CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1.	**Project Title:**	Village at Pacheco – Residential subdivision project to subdivide 1.57 acres into 33 lots, and common area parcels for construction of 33 townhomes, County files #CDSD22-09628 and CDDP22-03036.
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:**	Francisco Avila, Principal Planner, (925) 655-2866
4.	**Project Location:**	The project area consists of two parcels totaling 1.57 acres (APN's: 380-220-044 and 380-220-067) located at 3835, 3845 and 3855 Pacheco Blvd., Martinez, CA.
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**	Applicant: LCA Architects Inc. 590 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 310 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Owners: Ahmadieh and Zarin Mohammad 11 Alamo Lane Alamo, CA 94507
6.	**General Plan Designation:**	The subject property is located within the Multiple-Family Residential-High Density (MH) General Plan land use designation.
7.	**Zoning:**	The subject property is located within a M-29 Multiple Family Residential District (M-29).

8. Description of Project: The applicant seeks approval to modify County File #'s CDSD06-09100 and CDDP06-03014 (approved in 2007) to update the 32 Townhome project's architecture and building technology. The proposed Vesting Tentative Map includes one additional unit for a total of 33 parcels and a similar site layout. Lots range in area from 840 to 1,601 square feet. Project details are as follows:

Number of Buildings/Unit Types: The project includes construction of 4 buildings which will house 7 to 12 units each. All 33 townhomes will be of a three-story design: Unit Type 'A' Four Bedroom

2,045 square feet in area - 6 units total, Unit Type 'B' Three Bedroom 1,421 square feet in area - 27 units total. Each unit will have two parking spaces on the 1st floor (ground level).

Lot Coverage Variance: A variance to the maximum lot coverage is being requested - 54.8% proposed (35% maximum allowed).

Setback/Yard Variances: The applicant has requested the following variances.

1. Building One – 20'10" setback for Pacheco Blvd. (25' req.), 15'5" setback for Windhover Way (25' req.), 35' height (30' max allowed).
2. Building Two – 35' height (30' max allowed).
3. Building Three – 17'6" side yard (20' side req.), 35' height (20' max allowed when within 50' of a residential district), 35' height (30' max allowed for remainder of building).
4. Building Four – 17'6" side yard (20' req.), 35' height (30' max allowed), 10'11" separation between buildings 3 and 4 (20' req. min.).

Underground Utilities: The County Ordinance Code requires all overhead utilities along the frontage of public streets to be removed and placed underground. Most of the major overhead utilities along Pacheco Boulevard in this area are located on the opposite side of the street and will not be required to be relocated. However, some secondary utilities such as communications wires are located along the project frontage that will be required to be relocated underground.

Tree Removal: The project requires that all existing vegetation be removed in order to grade the site and construct the associated improvements. As part of the vegetation removal, 5 trees will be removed and work within the dripline of 9 others is proposed.

Housing Inventory: The project includes the construction of 33 for-sale units and is subject to County Ordinance Code, Chapter 822-4, Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. This ordinance requires at least 15 percent of the dwelling units in a residential development of five or more for-sale units to be developed as inclusionary units. As an alternative to the requirement to construct inclusionary housing, the applicant has proposed the payment of a For-Sale Housing Fee per the Inclusionary Housing Plan (in-lieu fee is $217,801.98) which has been agreed to by County staff.

Grading: 10,200 cubic yards of grading will occur to prep the site. Grading will include 100 cubic yards of fill and the export of 10,100 cubic yards of surplus soil.

Exemptions: One exception to Code Section 914-12.002 which requires detention basins to be at least 15-acre-feet of storage volume is included to allow small detention basins that are privately maintained and funded.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject parcels are located at 3835, 3845 and 3855 Pacheco Blvd., in the unincorporated Martinez area. The sites are bounded to the south by Pacheco Blvd., to the east by Windhover Way, to the north by single-family residential development and by apartments and single-family homes on the west.

The project site is generally level in topography and slopes gently to the southeast corner. The site consists of two parcels. Assessor's parcel number 380-220-067 is 0.76 acres in size and assessor parcel number 380-220-044 is 0.8 acres. The site contains several trees of various species and sizes.

Currently, parcel one (380-220-067) consists of one single-family residence, detached garage, single-story multiple unit apartment and associated parking. Parcel two (380-220-044) consists of a single-story residence, detached garage and several outbuildings that are used as residences. The northeastern portion of the property is fenced off and used for vehicle and equipment storage.

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

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Contra Costa County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
- Contra Costa Water District
- Mountain View Sanitary District

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

Notification of an opportunity to request consultation was circulated. No comments of concern were returned.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected		
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.		
☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities/Services Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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.

