced Landslide Zone.

The purpose of the GFK Investigation was to evaluate the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed minor subdivision, and provide geotechnical recommendations needed for the construction of the new residence and associated improvements. At the time of the investigation, GFK was provided with preliminary plans for the project. Their scope of work included: (i) site reconnaissance; (ii) review of pertinent geologic maps and reports; (iii) limited subsurface exploration of the project site; (iv) laboratory testing of samples retrieved from the borings; (v) evaluation of the data gathered; and (vi) preparation of a report documenting the investigation and presenting GFK's conclusions and recommendations. Field exploration included the logging of five (5) auger borings ranging from approximately 11 feet to 26 feet in depth (locations shown on Figure 4 of the GFK report). The logs are presented in Figures 6 through 10 and show the details of the units penetrated. The logs classify the materials penetrated using the Unified Soil Classification System; provide SPT adjusted blow counts, as well as presenting the results of laboratory testing of soil samples retrieved from the borings. Based chiefly on the photo-interpretative mapping of the USGS for landslide and other surficial deposits of the Diablo 7.5-minute quadrangle, GFK did not regard landslide displacement or ground failure to be a significant hazard for the proposed project. Although no landslide deposits are present on the hillside overlooking the project site, the methodology used by the CEG geologists has identified a potential risk of earthquake triggered ground failure.

Potential Impacts

A summary of the potential impacts based on the GFK Investigation and Geology Peer Review is below. Mitigation measures are available that would ensure the impacts are less than significant.

- Ground Rupture. The site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. On that basis the risk of surface fault ground rupture within the project site is negligible.
- Seismicity/Ground Shaking: The site is within the seismically active San Francisco Bay Region area, where a moderate to high magnitude earthquake is a foreseeable event. The risk of structural damage from earthquake ground shaking is controlled by building and grading regulations, compliance with the latest provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), and the use of sound engineering judgement. The seismic design provisions of the CBC prescribe minimum lateral forces applied statistically to the structure(s), combined with the gravity forces and dead- and live-loads. The code-prescribed lateral forces are generally considered to be substantially smaller than the comparable forces that would be associated with a major earthquake. The intent of the code is to enable structures to (i) resist minor earthquakes without damage, (ii) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage but with some non-structural damage, and (iii) resist major earthquakes without collapse but with some structural as well as non-structural damage.

The California Building Code (CBC) mandates that for structures requiring building permits (including the proposed residence, retaining walls over 3 ft. in height, and bioretention filters), the design must consider both foundation conditions and proximity of active faults and their associated ground shaking characteristics. With conservative design and quality construction, ground shaking damage can be kept to a practical minimum. Design level geotechnical reports routinely provide seismic design parameters based on the CBC. Thus, upon implementation of the mitigations below, adverse effects due to strong seismic ground shaking would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- Liquefaction: Since 2018, the California Geological Survey (CGS) has commenced updating and issuing Seismic Hazard (SHZ) maps for Contra Consta County. Based on the most recent SHZ maps for liquefaction, although all of the public right-of-way along the subject property's frontage is in a liquefaction SHZ, no part of the project site is located within the hazard zone. In addition, Figure 10-5 of the General Plan Safety Element locates the project site within an area that is rated "generally low" liquefaction potential. Liquefaction hazard is primarily limited to relatively loose, cohesionless soil that is saturated. Considering that bedrock on the project site is relatively near the ground surface, the surface soils on the site are expansive (clayey), and the ground surface is sloping/relatively steep, rapid runoff is expected resulting in a lower expectation for soil saturation. During GFK's investigation, no free water was identified in the exploratory borings, all of which penetrated bedrock. Consequently, GFK considers the liquefaction potential low. As such, the risk of liquefaction can be considered less than significant.
- Expansion and Corrosion Potential Hazard: Laboratory testing performed by GFK indicates that surface soils on the site are moderately to highly expansive. Although corrosion potential testing of soils was not included in GFK's scope of work, recommendations are included in GFK's Investigation to address expansive soils including future corrosion testing. Depending on the outcome of future corrosion potential testing, recommendations could be provided to protect concrete and/ or steel that is in contact with the ground. In addition, with implementation of the mitigations below, the impact of expansive and potentially corrosive soils would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- Landslides and Slope Stability: The County General Plan Safety Element ground failure policy most applicable to the project site is Policy 10-22 which states that “slope stability shall be a primary consideration on the ability of land to be developed or designated for urban uses.” There are no mapped landslides on or near the project site and, based on the most recent SHZ maps for landslides, the subject property is not located in a landslide SHZ. However, the SHZ map indicates that during a high magnitude earthquake the stability of all slopes will be reduced. Furthermore, a) slopes on the site are steep, varying from less than 15% to more than 26% degrees; and b) the project site is in an outcrop belt of expansive and weakly consolidated bedrock. The risks of slope failure will be greatest if an earthquake occurs during the winter rainy season, when surface soils are saturated. It should also be recognized that the hazard posed by ground failure is strongly influenced by the type of landslide (e.g., fast moving debris flow, cohesive/slow moving earthflow, depth of the slide plane, etc.). Any impacts due to landslides and slope instability during a high-magnitude earthquake would be reduced to less than significant levels upon implementation of the mitigations below.

Accordingly, staff recommends that the following mitigation measures be incorporated as part of the project:

GEO-1: At least 45 days prior to filing of the Parcel Map or CDD stamp-approval of plans for the issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is first, the project proponent shall submit for review by the Community Development Division (CDD) and the County Peer Review Geologist a final geotechnical report and *Landslide Hazard Assessment* that is prepared by an engineering geologist working in combination with the project geotechnical engineer. The report shall be compliant with the standards required for projects within the SHZ and its scope shall include:

- an original geologic map prepared by the engineering geologist which shall interpret site conditions, including delineation of any potentially hazardous soil conditions, and measurements of the orientation of bedding and dominant jointing from measurements made on site or in the immediate vicinity;
- a slope stability analysis that is compliant with standards of the SHZ Mapping Act, including standards for an acceptable safety factor and justification for the method of analysis selected (e.g. displacement model or computer program utilized in the analysis; justification for any assumptions regarding seismic parameters and engineering properties of rock and soil that are made);
- a review of improvement plans and updated recommendations and specifications that are needed for the project, if any, including any mitigation measure needed to respond to the results of slope stability analysis;
- recommendations for geotechnical monitoring and testing during the construction period; and,
- laboratory test data to evaluate the corrosion potential of soils and bedrock.

An investigation that does not adequately respond to each provision above shall require submitting supplemental data.

GEO-2: Prior to requesting final building inspection for a new residence or retaining walls, the applicant/project proponent shall submit a letter or report from the geotechnical

engineer documenting the monitoring work performed as indicated in the *Landslide Hazard Assessment* (GEO-1), including a map showing location and depth of subdrains and their cleanouts (if any), compaction test result and description of the bedrock exposures made during construction (i.e., lithology, degree of weathering, and orientation of bedding, etc.), and the opinion of the geotechnical engineer on compliance of the as-graded and as-built improvements with recommendations in the geotechnical report.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Based on their review of site conditions, GFK indicates the presence of undocumented fills on the site and recommends that existing fill within specific areas of the project site be over-excavated and graded in accordance with their recommendations. Any areas that are disturbed during construction of the project would be covered by the proposed improvements or landscaping. Since all areas of the property that will be disturbed will be covered by new structures, pervious and impervious surfaces, or landscaping, the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil is less than significant. Additionally, a routine provision for grading permits in Contra Costa County is a submittal requirement for an erosion control plan. This plan is subject to technical review by County Grading Section inspectors. Implementation of an erosion control plan during grading and/or construction activities would ensure that the project results in less than significant impacts on erosion or the loss of topsoil.

c) *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)*

As discussed above in subsection-a, the subject property is not located within a landslide hazard zone or a liquefaction hazard zone as designated by the CGS. Based on GFK's Investigation and County Geology Peer Review, there are no mapped landslides on or near the project site, nor is the project site located within a landslide SHZ. However, the SHZ map indicates that during a high magnitude earthquake the stability of all slopes will be reduced. The slopes on the site are steep, varying from less than 15% to more than 26% degrees, and the project site is in an outcrop belt of expansive and weakly consolidated bedrock. The risks of slope failure will be greatest if an earthquake occurs during the winter rainy season, when surface soils are saturated. The hazard posed by ground failure is strongly influenced by the type of landslide (e.g., fast moving debris flow, cohesive/slow moving earthflow, depth of the slide plane, etc.).