Francisco Avila

Francisco Avila
Principal Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

June 17, 2024

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

SUMMARY*:*

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

Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges & Waterways) of the General Plan Open Space Element identifies specific resources of Contra Costa County as designated scenic ridges and waterways. The intent of these scenic resource designations is to preserve and protect areas of identified high scenic value, where practical, and in accordance with the Land Use Element. The subject property is located at the northwest corner of Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Avenue in the Martinez area. This property is located over one mile south of the Sacramento River Delta a designated scenic waterway, as outlined in the Contra Costa County 2005-2020 General Plan. The residences directly to the west, south and east of the subject property are at the same base elevation as the subject property, which are only approximately 40 feet above sea level. Furthermore, at a distance of more than a mile, views of the Sacramento River from this property and the surrounding residences are negligible. Therefore, there is a less than significant adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

The Scenic Routes Map (Figure 5-4) of the County General Plan's Transportation and Circulation Element identifies scenic routes in the County, including both State Scenic Highways and County

designated Scenic Routes. The subject property is located at the northwest corner of Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Way in the Martinez area. Neither road is considered a scenic route, nor is the property within the local vicinity of one. Although the project site is not located in the vicinity of a state scenic highway as designed in the County's General Plan, Highway 4 is identified as a connecting highway. However, Highway 4 is over a mile north of the site and residential and industrial development exists between the project site and Highway 4. No rock outcroppings or clusters of significant trees are located on the subject property. Therefore, there is no potential for significant impacts to tree resources, rock outcroppings, or historic structures on the property within a scenic highway as a result of the proposed project.

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? 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)***

The subject property is located within a Multiple-Family Residential-High Density (MH) General Plan land use designation and within a M-29 Multiple Family Residential District (M-29) zoning district. The subject property is located in an urbanized area, primarily surrounded by residential development to the west, south, and east, and is within the Urban Limit Line. The project is to subdivide the subject property into 33 lots and common areas, removal of all existing trees on-site, and installation of the required improvements for the subdivision. Thus, the project would not conflict with the applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and 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 with Mitigation)***

Potential sources of light associated with the project would consist of typical sources of lighting associated with a residential development including lighting from the newly constructed residences, and vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Streetlights will be installed for public and private streets for the proposed development. Although trees and vegetation are proposed at the front of each lot, which provides some screening, the development of the 33 new townhomes will increase lighting above existing levels. However, Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-1 would require exterior lighting to be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent excessive light spillover. With the implementation of MM AES-1, lighting impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-1: New exterior lighting from the project site could adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

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

MM AES-1: Proposed exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent glare or excessive light spillover.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

Pursuant to the 2018 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map, the subject property has been categorized as "urban and built-up land." Figure 8-2 (Important Agricultural Land Map) of the Conservation Element of the County General Plan does not identify the property as important agricultural area. The property is zoned as M-29 Multiple Family Residential District (M-29), and has a General Plan land use designation of Multiple-Family Residential-High Density (MH). The project is to subdivide the property into 33 lots, construct a townhouse on each lot, and install improvements related to the subdivision. The proposed residences are a use that is consistent with the zoning and general plan. Therefore, the potential for converting Prime Farmland, Unique

Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as categorized by the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use is less than significant.

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

The project site is located within a residential related zoning district. The subject property is not currently in a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or with a Williamson Act contract.

c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g) or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?* ***(No Impact)***

The project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526, or zoned Timberland Production as defined by California Government Code section 51104(g). The project site is zoned for residential uses and the project includes a development plan to allow the residential development. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland.

California Public Resources Code Section 12220, under the Forest Legacy Program Act, defines "forest land" as land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Public Resources Code 4526, under the Forest Practice Act, defines "timberland" as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species are determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others.

California Government Code 51104, 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. "Timberland production zone" or "TPZ" means an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 51112 or 51113 of the Government Code and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, as defined in Public Resources Code 4526 or 12220. With respect to the general plans of cities and counties, "timberland preserve zone" means "timberland production zone." As stated in the Contra Costa County General Plan, no land is used for timber harvesting.

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

The project site is a 1.57-acre residential property with multiple ornamental trees and all vegetation will be removed in order to install the subdivision improvements. The project site is in a developed area and the project site is currently zoned for residential uses. Thus, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

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

The project site is surrounded by primarily residential and industrial zoned areas of the County. The project is to subdivide the site into 33 residential lots, and construct 33 townhomes and related improvements. Construction of a residence is an allowed use within the MH zoning district. Furthermore, the project site is in a developed area and the project site is currently zoned for residential uses. Thus, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Sources of Information

- Government Code section 51104(g)
- California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)
- California Public Resources Code Section 4526
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 8, Zoning Ordinance.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Land Use Element*, *Conservation Element*
- California Department of Conservation. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2018.*

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. *AIR QUALITY – Would the project:*				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The 2017 Clean Air Plan, prepared by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the most recent plan prepared to fulfill state and federal air pollution reduction requirements. The 2017 plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate, as well as describing how the air district will continue to progress toward attaining all state and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities from exposure to air pollution among Bay Area communities. To accomplish this, the 2017 plan describes a multi-pollutant strategy to simultaneously reduce emissions and ambient concentrations of ozone, fine particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, as well as greenhouse gases (GHG) that contribute to climate change. The subdivision of land, or any other aspects of the proposed project, does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans for the region; therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on this analysis category.

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 with Mitigation)***

In developing thresholds of significance for criteria air pollutants, the BAAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively significant. As such, if a project exceeds the identified thresholds of significance, its emissions would be significant in terms of both project- and cumulative-level impacts, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Thus, this impact analysis and discussion is related to the project- and cumulative-level effect of the project's regional criteria air pollutant emissions.

By its nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact resulting from emissions generated over a large geographic region. The non-attainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development within the Air Basin, and this regional impact is a cumulative impact. In other words, new development projects (such as the proposed project) within the Air Basin would contribute to this impact only on a cumulative basis. No single project would be sufficient in size, by itself, to result in non-attainment of regional air quality standards. Instead, a project's emissions may be individually limited, but cumulatively significant when taken in combination with past, present, and future development projects.

The cumulative analysis focuses on whether a specific project would result in cumulatively significant emissions. According to Section 15064(h)(4) of the CEQA Guidelines, the existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone does not constitute substantial evidence that the project's incremental effects would be cumulatively significant. Rather, the determination of cumulative air quality impacts for construction and operational emissions is based on whether the proposed project would result in regional emissions that exceed the BAAQMD regional thresholds of significance for construction and operations on a project level. The thresholds of significance represent the allowable amount of emissions each project can generate without generating a cumulatively significant contribution to regional air quality impacts. Therefore, a project that would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance on the project level also would not be considered to result in a cumulatively significant impact with regard to regional air quality and would not be considered to result in a significant impact related to cumulative regional air quality.

Construction of the Project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, haul truck trips, and vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the site. In addition, fugitive dust PM_{10} emissions would result from excavation, trenching, and other construction activities. Construction would occur over approximately two years total (site preparation and construction of townhomes). Site preparation consists of tree removal and associated grading. Approximately 10,200 cubic yards is proposed for grading, which will result in 10,100 cubic yards of surplus/export.

Construction-related effects from fugitive dust from the proposed project would be greatest during the site preparation and grading phases due to the disturbance of soils. If not properly controlled, these activities would temporarily generate particulate emissions in the area of the construction site. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM_{10} emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity (amount of equipment operating), local weather conditions (such as wind speed), and characteristics such as soil moisture and silt content of the soil. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site. For mitigation of fugitive dust emissions, the BAAQMD recommends

implementing best management practices (BMPs), as a pragmatic and effective approach to controlling fugitive dust emissions (BAAQMD, 2017a). The BAAQMD notes that individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 percent to more than 90 percent. The BAAQMD considers any project's construction-related impacts to be less than significant if the required dust-control measures are implemented. Without these measures, the impact is generally considered to be significant, particularly if sensitive land uses are located in the project vicinity. There are a number of residences located at the border of the project site that could be impacted by fugitive dust generated by construction activities. Therefore, implementation of these BMPs would ensure the Project's fugitive dust emissions remaine below a level of significance.

Impact AIR-1: Exhaust emissions and particulate matter produced by construction activities related to the project may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
C. 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.
D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
E. 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.
F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
H. The applicant shall post a publicly visible sign with the developer/project manager's name and telephone number regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

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

The project includes construction of 33 townhomes and related improvements. The surrounding properties are a mix of residential and industrial uses. The closest school is approximately 0.50 miles south of the project site. It is anticipated that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to significant pollutant concentrations due to the scale of the proposed project. Residential uses typically do not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. Furthermore, the construction activities will be restricted to specific days of the week and to a limited number of work hours in order to lessen the amount of time during the week that sensitive receptors would be exposed to construction-related air quality impacts.

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 project includes construction of 33 townhomes and related improvements. During construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coating would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. It is anticipated that by the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality or odor concern. Therefore, construction odors impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed 33 new townhomes would not likely generate objectionable odors. The types of uses that are considered to have objection odors include wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer station, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), or petroleum refineries. The proposed project is residential in nature, and it is not anticipated to generate objectionable odors which may affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan.*
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Guidelines.*

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

*a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (**Less than Significant Impact)***

According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located in or adjacent to a significant ecological area. The project site has been completely developed and includes multiple structures. There are five trees on site which will be removed as a result of the

project. The surrounding area primarily consists of developed properties with residences. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to habitats or special status species.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (**Less than Significant Impact)***

According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located in or adjacent to, a significant ecological area. The project site does not contain a riparian habitat. In addition, the project site is not within a sensitive natural community, since the surrounding area is largely developed. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (**Less than Significant Impact)***

The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Corps) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are two of the primary Federal agencies which enforce the Clean Water Act and administer the associated permitting program. As such, these agencies define wetland as areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. The subject property would not be categorized as a wetland as defined above. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project having an adverse effect on a federally protected wetland.

d) *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? **(Less than Significant Impact)***

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species. As such, the project's potential to 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 is considered less than significant.