Potential Impacts: If new parcels are developed with new single-family residences, there is potential for project impacts due to earthquake-induced landslides and slope instability.

Implementation of mitigation measures **GEO-1 and GEO-2** in subsection-a above would ensure that any potential impacts due to potential future landslides and slope instability would be reduced 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)*

The surficial soil is the Alo clay, which is considered highly expansive by the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, and laboratory testing of on-site soils performed by GFK confirms they range from moderately to highly expansive, depending on the clay content. According to the County's geology peer reviewer, the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County considers this soil series to be highly corrosive to uncoated steel.

Potential Impacts: When expansive materials are subjected to increases in moisture content, they swell if unconfined. As expansive soils swell, they are capable of lifting some foundation types or of causing pavement and ground surfaces to crack or be laterally displaced. These pressures can cause slabs and shallow foundations to heave and crack. When the expansive materials dry, they shrink, causing slabs and shallow foundations to settle. Thus, expansive clays, which are common in the San Francisco Bay Area, have the potential to cause extensive damage to structures, particularly when combined with the Bay Area's significant seasonal moisture changes due to its pronounced wet and dry seasons. There are potentially significant impacts due to the presence of expansive soils if the proposed parcels are developed with single-family residences, but mitigation measures are available that would ensure the impacts are less than significant.

The planning-level GFK Investigation indicates structures require appropriate design measures to control damage from expansive soils. Similarly, there are practical measures to prevent or control soil corrosion from damaging or weakening concrete and/or steel from damage. In addition, implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** in subsection-a above would ensure that any potential impacts resulting from expansive soils are reduced to less than significant levels.

e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)*

The subject property is within an area served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. Thus, a septic system will not be necessary or installed as a result of this project.

f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigations Incorporated)*

There is no indication in either the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by GFK & Associates or in the geology peer reviews for the project that there are known paleontological resources or unique geologic features on the subject property. Grading and construction of the proposed single-family residence, retaining walls, and driveway improvements would occur in an area of the subject property that is already developed or disturbed by the existing residential land use. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact with respect to the project directly or indirectly destroying unique geologic features.

Potential Impact: Although there are no known paleontological resources located on the subject property, ground disturbance during the project's grading phase has the potential for disturbing previously unknown unique paleontological resources.

In addition to the mitigation measures for Cultural Resources, the following mitigation measure will ensure that in the event unique paleontological resources are discovered, the proper actions are taken to reduce the adverse environmental impacts to unique paleontological resources to a less than significant level:

GEO-3: Should unique paleontological materials be uncovered during grading, trenching, or other on-site excavation(s), all earthwork within 30 yards of the materials shall be stopped until the Community Development Division (CDD) has been notified, and a qualified paleontologist contacted and retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and, if deemed necessary, suggest appropriate mitigation(s).

Sources of Information

California Geological Survey. "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation – California Geological Survey." Map. Accessed 2024. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 10: Safety Element." 2005-2020. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30920/Ch10-Safety-Element?bidId=1>

Darwin Meyers Associates. "Geologic Peer Review / 30-Day Comments, CDMS23-00005 & CDRZ23-03271." 28 March 2024.

Darwin Meyers Associates. "Geologic Peer Review / Revised TPM, CDMS23-00005 & CDRZ23-03271." 9 September 2024.

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

GFK & Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Consultants. "Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Minor Subdivision, APN's 194-070-015 and 194-070-018, 1921 Green Valley Road." Prepared for Mr. George Moore. 4 January 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SUMMARY:

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this study, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted the *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan* that, in addition to various criteria air pollutants, addresses greenhouse gas (GHG) emission within a region. As proposed, the two-lot subdivision will result in the construction of one new single-family residence on new Parcel B and associated development on the project site including improvements to an existing driveway

and new retaining walls. The construction and future operation of one new residence is likely to generate GHG emissions, however, one new dwelling unit would be well below the BAAQMD operational- or construction-related screening criteria for this type of project. For single-family residential development, the operational screening size is 421 dwelling units, and the construction-related screening size is 254 dwelling units (Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines). The screening criteria are not thresholds of significance but were developed to provide a conservative indication of whether or not a proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Based on the screening criteria provided in the 2022 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the amount of GHG generated would not result in a significantly adverse environmental impact. Thus, this project is expected to have a less than significant impact, either directly or indirectly, on the environment with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The 2022 Thresholds of Significance set forth in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines include an analysis and screening criteria for determining if a project would contribute to a significant impact to the environment due to the projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As is done with the regulated air pollutants, if the proposed project would generate GHG emissions above the identified threshold, then the project would be seen as having the potential for a significant impact. As indicated in the Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance (Table 2-1) of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a project with total Operational-Related GHG emissions from other than stationary sources¹ that are at a minimum 1,100 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e per year level or otherwise are not in compliance with a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would have a significant impact on the environment. If approved, the project would result in the construction of one new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B, in addition to site improvements (roadway/drainage facilities), and accessory structures (retaining walls). However, based on the Operational GHG Screening Size for single-family residences, any emissions generated as a result of the operational activities of a new single-family residence will be far less than the 1,100 MT carbon dioxide threshold. Thus, the project will not result in significant levels of GHG that will conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to the reduction of GHG. There may be some increase in greenhouse gases during construction of the project, but they would be considered less than significant due to the temporary nature of the construction phase of the project. Additionally, any cumulative impact of the proposed project to the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in the County would be negligible and well below the operational and construction-related screening size identified by the BAAQMD for single-family residences. Therefore, the proposed minor subdivision would not substantially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

Sources of Information

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. “California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines.” Adopted 20 April 2022, revised 20 April 2023. <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>.

¹ Stationary sources include, e.g., emergency generators (diesel or natural gas); stationary-source projects are those land uses that would accommodate processes and equipment that emit GHG emissions and would require an Air District permit to operate.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. "Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final, 2017 Clean Air Plan." Adopted 19 April 2017. <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en>.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SUMMARY:

a-b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or 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 Impact)*

The proposed project is a two-lot minor subdivision of a 2.004-acre parcel of land and rezoning from a General Agricultural District (A-2) to a Single-Family Residential district (R-40). After approval of the proposed two-lot minor subdivision application, and as proposed, a single-family residence and accessory structures would be built on Parcel B, and an existing single-family

residence would remain on Parcel A. There would be associated use of fuels and lubricants, paints, and other construction materials during the construction period. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (Cal/OSHA) requirements. Through compliance with existing regulations, the project would have a less than significant impact from construction.

Project operation would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in very small quantities as they relate to household use. Contra Costa County regulates household hazardous waste disposal, and the home's occupants would be responsible for proper handling and disposal of household materials. Because any hazardous materials used for household operations would be in small quantities, long-term impacts associated with handling, storing, and dispensing of hazardous materials from project operation would be considered less than significant.

According to the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report prepared by ALFA Environmental Assessment Services (ALFA) for the project (June 9, 2025), there is no evidence of improper usage, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste or other chemicals, or indication of potentially hazardous materials related to agricultural uses, on the subject property. The subject property does not utilize a septic system or contain any water, oil, injection, or dry wells. There is no evidence of any drainage ditch on the property. Nor were underground or aboveground storage tanks observed on the property. The ESA indicates that the subject property was not identified in any regulatory database reports, however, nearby properties within a 1-mile radius were identified in the RCRA NonGen/NLR database which identifies facilities that are considered non-generators of hazardous waste and do not currently produce hazardous waste and the e-Manifest database which is a national tracking system for hazardous waste shipments. The listings within a ½-mile radius of the subject property are related to renovations when asbestos containing waste was removed and are not expected to represent a significant concern related to hazardous waste.

ALFA reviewed aerial photographs dated between 1939 and 2025, USGS topographic maps dated between 1896 and 1989, and other historical sources to determine the historical use of the subject property and surrounding area. Based on these sources, the subject property was vacant land from at least 1896 to approximately 1969. Also, from the late 1930's until the late 1960's orchards depicted/visible in an area east of Green Valley Road until approximately the mid-1980s when that area east of Green Valley Road became a residential area. Residences to the south, north, and northwest were developed between 1950 and 1973, followed by residences to the northeast, east, and southeast of the project site between 1989 and 1997. The existing residence that would remain on proposed Parcel A was constructed in 1969. A barn that will be demolished was constructed in the mid-1970s. No significant changes to the subject property have occurred since then. Based on their review of the historical sources and site visit (May 20, 2025), ALFA found no evidence that the subject property was used for any agricultural purposes, including mixing, loading, or storage areas that would have resulted in contaminants of concern (COCs) related to agricultural crops, including pesticides being present in the soil or structures on the property. As such, no further analysis of COCs such as dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane, toxaphene, and dieldrin is required. Also, ALFA indicated in their report that there is no expected level of arsenic that would be present or that would require further analysis, sampling, or remediation. Finally, ALFA found no evidence of smudge pots being utilized; therefore, no additional sampling for Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and/or Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons is required.

Therefore, the potential for impacts associated with handling, storing, and dispensing of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment from the rezoning of the property from an agricultural A-2 district to a residential R-40 district, project construction, or operation of one additional single-family residence 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? (No Impact)*

The nearest school is Monte Vista High School, located approximately 0.35 miles southeast of the project site. There is no anticipated use or waste of significant quantities of hazardous materials or substances for either the construction or operation of the proposed project that is residential in use. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this respect.

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)*

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. Furthermore, as discussed above in subsection-a, ALFA indicated in their Phase I ESA that the subject property was not identified in any regulatory database reports for hazardous waste or materials on the project site.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)*

The project is not located within the vicinity of any public airport or public use airport and will not conflict with an airport land use plan. The nearest airport facility to the project site is the Buchanan Field Airport, which is approximately 3.75 miles northeast of the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not present any safety hazard to airports or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The Contra Costa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines general procedures in the event of emergency crises and includes policies and information regarding evacuations or shelter-in-place orders. In addition, the project is within the service area of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (Fire District). The Fire District has published Fire Evacuation Plans. The subject property located on Green Valley Road is included in the North Alamo Fire Evacuation Plan which identifies the Round Hill Country Club Golf Course Open Space as a Temporary Refuge Area. The existing roadways would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local neighborhood. As proposed, the driveway improvement for the project would widen and realign the mouth of the existing driveway for improved sight distances and emergency vehicle access to the project site and hillside above. The proposed improvement of the existing driveway has been reviewed by County Public Works and the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District for agency comments and there is no indication that it will affect minimum

sight distances for vehicles entering and exiting the site or impair emergency apparatus access. The project will be located completely within the boundaries of the subject property. As such, the proposed two-lot minor subdivision would not interfere with the existing infrastructure of Green Valley Road or the nearby arterial or expressway.

The project involves a two-lot subdivision and construction of a new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B. An existing residence would remain on proposed Parcel A. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this study, the project has the potential to increase the population in the area by approximately 3 people. Cumulatively, there may be an impact on transport or access along any nearby roadways that may be part of an emergency response or evacuation plan, however, the increase in population is not significant enough to require an analysis for the purpose of the projects impact on emergency response and evacuation plans. In addition, the proposed project will not affect any existing communication/utility structures such as power poles or telecommunications towers, which may be necessary for an existing emergency response or evacuation plan.

All construction plans for future development will be subject to the applicable Fire Code that is in effect when the application for a building permit is submitted. Thus, the project would not impair implementation of the emergency response or evacuation plan in the County's EOP.

g) *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated)*

The project site is in a developed area within the service area of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (Fire District). Development projects are generally referred to the Fire District for review and comment to ensure that the proposal does not conflict with applicable fire codes. Although the subject property is located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), there was no indication from the Fire District review of the project that the proposed development poses a significant fire risk. The project proponent will be required to comply with any applicable California Fire Codes for improvements related to the subdivision and site improvements. The project will be required to comply with current building codes, including those requiring the installation of automatic fire sprinklers in new single-family residential buildings. Therefore, with routine review of construction plans ensuring compliance with current building and fire code standards, there is a less than significant direct or indirect risk of the project exposing people or structures to loss, injury, or death involving wildland fire.

Sources of Information

ALFA Environmental Assessment Services. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 1921 Green Valley Road, Alamo, California." 9 June 2025.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. "Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese)." Accessed in 2023. <https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/>

CalFire. "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas." 29 September 2023. Effective 1 April 2024. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps-2022>

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 5: "Transportation and Circulation Element." 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County. "Emergency Operations Plan." 29 November 2000.

<https://www.cocosheriff.org/home/showpublisheddocument/600/638422043796770000>

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. "Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval." 24 October 2024, revised 3 September 2025.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. "CDMS23-00005, CDRZ23-03271." Agency Comment Response Letter. 10 July 2023.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. "CDMS23-00005, 1921 Green Valley Road: revised submittal." Email. 26 August 2024.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. "North Alamo Fire Evacuation Plan." Brochure. 2025.

<https://www.firedepartment.org/home/showpublisheddocument/2308/637218536907800000>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

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 Impact)*

The proposed development is residential in nature, and will not consist of any manufacturing, processing, industrial, or other commercial activities which would generate by-products or waste that would pose a significant risk for impacting water quality or waste discharge requirements within the County. The project site is located within the service area of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (Central San) and will have access to public sewage disposal services. Based on comments received from Central San staff, the project would not be expected to produce an unmanageable added capacity demand on the wastewater system, nor interfere with existing, public facilities.

A Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) is required for applications to subdivide land where the resulting project may result in a total amount of impervious surface area exceeding 5,000 square feet. If at least 5,000 square feet of impervious area is identified for development, a SWCP shall be prepared and submitted for the review and approval of the Public Works Department, in compliance with the Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014), and the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. As the project would create more than 5,000 square feet of new impervious area, the applicant submitted a Preliminary SWCP for the proposed stormwater management facilities and controls as required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program.

The existing and proposed driveways are steep. Thus, according to the Preliminary SWCP prepared for the project, due to elevation constraints and County Public Works' requirement that no bioretention filter be placed in the public right-of-way, runoff from the lower portion of the widened driveway adjacent to Green Valley Road cannot be treated before flowing directly to the street gutter. The roof area of the existing house that would remain on proposed Parcel A exceeds the area of the lower driveway that cannot be treated. As such, in lieu of treating the runoff from the lower portion of the driveway, it is proposed to treat runoff from the roof of the existing house on-site via two new, small bioretention filters near the house. The remaining storm water runoff generated at the site from the roof and patios of the proposed residence, and impervious paving of the driveway at higher elevations will be drained and treated to a third, large, on-site bioretention filter on proposed Parcel B. Based on comments received from staff of the County Public Works Department (October 24, 2024 and revised on September 3, 2025), the Preliminary SWCP has been accepted as preliminarily complete and a Final SWCP is not required for this project until an application for a building permit is submitted.

Thus, it is anticipated that the proposed project will be in compliance with applicable water quality standards and/or discharge standards and will not significantly degrade water quality. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the record that the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

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 Impact)*

The project site is located in the service area of the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). Since the project proposes utilizing a public water supply, no groundwater wells would be required. The proposed project includes three bioretention basins for storm water control that would facilitate groundwater recharge and help offset the increased impervious surface area on the project site. Therefore, there is less than significant potential for the project to substantially decrease groundwater supplies, interfere with groundwater recharge, or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

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?*
- ii) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site*
- 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?*
- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

(Less Than Significant Impact (i-iv))

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. Based on County elevation data, runoff flows eastward toward Green Valley Road. According to the plans submitted for the project, proposed modifications to grading and drainage infrastructure are confined to proposed Parcel B. No improvements are proposed for resultant Parcel A. As proposed, stormwater infrastructure for Parcel B would tie-in to three separate curb inlets along Green Valley Road.

The project is anticipated to create more than 5,000 square feet of new impervious surfaces. Therefore, in compliance with Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014), and the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and the California Regional Water Quality Board C.3 requirements for storm water design elements, the project would be required to submit a final SCWP and construct C.3-compliant stormwater control facilities, as a condition of approval (memo from County Department of Public Works, September 3, 2025). The stormwater facilities would be installed concurrently with or prior to residential construction. Three bioretention basins are proposed which would filter stormwater and reduce the level of surface runoff and pollution

resulting from additional runoff. A Preliminary SWCP prepared for the project was submitted for review and was determined to be adequate. A Final SWCP is not required for this project until an application for building permits is submitted. A completed and County-approved Final SWCP prior to construction would ensure that the project will regulate surface runoff in a manner that prevents erosion, siltation and on- or off-site flooding.

The subject property does not lie within the Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year flood boundary) as designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map. Therefore, it is anticipated that the project will not impede or redirect flood flows in the area.