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

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal and development within their drip lines while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any property proposed for development approval, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. The proposed project includes the removal of 5 code-protected trees and work within the dripline of 9 other trees. The proposed tree removal has been evaluated by CDD staff pursuant to the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance as well as the project plans for construction of new townhomes, driveways, storm water control, and other site improvements. As the project includes the removal of code-protected trees, a tree permit is required in order to remove the trees. The project will require findings for approval or denial, and, if approved, will receive standard conditions of approval for restitution in order to reasonably restore the natural resources on-site. With the standard review and conditions implemented, the project will have a less than significant impact.

f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The County has adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County. This plan covers areas within the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, Pittsburg, as well as unincorporated areas of eastern Contra Costa County. The subject property is not within the covered area for the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the HCP/NCCP.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Land Use Element*, *Conservation Element*
- East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Plan

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. *CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:*				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5?* ***(Less than Significant with Mitigation)***

Setting

Evidence gathered from archaeological sites in the region indicates that this part of Contra Costa County is known to have been occupied, at least intermittently, for the past 6,000 years or longer (Fredrickson 1973; Moratto 1984). The ethnographic inhabitants of the area were the Bay Miwok Native American group, who are known to have established villages in the project vicinity (Kroeber 1925 and Levy 1978). Located at the margin of the Sacramento River Delta, this area was ecologically rich in resources during aboriginal times. The project area is within the boundary of the Rancho Las Juntas, a Mexican Land Grant initially awarded in 1832 and later confirmed by the U.S. General Land Office in 1870.

Contra Costa County was incorporated in 1850 as one of the original 27 counties of the State of California. Climate, topography, and the wealth of natural resources found within the county contributed to its development as an agricultural, industrial and maritime hub. Contra Costa's county seat is the City of Martinez, which was incorporated in 1867 and served as a center for wheat shipping. The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad further developed the town's commerce beginning in 1879. The project region historically comprised good grazing and agricultural lands, orchards, and nearby coal mines. The discovery of coal on the northern slopes of Mt. Diablo in 1848 drew settlers to the region; however, by the mid-1880s when the coal boom was over, the mining "boom towns" were deserted. The population centers of Concord, Martinez, and Walnut Creek survived owing to their reliance on an agricultural economic base.

Results of the Record Search

On behalf of William Self Associates, Inc. (WSA), staff at the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, conducted a record search of the project vicinity on January 10, 2006 (File No. 05-581). Information on previous cultural resource surveys, known historic or prehistoric sites, and

listed or eligible National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Resources properties within a ¼ mile radius of the project area was gathered to identify and evaluate the potential for the presence of cultural resources. The study included a review of archaeological, ethnographic, historical, and environmental literature as well as records and maps on file at the California Archaeological Inventory. Additional data on the history and prehistory of the area on file at WSA were reviewed.

NWIC search results indicated there were no recorded archaeological sites or previous studies conducted within the project area. One recorded site, the Contra Costa Canal (P-07-2695) is within ¼ mile, but well outside the project area. In addition, three previous studies have been conducted within ¼ mile as follows:

Survey #	Author	Date	Report Title	Location
S-1582	Peter Banks	1979	An Archaeological Investigation of the Plant Modernization Project, Shell Oil Refinery, Martinez.	Approx. ¼ mile N and NW of project area.
S-18440	West and Welch	1996	Class II Archaeological Survey of the Contra Costa Canal, CCC, CA.	Approx. 800 feet N and NE of project area.
S-25334	Carrie D. Willis	2002	Archaeological Survey and Assessment of 3980 Pacheco, CA, APN 161-240-003.	Approx. 600 feet SE of project area.

Native American Heritage Commission

WSA contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California, on January 5, 2006 by letter with a description of the proposed development in Contra Costa County, California. The letter included a request for a listing of local, interested Native American representatives and information on traditional or sacred lands within the project area and vicinity.

NAHC staff member Ms. Debbie Pilas-Treadway wrote in response to the WSA letter on January 16, 2006, that a "search of the sacred lands file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area." Included in the NAHC response was a list of interested Native American contacts.