Therefore, the project's potential for altering drainage patterns or exceeding the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, polluted runoff, or flooding is less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (No Impact)

Seiche and tsunami events are generally associated with large bodies or large flows of water. Based on the Contra Costa County Tsunami Hazard Areas map, the subject property is outside of any tsunami hazard area. A seiche is a water wave in a standing body of water such as a large lake or reservoir that is caused by an earthquake, a major landslide, or strong winds. This hazard does not exist within the unincorporated Alamo area as there are no large lakes or reservoirs in the area. The project site is not located within a tsunami zone and is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain or a flood hazard zone. As such, there would be no risk of pollutants being released from the site due to project inundation through flooding, tsunamis, or seiche.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)

As discussed above in subsection-b, the project site is located in the service area of the EBMUD, which is a public utility regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). As such, the utility is allowed to extend services to new customers within its service area. Since the project proposes to utilize the accessible public water supply, no groundwater wells would be required. As such, there is no indication that the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Sources of Information

California Department of Conservation. "Contra Costa County Tsunami Inundation Maps." Accessed in 2025. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Pages/Tsunami/Maps/ContraCosta.aspx>

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. "Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval." 24 October 2024, revised 3 September 2025.

dk Engineering "Stormwater Control Plan for 1921 Green Valley Road, Alamo." 15 August 2024.

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

FEMA. "FEMA Flood Map Service Center, National Flood Hazard Map." Accessed in 2025. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The subject property is developed with one single-family residence and structures that are accessory to its use. The project site is approximately 2.004 acres in area and is not large enough to constitute an independent, established “community” within its boundaries. Although the project proposes to rezone the property from A-2 to a R-40, Single-Family Residential (R-40) zoning district, the subject property is surrounded by primarily single-family residences. The project includes the proposed development of resultant Parcel B with one new single-family residence; however, no aspect of the project would change the existing residential land uses on the lot or the existing residential or agricultural uses of any of the surrounding lots. Furthermore, the proposed project does not consist of a new roadway or other improvements that would impede or disrupt the manner in which people enter and exit the Alamo area. Thus, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The proposed project for a two-lot minor subdivision of an approximately 2.004-acre parcel of land, rezoning from A-2 to an R-40 Single Family Residential (R-40) district, and proposed construction of a new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B is subject to the land use plans and policies below:

General Plan Land Use Element:

On November 5, 2024, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan. The subject Minor Subdivision and Rezoning applications were deemed “complete” for processing on October 7, 2024. Therefore, the County General Plan 2005- 2020 applies as analyzed below.

The subject property is located within a Single-Family Residential, Low Density (SL) land use designation. Generally speaking, the purpose of the SL designation is to allow for the development of detached single-family residences and accessory buildings and structures, while also allowing for secondary uses that are considered to be compatible with low density homes (e.g., ADUs, churches, home occupations, small residential and child care facilities). The SL land use designation allows for a density of 1 to 2.9 units per net acre. According to Table 3-4 of the 2005-2020 County General Plan, “Net acreage includes all land area used exclusively for residential

purposes, and excludes streets, highways, and all other public rights-of-way.” Due to the proposed access easement, the total net acreage of the 2.004-acre subject property is approximately 1.9 acres. As proposed, the two-lot minor subdivision would result in a density of approximately 1 unit per net acre, which is within the range of units allowed. Thus, the proposed subdivision of land will not alter or conflict with the density or result in more residential units than is allowed for the project site. No other uses other than residential are proposed with this application. In addition, based on Table 3-5 of the General Plan (Consistency Between the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance), the proposal to rezone the subject property from A-2, General Agricultural District to R-40, Single-Family Residential is consistent with the SL General Plan land use designation.

Policies for the Alamo-Diablo-Blackhawk Area:

General Plan Policies 3-115 to 3-125 are specific to the guidance of uses and development for the Alamo-Diablo-Blackhawk areas of the County. Policies 3-115, 3-116, 3-122, and 3-124 are applicable to residential development or rezoning within the Alamo area. As such, these are the area policies that are applicable to the project, as discussed below:

- The intent of policies 3-115 and 3-116 is to promote the individuality and unique character of each community based on existing community images, and to promote the character of the area as one of predominantly single-family residences. After approval of the proposed two-lot minor subdivision application, one existing single-family residence would remain on Parcel A and a single-family residence would be built on Parcel B. Each parcel would be approximately 1 acre in area, which is similar to other lots in the vicinity. Thus, the project would have no impact on the character of the community and established single-family residential neighborhood in which the project is located.
- The intent of policy 3-122 is to ensure that when rezoning in Alamo the appropriate single-family residential zoning will include R-20, R-40, R-65, R-100, and P-1. If approved, the subject property would be rezoned to R-40 which is consistent with both Policy 3-122 and the underlying SL General Plan land use designation in the surrounding Alamo area.
- The intent of policy 3-124 is to require developments to be reviewed to ensure the continued rural character of the area. The surrounding area is generally developed with single-family residences. Although the area to the east of the subject property is developed with residences, roads, curbs, and some sidewalks as would typically be found in a suburban environment, there is an element of rural character in the immediate vicinity of the project site where Green Valley Road lacks sidewalks and curbs. Based on comments received from staff of the Public Works Department, the project would not be required to install curb and sidewalk improvements along its Green Valley Road frontage. Thus, the project will maintain the “rural” character of the area.

General Plan Conservation Element: The Conservation Element of the General Plan lists three overall conservation goals (8A-8C):

- Conservation Goal 8A: To preserve and protect the ecological resources of the County.
- Conservation Goal 8B: To conserve the natural resources of the County through control of the direction, extent, and timing of urban growth.

- Conservation Goal 8C: To achieve a balance of uses of the County's natural and developed resources to meet the social and economic needs of the County's residents.

The subject property is located approximately 3 miles west of the lower elevations of Mt. Diablo State Park, however, according to Figure 8-1 of the County General Plan, it is not located within an area of known ecological sensitivity. Furthermore, the entire project site has been previously disturbed, primarily through maintenance of the property that is developed with one single-family residence and a barn with a shared driveway to each structure. The project does not affect any known gas or mineral resources and, through the implementation of mitigation measures throughout this Initial Study, would not significantly affect air quality, biological, geological, or cultural resources in Contra Costa County.

Zoning – Standards and Land Uses

The subject property is located within an A-2 General Agricultural District (A-2). The proposed two-lot minor subdivision project and proposed residential development of resultant Parcel B with one new single-family residence, retaining walls, is consistent with the criteria for residential heights and permitted land uses within the A-2 zoning district. However, as the existing A-2 zoning district requires a minimum 5-acre lot size, minimum 250-foot average width, and minimum 200-foot depth, the applicant has requested a rezoning of the property to a R-40, Single-Family Residential (R-40) zoning district. As proposed, the subdivision is consistent with the standards of the R-40 district for minimum lot size, average width, and depth, and permitted residential land uses within the R-40 zoning district. In addition, the R-40 zoning district is consistent with the underlying SL General Plan land use designation. Both A-2 and R-40 districts require a 25-foot front setback for primary and accessory structures, a 20-foot side yard with a 40-foot side yard aggregate for primary buildings/structures, and a 15-foot rear side yard. R-40 allows a 3-foot side yard for accessory structures with a minimum 75-foot front setback. As designed, the proposed residence for Parcel B is consistent with the minimum front setback, rear yard, side yard, side yard aggregate, and maximum building heights. The applicant has requested variances from the standards to allow a 0-foot front setback and an 8-foot side yard for retaining wall #1 and to allow a 5-foot front setback for retaining wall #3. Staff considers that findings exist to allow the variances for a reduced setback and reduced side yard for retaining walls over three feet in height due to the steep topography of the subject property and need to widen the existing driveway for safe ingress and egress. In addition, the use of a shared driveway minimizes the number of curb cuts on Green Valley Road and minimizes grading for a new residence on a steep lot.

Zoning – Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (Tree Ordinance) provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal and alteration while allowing for reasonable development of private property and tree maintenance. The subject property contains a number of mature trees, including valley or coast live oaks, coast redwoods, black walnut, fan palm, and ash, all of which are considered protected trees under the Tree Ordinance due to their size and their presence on a property that is further subdividable if the requested rezone to an R-40 zoning district is approved. The project proposes to remove a portion of these code-protected trees, or to alter code-protected trees by working within their driplines for site improvements or development of proposed Parcel B. Thus, due to the anticipated grading, trenching, and construction activities as part of the proposed project on the subject property, a tree permit has

been requested as part of the minor subdivision application for the removal of eight code-protected trees and for the alteration of four code-protected trees due to potential drip line encroachment. As conditions of approval, staff will recommend that restitution in the form of replacement of any tree approved for removal, protection of remaining trees where work may occur within the drip lines of the trees, and implementation of the tree protection measures as recommended in the project's arborist report be required. Additional trees that are less than 6.5-inches in diameter or that are located within the public right-of-way may also be removed for construction or maintenance of the property, however, these trees are not protected pursuant to the Tree Ordinance.