Results of the Survey

WSA Senior Archaeologist Leigh Martin conducted a survey of the project area on January 9, 2006. The objective of the cultural resource survey was to locate and record all cultural resources within the project area and evaluate them for significance. The archaeological survey was conducted using transect intervals of 30 feet or less within the open portions of the project corridor. Ground visibility varied from fair to poor, depending on the vegetation coverage. Grass was scraped away

in several areas to improve ground visibility. The eastern portion of each parcel consists of open, level ground that was completely fenced. The western portions of each parcel contain structures surrounded by landscaping and asphalt/concrete/gravel surfaces. The project area comprises 1.5 acres and consists of two separate lots: Parcel One is located at 3835 Pacheco Blvd., adjacent to the north boundary of Parcel Two; Parcel Two is located at 3845 Pacheco Blvd. and bounded on the south by Windhover Way. No prehistoric cultural resources were observed, and one house located on Parcel Two at 3845 Pacheco Blvd. was recorded on DPR forms because it is over 50 years of age.

Parcel One – 3835 Pacheco Blvd (APN 380-220-067)

Parcel One has a modern single-family residence and garage with a single-story 4-plex rental unit in the rear. None of these structures meet the age requirements to be considered historic resources and were not recorded as part of this survey. An asphalt-covered driveway leads to a vacant, level field that is enclosed by a wood fence with a cyclone-type gate opening. The one-story, stucco 4-plex has an asphalt covered parking area extending to the east and north of the unit. Ground visibility within the surveyed area was between 50 and 60 percent. No cultural material, except fragments of concrete rip-rap in the rear field, was observed during the survey of Parcel One.

Parcel Two – 3845 Pacheco Blvd. (APN 380-220-044)

Parcel Two is bounded by Windhover Way on the south and Pacheco Blvd. on the west. It is part of the Meadowbrook Subdivision 5210 designated on the County Assessor's map as Lot 34. The eastern half of the parcel is an open, level, fenced field. The field is currently used for vehicle and equipment storage; a house trailer was also noted. Ground visibility within the surveyed area was between 40 and 50 percent. No cultural material was observed during the survey. The western half of the parcel contains several structures. According to research conducted at the Contra Costa County Assessor's Office, the house located at 3845 Pacheco Blvd. was constructed in 1947. Since the time of its original construction, the house has been extensively remodeled. Records indicate additions in 1983 for solar installation, 1999 (roof), and 1992 (vinyl siding). The one-story U-shaped plan is typical of post war ranch-style architecture in California. The 1,437 square foot structure has 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms with a wood deck and detached garage in the rear. It appears that most of the original windows have been replaced with vinyl-clad product. The vinyl siding is beige colored and the roof material is asphalt shingle. The west elevation (front façade) has a concrete porch with 3 concrete steps descending from it. The east elevation has a back porch that opens out onto a gravel/concrete pathway and the rear asphalt driveway that leads from Windhover Way to a parking area and garage. Measuring approximately 20 feet across, a dilapidated carport is attached to the east side of the garage. This carport is attached to a small cottage rental unit that appears to be modern. Mature landscaping around the main house includes lawn, citrus (orange), and oleander. A California Department of Parks and Recreation DPR 523 form has been prepared on the 1947 house and is appended to the WSA report.

Recommendations

An assessment of the historical significance of the main house at 3845 Pacheco Blvd. was made following CEQA Guidelines (Title 14.CCR Chapter 3. Sec 15064.5(3)) which state that, generally, a resource shall be considered to be historically significant if the resource meets criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852). A historical resource must be significant at the local, state or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The house does not appear to meet any of these criteria and, therefore, should not be considered historically significant.

No other significant cultural resources were observed during the survey of the project area. However, there is always a possibility that such resources may become apparent during any ground-disturbing activities. Indicators of prehistoric site activity include charcoal, obsidian or chert flakes, grinding bowls, shell fragments, bone, and pockets of dark, friable soils. Historic resources include glass, metal, ceramics, wood and similar debris. This would represent a potentially significant impact related to historic resources if encountered. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to undiscovered historical resources to a less than significant level.

Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities could have the potential to damage previously undiscovered historical resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: If during the course of construction activities there is accidental discovery, the following steps shall be taken and included on the face all construction plans:

> All construction personnel, including operators of equipment involved in grading, or trenching activities will be advised of the need to immediately stop work if they observe any indications of the presence of an unanticipated cultural resource discovery (e.g. wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; deposits of wood, glass, ceramics). 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 and a qualified archaeologist contacted to evaluate the finds and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the appropriate County and other agencies.

If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If eligible, deposits 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 NWIC and appropriate Contra Costa County agencies.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

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

Figure 9-2 of the Open Space Element of the County General Plan identifies archaeologically sensitive areas in the County. According to this map, the project site is located within a largely urbanized area. Based on the site's location, the project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archeological site(s). However, during construction activities, sensitive resources may encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to undiscovered archaeological resources.

Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities may have a significant impact to previously undiscovered archaeological resources.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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

No human remains or cemeteries are known to exist within or near the project site. However, there is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously human remains, there could be a potentially significant impact. If human remains or any associated funerary artifacts are discovered during construction, all work must cease within the immediate vicinity of the discovery. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), the Contra Costa County Sheriff/Coroner must be contacted immediately. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will in turn appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD) to act as a tribal representative and confirm next steps. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

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

Impact CUL-3: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered human remains.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If during the course of construction activities there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken and included on the face of all construction plans:

If human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation. If the human remains are of a Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the property and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. The MLD will work with the Applicant and a qualified archaeologist to determine the proper treatment of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. Construction activities will not resume until either the human remains are exhumed, or the remains are avoided via project construction design change.

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

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.
- Record Search, Archeological Field Survey and Assessment by William Self and Associates dated January 16, 2006.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY*:*

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

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

Environmental effects related to energy include the project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type during construction and operation; the effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies; the effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy; the degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards; the effects of the project on energy resources; and the project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives, if applicable. The following factors demonstrate a project's significance in relation to these effects: (1) Why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed; (2) The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste; (3) The potential for reducing peak energy demand; (4) Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems; and (5) Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

Energy consumption includes energy required for the construction of the proposed project and the operational use of the 33 townhomes. The proposed project's energy demand would be typical for a development of this scope and nature and would be required to comply with current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, enforced by the Building Inspection Division. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact due to energy consumption.

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

The Climate Action Plan (CAP) includes a number of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County. The proposed project's energy demand would be typical for a development of this scope and nature and would be required to comply with current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, enforced by the County's Building Inspection Division. Therefore, the project's potential to conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be less then significant.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County, 2015. *Climate Action Plan.*

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. ***GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:***				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUMMARY:

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

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

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo (A-P) zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Concord

fault, which is mapped approximately 1½ mile northeast of the project site. No faults are mapped within the subject project.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

According to the Safety Element (p. 10-23) the site is in an area rated "lowest damage susceptibility". Nevertheless, conservative design and quality construction could keep ground shaking damage to a minimum, but it cannot be eliminated in the event of an earthquake. The risk of damage from ground shaking is controlled both by use of sound engineering judgement and compliance with the latest provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), as a minimum. 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 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. Thus, the potential impact from seismic shaking would be less than significant.

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

According to the Safety Element (p. 10-27), the site is rated "generally low" liquefaction potential. This preliminary finding is supported by the subsurface data presented in the Terrasearch report.

iv) Landslides? ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The Safety Element of the General Plan includes four policies that pertain to lands considered to be located within an area where liquefaction related hazards are present. These policy indicate that *(i)* project approvals are contingent on geologic and engineering studies which define and delineate the potential hazard posed by liquefaction, *(ii)* the geotechnical/ engineering geologic report for the project shall provide recommendations to reduce risks to less-than-significant, and *(iii)* through monitoring and testing during the construction period, the geotechnical engineer/ engineering geologist that ensure that their recommendations are properly interpreted and implemented by the contractor.

Since there are no landslides indicated on the site by mapping of the USGS, and because the official SHZ map indicates that site is not considered to be at risk of earthquake-triggered landslide displacement, the risks of landslide related ground failure are not substantial for this project.

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

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

A SWPPP and Erosion Control Plan are a routine requirement of projects requiring grading permits. The SWPPP identifies the "best management practices" that are most appropriate for the site, and the "Erosion Control Plan," which is required for the grading permit, provides the details of the erosion control measures to be applied on the site and maintained throughout the winter rainy season.

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)***

The geotechnical report prepared for the project indicates that the geologic data indicates that the proposed development is feasible. The site is mantled by stiff, clayey alluvial deposits of inferred Late Pleistocene age. At a depth less than 10 feet the site is underlain by bedrock that consists chiefly of siltstone and sandstone. The Terrasearch report provides preliminary standards and criteria for site grading, drainage and foundation design.

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)***

Expansive soils shrink and swell as a result of moisture changes that can cause heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements and structures founded on shallow foundations. Building damage due to volume changes associated with expansive soils can be reduced by placing slabs on select, granular fill, and by use of rigid mat or port-tensioned slabs. General foundation design criteria are provided by the Terrasearch report. It should be recognized that expansive soils are an engineering issue, and not a land use or feasibility issue. Because the site will be graded resulting in a cut situation, nearly all improvements will be in that cut soil area. Any building on fill must give consideration to expansion potential and corrosivity, and building pads that are astride the cut/fill transition or are astride the contact of expansive claystone/non-expansive sandstone may require special foundation design measures. These are geotechnical design details not environmental impacts.

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

The project is expected to be served by public sewers.

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

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ***(Less than Significant with Mitigation)***

The possible opportunity for fossil material to be exposed would occur during trenching for utility lines (including storm drainage, sewers, domestic water, electrical and TV cable). Trenches would likely penetrate native soils. Standard CDD practice is to require that work shall stop if such materials are uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite earthwork until a certified paleontologist has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation as deemed necessary. The following mitigation measure will address any unexpected discovery or find which may occur during the construction phase of the project.