Although the two-lot minor subdivision involves a rezoning from a General Agricultural District (A-2) to a Single-Family Residential (R-40) district, it does not involve an amendment to the Single-Family Residential, Low Density (SL) General Plan land use designation. The use of the resultant parcels would remain residential in nature. As a result of CDD staff applying the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance to the proposed project, there would be no conflict with the Tree Ordinance. Therefore, as indicated above and as conditioned, the proposed two-lot minor subdivision, rezoning, tree permit, and future development of one new single-family residence and structures that are accessory to residential uses would have a less than significant potential for conflict with any applicable land use policy with the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 3: Land Use Element." 2005 – 2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30913/Ch3-Land-Use-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. "Chapter 8: Conservation Element." 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30918/Ch8-Conservation-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County Code. "Title 8 – Zoning."

https://library.municode.com/ca/contracosta_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a, b) *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, or 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)*

According to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the Contra Costa County General Plan, the subject property is not located within an area identified as a significant mineral resource area and there is no other information in the record that indicates the presence of mineral resources. Thus, there is no indication that known mineral resources would be affected by the proposed two-lot subdivision and construction of a new residence on Parcel B. Nor is there any indication that the project would 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, or of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 8: Conservation Element.” 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30918/Ch8-Conservation-Element?bidId=>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE – Would the project result in:					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project result in the 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 Impact)*

Figure 11-6 (Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments) of the Noise Element of the County General Plan specifies noise exposure levels of 60 dB day-night sound level (DNL) or less as normally acceptable, and noise levels between 60 dB and 70 dB DNL as conditionally acceptable in residential areas. County General Plan Policies 11-2 and 11-4 set the standards for acceptable noise levels in residential areas and for new development, and require an acoustic analysis if projects are potentially exposed to a DNL of 60 dB or greater. According to Figure 11-5I of the Noise Element, the subject property is not located within an area of the County that is subject to average noise levels above what would be considered normally acceptable for the operation of residential units. As such, acoustic analysis is not required for the project. The types and levels of noise generated from the residential uses associated with the existing residence to remain on proposed Parcel A and the future residence on proposed Parcel B would be similar to noise levels from other single-family residential developments in the area. Thus, once proposed Parcel B is developed with a new single-family residence, there would be no permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of the established standards.

The future development of the private roadway, retaining walls, and residence on proposed Parcel B is expected to temporarily increase ambient noise in the area due to the use of work vehicles and power equipment for the duration of construction activities as well as earthmoving equipment for the proposed grading. Although the temporary increase in ambient noise would be minimal, staff will recommend conditions of approval limiting the hours and days of construction and requiring the project proponent/contractor to observe best construction practices to reduce temporary noise impacts on the surrounding area due to grading or construction activities. Therefore, the proposed subdivision, site improvements, and development of one new single-family residence would have a less than significant impact due to temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity.

b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Groundborne vibration is most commonly associated with railroads, freeways, bus lines, heavy construction and grading activities, large truck traffic, and airports. As such, residential uses are not the type of uses that are expected to result in the generation of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. However, it is reasonable to expect the potential future grading, site improvements, and construction of one new residence resulting from the minor subdivision to include the introduction of work vehicles and power equipment for the duration of construction activities as well as earthmoving equipment for the proposed grading. Groundborne noise is produced when ground vibrations cause resonances in the floors and walls of buildings, which then radiate a rumbling noise directly into the rooms. Potential construction-related activities for the development of one new parcel resulting from the minor subdivision are not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels that would impact the surrounding area. However, staff will recommend conditions of approval limiting the hours and days of construction and requiring the project proponent/contractor to observe best construction practices to reduce vibration impacts due to construction activities in the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed subdivision, site improvements, and construction of one new single-family residence would have a less than significant impact due to temporary increases in ambient noise levels or groundborne vibration/noise in the vicinity.

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 nearest airport, Buchanan Airport, is located more than 9 miles north of the project site. As such, there would be no impact in regard to an airport land use plan or excessive noise levels due to an airport use.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 11: Noise Element.” 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30921/Ch11-Noise-Element?bidId=>

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (No Impact)*

The proposed two-lot minor subdivision, if approved, would potentially increase the housing stock in Contra Costa County by one dwelling unit, a change that would not result in substantial population growth. The most recent demographic data for population and housing compiled by the US Census Bureau for the Alamo area is based on the 2020 American Community Survey (2020 ACS). Available data indicates a population of approximately 15,134 people in the Alamo area, and an average estimate of 3.12 people per household. Thus, the expected population increase upon construction of one additional residence would be approximately 3 people, which would increase the population in the Alamo area by less than 0.02 percent. The project would utilize Green Valley Road, an existing 30-foot-wide public road within a 60-foot-wide right-of-way. Based on comments received from the County Public Works Department, Engineering Division, this is the final design planned for the road. Therefore, the project would have no potential to induce substantial population growth in the County, either directly or indirectly.

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

The project site for the proposed two-lot minor subdivision is developed with one existing single-family residence that will remain. There is no need to alter, remove, or otherwise disturb any of the nearby single-family residences to establish the subdivision or develop Parcel B with a new residence in the future. Therefore, the proposed minor subdivision of land would not displace any person or existing housing, nor necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. “Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval.” 28 August 2023.

United States Census Bureau. “Alamo CDP, Place in California, Profile.” Accessed in 2025.

https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile/Alamo_CDP,_California?g=1600000US0600618

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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? (No Impact)***

The proposed project for a two-lot minor subdivision has been reviewed by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. There was no indication in the correspondence received from staff of the Fire District that the District would not approve the proposed private road or that new fire protection facilities would be needed as a result of this project. Future development of the proposed single-family residence on proposed Parcel B would be required to comply with all applicable fire code requirements. The nearest fire station is San Ramon Valley Fire Station 33, located on Diablo Road at Green Valley Road approximately 1 mile south of the project site, which is consistent with County General Plan Growth Management policies for fire protection that require a fire station within 1-1/2 mile of developments in urban or suburban areas. The anticipated, approximately three-minute response time from Station 32 to the project site is adequate in urban or suburban areas. Therefore, the project would have no impact on the provision of fire protection services.

b) ***Police projection? (No Impact)***

Police protection and patrol services in the Alamo area and the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's office. The Public Facilities/Services Element of the County General Plan requires 155 square feet of station area per 1,000 population in unincorporated Contra Costa County. The project for a two-lot minor subdivision proposes the development of a new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B, and an existing residence would remain on proposed Parcel A. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this study, the addition of one new dwelling unit would minimally increase the population and would thus not impact the County's ability to maintain the General Plan standard of having 155 square feet of station area and support facilities for every 1,000 members of the population. Thus, the proposed project will

not result in the need for new or expanded police protection facilities or services in the County or the Alamo area.

c) ***Schools? (Less Than Significant Impact)***

The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Lafayette Elementary School District and the Acalanes Union High School District. To address student growth in school districts as a result of residential developments in the County, a fee as determined by the school district is levied on all new dwellings. The project for a two-lot minor subdivision proposes the development of a new single-family residence on one of the resultant parcels. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this study, the addition of one new dwelling unit would minimally increase the population in the area. Additionally, the applicant for the future single-family residence would be required to pay the applicable school impact fees for the new residential dwelling unit prior to issuance of a building permit. Payment of the development fees pursuant to State regulations for school services would reduce impacts to neighborhood schools to less than significant levels.

d) ***Parks? (Less Than Significant Impact)***

The policy for Parks and Recreation in the Growth Management element of the County General Plan indicates that a standard of 3 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 people should be maintained within the County. The new residents of the proposed dwelling unit would be expected to increase the use of parks in the surrounding area; however, one additional residence would result in a less than significant impact on park facilities. Additionally, the applicant for the future single-family residence would be required to pay the County mandated park dedication and park impact fees collected to fund the acquisition and development of parks in Contra Costa County to serve unincorporated County residents.

e) ***Other public facilities? (Less Than Significant Impact)***

The proposed two-lot minor subdivision and plan for the construction of one new single-family residence would not significantly affect existing public facilities as it is not expected to substantially induce population growth in the area. Accordingly, the impact of the use of the public libraries or public health facilities by new residents of the future dwelling on Parcel B is less than significant.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 4: Growth Management Element.” 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30914/Ch4-Growth-Management-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 7: Public Facilities/Services Element.” 2005-2020.

https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30917/Ch7-Public-Facilities_Services-Element?bidId=

Contra Costa County. “Title 9, Division 920 – Park Dedication.” Accessed in 2025.

https://library.municode.com/ca/contracosta_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT9SUDIV920PADE

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. "CDMS23-00005, CDRZ23-03271." Agency Comment Response Letter. 10 July 2023.