Impact GEO-1: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Should any significant fossils (e.g., bones, teeth, or unusually abundant and well-preserved invertebrates or plants) be unearthed, the construction crew shall not attempt to remove them, as they could be extremely fragile and prone to crumbling, and to ensure their occurrence is properly recorded; instead, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be diverted at least 15 feet until a professional paleontologist assesses the find and, if deemed appropriate, salvages it in a timely manner. All recovered fossils shall be deposited in an appropriate repository, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), where they would be properly curated and made accessible for future study.

Sources of Information

- *Geotechnical Investigation on Proposed Residential Development by Terrasearch, Inc. dated February 21, 2006*
- Geologic Peer Review and CEQA Section by Darwin Meyers Associates dated March 29, 2006.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Safety Element.*

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY*:*

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

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)***

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

Senate Bill 97 directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA Guidelines for evaluation of GHG emissions impacts and recommend mitigation strategies. In response, OPR released the Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change, and proposed revisions to the State CEQA guidelines for consideration of GHG emissions. The California Natural Resources Agency adopted the proposed State CEQA Guidelines as discussed below.

The bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT CO2/yr is a numeric emissions level below which a project's contribution to global climate change would be less than "cumulatively considerable." This emissions rate is equivalent to a project size of an approximately 541,000-square-foot industrial use. Future construction of 33 townhomes and related improvements would create some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would be below the above-noted emission rate and not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. As the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions that exceed the threshold of significance.

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)***

At a regional scale, the BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan that addresses GHG emissions as well as various criteria air pollutants. The BAAQMD Plan included a number of pollutant reduction strategies for the San Francisco Bay air basin, many of which would be included in the project through Title 24 energy efficiency requirement for the expected new residences.

Within Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors convened a Climate Change Working Group (CCWG) in May 2005, to identify existing County activities and policies that could reduce GHG emissions. In November 2005, the CCWG presented its Climate Protection Report to the Board of Supervisors, which included a list of existing and potential GHG reduction measures. This led to the quantification of relevant County information on GHGs in the December 2008 Municipal Climate Action Plan.

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

In April 2012, the Board directed the Department of Conservation and Development to prepare a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address the reduction of GHG emissions in the unincorporated areas of the County. In December 2015, the Climate Action Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The Climate Action Plan includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County.

The project does not conflict with the policies outlined in the CAP. The project will incorporate Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (CCC) emission reduction measures (as referenced in Appendix E "Developer Checklist" of the CCC). The checklist will be submitted to the Community Development Division prior to issuance of a building permit for each residence. Implementation of these emission reduction measures is considered a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy under the CCC and therefore meets the BAAQMD's GHG threshold. The project would not conflict with the CAP and therefore would not be considered to have a significant impact.

Sources of Information

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Guidelines.*
- Contra Costa County. *Title 8: Zoning Ordinance*.
- Contra Costa County. 2008. *Municipal Climate Action Plan*.
- Contra Costa County. 2015. *Climate Action Plan.*
- Contra Costa County. 2023-2024. Interim Climate Action Plan.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The project site is currently occupied by residential uses so very limited risk of upset (e.g., underground storage tanks. etc.) is expected. However, during construction the proposed project would be expected to involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuels, aerosols, and paints. The proposed project would be subject to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, California Public Resources Code, and other State and local regulations that would reduce and limit the associated risks. Any handling, transporting, use, or

disposal would comply with applicable laws, policies, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies and regulations.

During project operations, small quantities of hazardous materials may be handled on the project site. Because of the nature of the project, hazardous materials used on-site may vary but would likely be limited to small quantities of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, solvents, cleaning agents, and similar materials used for daily residential operations and maintenance activities. These types of materials are common for residential developments such as the project and represent a low risk to people and the environment when used as intended. Further, compliance with applicable plans and regulations, would provide public protection from hazards associated with the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous substances. Therefore, operational impacts related to public hazard risk as a result of hazardous materials transport, use, or disposal would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

Construction activity would be expected to involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuels, aerosols, and paints. The use of these materials would be subject to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, California Public Resources Code, and other State and local regulations that would limit the use of hazardous materials and reduce the associated risks of exposure. Any handling, transporting, use, or disposal would comply with applicable laws, policies, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies and regulations, including the Environmental Protection Agency, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Caltrans, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, and the Contra Costa County Hazardous Materials Program. Therefore, construction impacts related to hazardous materials upset risk would be less than significant.

The project proposes construction of 33 townhomes and related subdivision improvements, landscaping, and open space. As such, the proposed project would not be expected to include industrial or retail development that involves hazardous materials such as gas stations, paint stores, or auto parts stores. Unlike industrial or retail facilities, residential development does not involve the type or quantity of hazardous materials that could pose a significant environmental accident.