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. "CDMS23-00005, 1921 Green Valley Road: revised submittal." Email. 26 August 2024.

dk Engineering. Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map – Project Plans. Received 19 August 2024.

Douglas A. McQuillan, Architect. Green Valley Residence – Project Plans. Received 14 February 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Impact)*

Given the small scale of the project, potentially resulting in one new single-family residence, the project would not 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. In addition, the applicant for the future residential building permit would be required to pay the County mandated park impact fee collected to fund the acquisition and development of parks and recreational facilities in Contra Costa County. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on neighborhood and regional parks and their recreational facilities.

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? (No Impact)*

The project does not propose the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Impact)*

Access to both proposed Parcels A and B would be from Green Valley Road, a two-lane public roadway, through an approximately 16-foot paved road within an access easement ranging between 16 feet and 30 feet in width. The site plan proposes to remove and replace the existing access driveway onto Green Valley Road. This new and wider driveway will take a 90-degree turn, providing direct access to the proposed residence on Parcel B and branching onto the existing 10-foot-wide drive that is to remain. The applicant will be required as a condition of approval to relinquish abutters' rights of access along the frontage of Green Valley Road, with the exception of the new driveway access. A car turnaround is proposed at the front of the proposed residence on Parcel B. Regional access to the project site would be via Stone Valley Road or El Cerro Boulevard/Diablo Road, which are classified as arterial routes (Figure 5-2 of the Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan), and I-680 which is part of the Interstate freeway system. No extension of the existing thoroughfare infrastructure is proposed now or would be required in the future due to development of the new parcels.

Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis for any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips based upon the trip generation rates as presented by the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). According to ITE trip generation rates (ITE code 210) for detached single-family residential development, the project would result in approximately 1.73 peak trips per day per home (0.74 daily AM trips and 0.99 daily PM trips) if a residence were to be constructed on Parcel B. Therefore, a project-specific traffic impact analysis is not required. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and would have a less than significant impact on the circulation system in the project vicinity.

b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

CEQA provides guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts relating to vehicle miles travelled (VMT) resulting from the project. The Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) has provided the following guidance on evaluating such impacts for small projects: "Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact." According to ITE trip generation rates for detached single-family residential development, the project would result in approximately 9.44 total weekday trips and 9.54 Saturday trips per home. Since there is no reasonable expectation that a project of this scale could exceed 110 daily trips, the project is assumed to have a less than significant impact on traffic. Therefore, the project does not conflict with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3(b).

c) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The subject property fronts on Green Valley Road, an existing, two-lane public roadway with an existing pavement width of 30 feet within a 60-foot right of way. According to comments received from staff of the County Public Works Department, the current configuration of Green Valley Road is considered a final design. As shown on Figure 5-2 (Roadway Network Plan) of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element, Green Valley Road is not considered to be an existing or proposed arterial, expressway, or freeway, but connects to Stone Valley Road, an existing arterial south of the project site. No substantial changes to the existing transportation system are proposed with this application. Vehicles would access both proposed parcels from the existing driveway on proposed Parcel B. Improvements to the new driveway include widening it, particularly where it meets Green Valley Road, and resurfacing. This new and wider driveway would take a 90-degree turn, providing direct access to the proposed residence on Parcel B and branching onto the existing drive that is to remain for access to proposed Parcel A. As required by the Department of Public Works, the applicant would submit an encroachment permit prior to construction of the proposed driveway improvements. There is no indication that the new configuration of the driveway would substantially increase hazards on Green Valley Road due to geometric design features or incompatible uses.

d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in subsection-e above, Green Valley Road is at its planned, final design width and there are no proposed changes due to the project that would affect access along the public roadway. The project was referred to the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District for agency comments. As part of their response received on July 10, 2023, the Fire District did not identify any concerns with the adequacy of existing or proposed emergency vehicle access. Additional comments were received from staff of the Fire District on August 26, 2024, advising that a fire apparatus turnaround is not needed and, as the grade of the driveway is being kept under 16 percent, there is no need for a grooved concrete application of the driveway. All construction plans for future development will be subject to the applicable Fire Code that is in effect at the time when the application for a building permit is submitted. Therefore, routine review of construction plans

will ensure that the proposed project has no potential for adversely impacting existing emergency access to the subject property or other properties within the County.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County Conservation and Development Department and Public Works Department.

“Transportation Analysis Guidelines.” 23 June 2020, amended 10 May 2021.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/70739/FINAL-CCC-Transportation-Analysis-Guidelines-v3-5-10-21?bidId=>

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. “CDMS23-00005, CDRZ23-03271.” Agency Comment Response Letter. 10 July 2023.

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. “CDMS23-00005, 1921 Green Valley Road: revised submittal.” Email. 26 August 2024.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 5: Transportation and Circulation Element.” 2005-2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. “Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval.” 28 August 2023.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, b) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 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? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated)

Based on comments received from the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for this project (July 12, 2023), the Office of Historic Preservation has determined that any building or structures 45 years or older may be of historical value. As discussed in Section 5 of this report (Cultural Resources), the subject property does not contain any buildings, nor does it contain any structures that are 45 years or older. In addition, the subject property is not listed in the California Register of Historic Resources or the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory and is not associated with historically or culturally significant events. According to the comments received from the NWIC, the project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites although there is no record of any previous cultural resource studies for the proposed project area. As shown on Figure 9-2 (Archeological Sensitivity Map) of the Contra Costa County General Plan (2005-2020), the surrounding area to the west of the subject property is identified as having medium archeological sensitivity. However, the project site and the surrounding area to the east is a largely urbanized area that are excluded from archaeological sensitivity surveys although there may also be significant archaeological resources within these areas. Additionally, there is no evidence in the record at the time of completion of this study that indicates the presence of human remains at the project site.

Staff of the NWIC recommended that the lead agency contact the local Native American tribe(s) regarding traditional, cultural, and religious values. Notices of Opportunity to Request Consultation for the 2-lot minor subdivision were sent to the Wilton Rancheria on October 31, 2024, and to the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation on November 1, 2024. The Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation requested consultation and ultimately indicated in email correspondence received on January 27, 2025, that due to the proximity of this project to Green Valley Creek, the project area may be sensitive for Tribal Cultural Resources.

Potential Impacts: Upon approval of the project, the future development of the site would include ground disturbance which has the potential for uncovering previously unknown tribal cultural resources or the accidental discovery of human remains.

Implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** through **CUL-3**, requiring that the tribe requesting consultation be notified if tribal cultural resources are found and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) if human remains are found, would reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information System (NWIC).

“CDMS23-00005 & CDRZ23-03271 / APNs 194-070-016 & 194-070-018.” Agency Comment Response Letter. 12 July 2023.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 9: Open Space Element.” 2005 – 2020.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30922/General-Plan?bidId=>

Contra Costa County. “Historic Resources Inventory.” Revised 2019. Accessed in 2024.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) *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 Impact)*

The project site is located in a developed, urbanized area which is served by existing water, sewer, storm drain, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications services. There is no indication from any utility service provider that the proposed residential complex would result in a need to relocate, expand, or construct new facilities in such a way as to cause significant environmental effects.

Water: The new development is located within the service area of the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), a public utility regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which allows the extension of services to new customers within its service area in compliance with CPUC Rule 15. Project plans were sent to EBMUD as part of the initial review process. EBMUD staff indicated that the project proponent will need to contact EBMUD's New Business Office and request a water service estimate to determine the conditions of providing water service to the development (of Parcel B). There is no indication from EBMUD staff that the

proposed project would exceed the capacity of the existing public water infrastructure or would conflict with their water service regulations.

Wastewater treatment: The project is within the service area of Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (Central San), which is the agency responsible for ensuring that applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board are met and maintained. The wastewater generated by one new single-family residence would incrementally increase wastewater flows in the Central San system. The project plans for the proposed two-lot subdivision and construction of one new single-family residence on resultant lot Parcel B were sent to Central San as part of the initial review process. There is no evidence that the project would be expected to produce an unmanageable added capacity demand on the wastewater system or interfere with existing public facilities. In their comments, Central San staff indicated that a side sewer connection for the existing residence on the subject property may need to be relocated. However, there is no indication that the project would require expansion of the wastewater treatment system.

Storm water drainage: As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section above, the applicant has submitted a preliminary Storm Water Control Plan (SWCP) designed with project storm water controls including dispersion to bioretention filters and storm drains. The preliminary SWCP has been reviewed by the County Public Works department, which has provided final comments and recommendations for conditions of approval for the formal entitlement recommendation being made. Prior to filing of the Parcel Map, the applicant will be required to submit a final SCWP and Stormwater Control Operation and Maintenance Plan to the County Public Works Department. In addition, improvement plans for construction of the residence on proposed Parcel B will require review for compliance with Provision C.3 of the County's NPDES Permit and the County's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant adverse environmental impact on storm water drainage or treatment facilities.

Electric/Natural Gas: The project is within the service territory of PG&E for electric and natural gas service. It is anticipated that the project will connect to underground electric and/or natural gas connections. There is no indication that the construction of new or expanded electric or natural gas services is required for the ongoing operation of the project. If necessary, temporary power for construction activities will also be provided by PG&E. The applicant will be required to apply for temporary power and follow the permitting process for connecting to the electrical grid.

Telecommunications services: Existing telephone, cellular, internet, and cable television are available within the project site's vicinity. The project site would connect to these services provided by several different providers, and there is no indication that the new residential unit would result in the need for expanded services such as new or larger wireless facilities.

By following the processes required to connect to existing water, sanitary sewer, storm water drainage, electric power, or telecommunications facilities, the impact of the project concerning these utilities and services would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in subsection-a above, the new development is located within the service area of the EBMUD, a public utility regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which allows the extension of water services to new customers within its service area in compliance with CPUC Rule 15. Project plans were sent to EBMUD as part of the initial review process. EBMUD staff reviewed the project application documents regarding the provision of new water service pursuant to their water service regulations and indicated that water service shall not be furnished or expanded unless all applicable water-efficiency measures in the regulations are installed at the applicant's expense. There has been no indication from the water company that the existing public water infrastructure would have insufficient water supplies to serve the project, or that the project would have a significant impact on the public water infrastructure during dry, and multiple dry years.

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 Impact)*

As discussed in subsection-a above, the new development is within the service area of Central San, which is the agency responsible for ensuring that applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board are met and maintained. Project plans were sent to Central San as part of the initial review process who did not provide comments prior to preparation of this Initial Study. There is no evidence that the project would be expected to exceed Central San's ability to provide sewer services with the currently available facilities or interfere with or require expansion of the existing, public wastewater treatment system. Central San would connect the new residences to its facilities after processing the residential sewer service application and collecting the applicable connection fees, completing a building plan review, and issuing a permit for sewer work. By following this process, the impacts related to the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region, or the Central San facilities would be less than significant.

d) *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Construction of a new single-family residence would generate construction solid waste. Construction on the project site would be subject to the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), which requires that at least 65% (by weight) of job site debris generated by most types of building projects be recycled, reused, or otherwise diverted from landfill disposal. This requirement applies to demolition projects and most new construction, as well as the majority of building additions or alterations. CalGreen is administered in the County through the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, and verifiable post-project documentation is required to be submitted to demonstrate that at least 65% of the nonhazardous construction and demolition (C&D) debris generated on the job site are salvaged for reuse, recycled or otherwise diverted. The average amount of debris generated by new single-family residential construction is 7.5 pounds per square foot for a custom home. If approved, the construction of a new residence on Parcel B

would result in approximately 632 pounds of construction debris. The Debris Recovery Program would reduce the construction debris headed to a landfill by diverting materials that can be recycled to appropriate recycling facilities. Nondisposed C&D debris is required to be transported to an approved Construction and Demolition Processing Facility. Accordingly, the environmental impact of construction waste would be less than significant.

With respect to residential waste, Contra Costa County contracts with franchise haulers for solid waste, recycling, and organics collection service for about one half of the unincorporated County. The Department of Conservation and Development, Solid Waste and Recycling Section administers four franchise agreements with other haulers including Allied Waste Systems, Crockett Sanitary Service, Garaventa Enterprises, and Richmond Sanitary Service. Republic Services collects residential waste under the Allied Waste, Crockett Sanitary, and Richmond Sanitary agreements. Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery collects residential waste under the Garaventa Enterprises agreement. The other half of unincorporated County collection service is managed by three different sanitary districts: the Kensington Community Services District, the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority (RecycleSmart, a joint power authority), and the City of San Ramon, where unincorporated areas of San Ramon are served under the city's collection franchise. The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) requires jurisdictions to show a minimum of 15 years of total disposal space at a landfill. Household waste is ultimately destined for the Keller Canyon Landfill, which has enough approximate capacity to continue accepting waste for the next 40 years if the maximum daily capacity was brought to the landfill. Residential waste from one potential future single-family residence on proposed Parcel B would incrementally increase waste to be hauled to a landfill. However, as is the case with construction debris, a portion of the residential waste is expected to be recycled and would thereby reduce the residential waste headed to a landfill by a franchise hauler. Therefore, the impact of the project-related residential waste is considered to be less than significant and would not otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As mentioned above in subsection-d, construction at the project site would be subject to the CalGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program administered by the Department of Conservation and Development. The Debris Recovery Program requires that at least 65% of construction job site debris (by weight) for most construction types, that would otherwise be sent to landfills, be recycled, reused, or otherwise diverted to appropriate recycling facilities. The proposed project is not expected to produce significant amounts of waste that would present a greater conflict with laws and regulations regarding solid waste than similar single-family residences in the vicinity. Furthermore, the owner, construction contractor, and future tenants would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste. Therefore, the potential for conflict with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste is less than significant.

Sources of Information

Contra Costa County. "Approved Construction & Demolition (C&D) Processing Facilities." 2025.

<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/44986/Approved-CD-Processing-Facilities?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County. "CalGreen / Construction & Demolition (C&D) Debris Recovery Program."

2025. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4746/CalGreen-Construction-Demolition-Debris->

Contra Costa County. "Franchise Agreements." 2025. <https://cccrecycle.org/235/Franchise-Agreements>.

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. "Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval." 24 October 2024, revised 3 September 2025.

Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. "1921 Green Valley Road; APN: 194-070-015 / 194-070-018, Central San Response." Letter. 25 March 2025.

Contra Costa County. "Waste Hauler Map." 2025.

<https://cocogis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2c5e6c6b1f7d419eac7005c84a76de90>.

EBMUD, Water Distribution Planning Division. "Review of Agency Planning Application, Agency Files CDMS23-00005 & CDRZ23-03271" Agency Comments, Email. Dated 10 July 2023.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<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"/>	<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 With Mitigation Incorporated)*

According to the California Fire Hazard Severity Zone map, the subject property is located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and lands designated as High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Contra Costa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines general procedures in the event of emergency crises and includes policies and information regarding evacuations or shelter-in-place orders. In addition, the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District has published Fire Evacuation Plans. The subject property located on Green Valley Road is included in the North Alamo Fire Evacuation Plan which identifies the Round Hill Country Club Golf Course Open Space as a Temporary Refuge Area. The project which fronts Green Valley Road involves a two-lot subdivision and construction of a new single-family residence on proposed Parcel B. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this study, the project has the potential to increase the population in the area by approximately 3 people. Cumulatively, there may be an impact on transport or access along any nearby roadways that may be part of an emergency response or evacuation plan, however, the increase in population is not significant enough to require a transportation analysis for the purpose of emergency response and evacuation plans. The proposed project will be located completely within the boundaries of the subject property and will not affect any existing communication/utility structures such as power poles or telecommunications towers, which may be necessary for an existing emergency response or evacuation plan. In addition, the project will not affect the minimum sight distances for vehicles entering and exiting the site and would not interfere with the existing infrastructure of Green Valley Road.

The project site is in a developed area within the service area of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (Fire District). Development projects are generally referred to the Fire District for review and comment to ensure that the proposal does not conflict with applicable fire codes. In their comments received on July 10, 2023, and on August 26, 2024, staff of the Fire District indicated that they gave the applicant direction on the requirements for the driveway access and that a turnaround for fire apparatus on the project site is not required due to the ability to pull a hose up to 200 feet from the top of the driveway to the street. All construction plans for future development will be subject to the applicable fire code that is in effect at the time an application for a building permit is submitted. Thus, by complying with the requirements of the Fire District and upon implementation of mitigation measures **FIRE-1** and **FIRE-2**, the project will not impair the County's emergency response or evacuation plan, and project impacts would be less than significant.

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 With Mitigation Incorporated)*

The subject property is located within a hilly area of the County identified in the County General Plan having slopes varying from less than 15% to more than 26% degrees. The project site elevation ranges from approximately 525 feet above sea level at the eastern property boundary to 670 feet above sea level at the northwestern corner. The project site is in a developed area within

the service area of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (Fire District). According to Exhibit A of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District Ordinance 2023-38, high temperatures in the area range from an average of 90° and reaching up to approximately 115°. The average monthly wind speeds range from approximately 11 mph to 20 mph, with wind gust speeds up to between 25 mph to 40 mph, and high maximum wind gust speeds from up to 55 mph. Development projects are generally referred to the Fire District for review and comment to ensure that the proposal does not conflict with applicable fire codes. Based on Fire District's review, the project proponent will not be required to install any new hydrants for fire protection. The project will be required to comply with current building codes, including those requiring the installation of automatic fire sprinklers in new single-family residential buildings.

Potential Impacts: The project is located in an SRA and lands designated as High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Although there was no indication from the Fire District review of the project that the proposed development poses a significant wildfire risk during or after construction, there is a potential for the steep slopes of the project area, high temperatures and dry conditions in the summer, and high maximum wind gusts including strong, dry, gusty winds during the winter to exacerbate wildfire spread.

Accordingly, implementation of the following mitigation measures will ensure that potentially significant impacts on project occupants and/or surrounding properties from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire are reduced to less than significant levels:

FIRE-1: Prior to CDD stamp-approval of plans for issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is first, the applicant shall develop and submit to the CDD and the Fire District a written plan to establish, implement, and maintain a fire prevention program at the project site throughout all phases of construction of the development.

FIRE-2: Prior to recordation of the parcel map or CDD stamp-approval of plans for issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever is first, the applicant shall submit to the CDD and the Fire District a written fire prevention management plan for all combustible materials stored outside and/or vegetation growth including but not limited to trees, weeds, grass, and vines, that is capable of being ignited and endangering property.

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 Impact)*

The proposed project for a two-lot minor subdivision and development of Parcel B with a new single-family residence was reviewed by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District and there is no indication in their comments that the project will require the installation of fuel breaks, water sources, hydrants, or other fire protection related infrastructure. In addition, the proposed project would follow standards and regulations as required by the Fire District and California Fire Code intended to reduce fire risk. Electric and natural gas utilities would be provided by PG&E and new connections to the project site would be installed underground, minimizing potential impacts to fire risk. Thus, by following the requirements of the Fire District, there would be no need for the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in impacts on the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

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 Incorporated)*

The subject property is located on an east facing slope with elevation ranging from approximately 525 feet above sea level at the eastern property boundary to 670 feet above sea level at the northwestern corner. Based on the preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (SCWP) submitted for the proposed minor subdivision, three bioretention filters designed for compliance with the California Regional Water Quality Board C.3 requirements for runoff are proposed. As the project proposes more than 5,000 square feet of new impervious area, the applicant will be required to submit a final SCWP. In complying with C.3 requirements for storm water design elements, a completed and County-approved SWCP ensures that the project will regulate surface runoff in a manner that prevents runoff and on- or off-site flooding. The subject property is not located within a flood plain or special flood hazard area and thus will not impede or redirect flood flows in the area.

As discussed in the Geology and Soils section of this study, there are no mapped landslides on or near the project site. However, according to the Geotechnical Investigation by GFK & Associates for the project, the seismic hazard map (SHZ map) indicates that during a high magnitude earthquake the stability of all slopes will be reduced. Furthermore, the project site is in the outcrop belt of expansive and weakly consolidated bedrock. The risks of slope failure will be greatest if an earthquake occurs during the winter rainy season, when surface soils are saturated. Upon implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** prior to construction, and mitigations measures **FIRE-1** and **FIRE-2**, any potential impacts of the development of one new single-family residence and accessory structures due to post-fire landslides or slope instability will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

CalFire. “Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas.” 29 September 2023. Effective 1 April 2024. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps-2022>

Contra Costa County. “Emergency Operations Plan.” 29 November 2000.
<https://www.cocosherriff.org/home/showpublisheddocument/600/638422043796770000>

Contra Costa County, Public Works Department. “Minor Subdivision MS23-0005 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval.” 24 October 2024, revised 3 September 2025.

GFK & Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Consultants. “Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Minor Subdivision, APN’s 194-070-015 and 194-070-018, 1921 Green Valley Road.” Prepared for Mr. George Moore. 4 January 2024.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. “CDMS23-00005, CDRZ23-03271.” Agency Comment Response Letter. 10 July 2023.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. “CDMS23-00005, 1921 Green Valley Road: revised submittal.” Email. 26 August 2024.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. "Ordinance 2023-38, Fuel Mitigation and Exterior Hazard Abatement." 26 April 2023. <https://www.firedepartment.org/home/showdocument?id=5086>.

San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. "North Alamo Fire Evacuation Plan." Brochure. 2025. <https://www.firedepartment.org/home/showpublisheddocument/2308/637218536907800000>.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated)*

As discussed in individual sections of this Initial Study, the project to rezone the subject property from an A-2 to an R-40 zoning district and create two parcels from the site for single-family residential development of proposed Parcel B may impact the quality of the environment with respect to Biological Resources, Cultural and/or Tribal Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils and Wildfire. Where mitigation measures are enforced as 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. Therefore, the potential for substantial impacts to biological,

historical, cultural, or other resources as a result of the proposed project is reduced to a less than significant level.

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 Impacts)**

The project site is located within the US Census-designated Concord-Walnut Creek Urban Area in a neighborhood where the established uses and related development are predominantly single-family residential. If approved, based on the project plans, the two-lot minor subdivision and rezone to R-40 Single-Family Residential district would result in the development of one new single-family residence on Parcel B. An existing single-family residence would remain on Parcel A. Thus, the number of housing units in the Alamo CDP would increase by one unit with the proposed project, which would be approximately 0.017 percent of the estimated 5,594 housing units in the Alamo area as of the year 2022. The residential use is consistent with the existing General Agricultural (A-2) and proposed Single-Family Residential (R-40) zoning districts, and upon rezoning to R-40, would remain consistent with the single-family residential, low-density (SL) General Plan land use designation of the subject property. The project would also be considered consistent with the existing residential development in the surrounding area.

Staff is aware of one additional, substantial development project in the nearby unincorporated Alamo area:

County File #CDSD24-09696 – A vesting tentative map to subdivide into 19 single family residential lots under Density Bonus Law. The project site is located at 1125 North Gate Road in the unincorporated Walnut Creek area. The project is currently under environmental review.

Cumulatively, the proposed subdivision project described above, and the proposed two-lot minor subdivision that is subject to this initial study may have significant impacts on population/housing, transportation, and public services/utilities if development resulted in a significant increase in population. As discussed in the Population and Housing section of this study, the potential increase in population of the proposed project is minimal. The California Department of Finance (CDF) estimates the County’s total population as 1,156,55 persons as of January 1, 2022. Of this total population, the population in the unincorporated area of the county is approximately 176,941, with an average of 2.79 persons per household as of January 1, 2022. Based on this average, the two projects together are anticipated to increase the population in the County by approximately 56 people, or approximately 0.03%.

The subject property is one of the few in the immediate vicinity of Alamo that is further subdividable. The County is not currently processing any discretionary applications for residential or non-residential development for properties that are contiguous to the project site. In addition, there are no other applications for the subdivision of parcels, or the construction of multi-family residential units currently being processed within at least five miles of the subject property. Due to the small scope and size of the proposed project and the proposed 20-lot subdivision in the vicinity, with the implementation of the mitigations described in the sections throughout this initial study, the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on the environment.

c) *Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated)*

This Initial Study has disclosed potential direct or indirect impacts on human beings that would be less than significant upon the implementation of mitigation measures. All identified mitigation measures will be included as 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 references cited throughout this Initial Study were consulted. Reference materials are available for review by contacting the project planner, Syd Sotoodeh, Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, by email at syd.sotoodeh@dcd.cccounty.us or by phone at (925) 655-2877.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Maps: Vicinity, Aerial View, General Plan, Zoning
- 2) Project Plans
- 3) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program