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 closest school is approximately 0.50 miles south of the project site. Thus, construction and operational impacts related to hazardous emissions proximate to a school would be less than significant.

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

Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the project site is not categorized as a hazardous materials 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 site is located approximately 3.8 miles northwest of the Buchanan Field Airport. There would be no safety hazard or excessive noise related to a public airport or public use airport.

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 project site is primarily accessed from Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Way in Martinez. There are a number of streets off of Pacheco Boulevard that are perpendicular and would utilize this roadway in an emergency. However, no aspect of the project will impede or reduce access to Pacheco Boulevard because of its construction or operation. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) has reviewed the project plans and provided routine comments for the site. The project site is designed in accordance with the CCCFPD's and the County's standards to accommodate emergency vehicle access by providing two points of access that would be available to emergency vehicles. The Fire Protection District would review the construction drawings for the project at the time of submittal of a building permit application. Thus, project impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be less than significant.

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 Impact)***

The project site is located within a "Urban Unzoned" Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area as indicated in the County's mapping system in Accela. The fire hazard severity zones reflect the degree of severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail in the area. The construction of the new townhomes would be subject to building standards required for structures within "Urban Unzoned" Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The building standard for the Fire Hazard

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

Severity Zones would be enforced as the project goes through the plan checking process with the Building Inspection Division and the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. As the project will comply with these standards, there would be a less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.

Sources of Information

- County's Mapping System in Accela.
- Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – "Cortese List."
- Contra Costa County. 2000. *Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.*
- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element.*
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, *Agency Comment Letter*.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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:				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 project would comply with applicable water quality and discharge requirements. Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and 16 incorporated cities in the county have formed the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. In October 2009, the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) adopted the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Regional Permit for the Program, which regulates discharges from municipal storm drains.

Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control stormwater runoff. The County has the authority to enforce compliance with its Municipal Regional Permit through the County's adopted C.3 requirements. The C.3 requirements stipulate that projects creating and/or redeveloping at least 10,000 square feet of impervious surface shall treat stormwater runoff with permanent stormwater management facilities, along with measures to control runoff rates and volumes. Due to the potential impervious areas that would be created for the residential and access improvements on the site (approximately 55,083 square feet), this project triggers threshold requiring submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP).

The SWCP prepared for the proposed project identifies Low Impact Development (LID) design strategies that optimizes site layout, use of permeable pavements, dispersal of runoff to pervious areas, and bioretention or other Integrated Management Practices. The applicant provided Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan that is deemed to be preliminarily complete, however, it remains subject to future revision, as necessary, during preparation of improvement plans to bring it into full compliance with C.3 stormwater requirements. One exception to Code Section 914-12.002 which requires detention basins to be at least 15-acre-feet of storage volume is requested to allow small detention basins that are privately maintained and funded. Nevertheless, with implementation of the practicable stormwater controls, the project would be compliant with applicable water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, resulting in a less than significant impact.

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 proposed project would have new impervious surfaces of approximately 55,083 square feet. However, the proposed project would incorporate LID techniques as described in the SWCP, some of which allows natural filtration into project soils and naturally recharge ground water. The proposed project would not interfere substantially with groundwater supply, recharge, or groundwater management. Therefore, potential impacts related to the groundwater recharge and supply would be less than significant.

c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

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 the provided stormwater infrastructure and grading plan, the site drains from south to north. A series of storm drain lines will direct runoff from the site to the stormwater treatment basins, ultimately discharging to an existing storm drain system in Windhover way. The drainage analysis show the treatment basins have sufficient capacity to meter the stormwater runoff and satisfy the drainage requirements cited above. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact regarding 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?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The proposed project would comply with regulations of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit consistent with Division 1014 of the Ordinance Code. The site generally slopes towards the north and is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Nevertheless, as described above, analysis has been provided that indicates the project design is adequate to accommodate the rainwater runoff generated during storm events. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial on- or off-site flooding.

iii) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

Three bioretention basins are proposed to capture and treat the stormwater runoff. All bioretention basins will then discharge into the storm drain system located within Windhover Way. No runoff will be directly discharged to the drainage systems outside of the project site. Accordingly, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of the stormwater system.

iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project is not located in area that is within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Furthermore, the improvements on the site are not expected to create any barrier that would impede or redirect flood flows, should flooding occur.

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

The 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. The project site is not located near the ocean, and as such would not be susceptible to inundation from a tsunami. The project site is not immediately located near a large, enclosed body of water and as such would not be susceptible to inundation from a seiche. As a result, the project site would not be a risk for inundation from flooding, tsunami, or seiche. Therefore, impacts related to risk of pollutant release due to inundation would be less than significant.

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 stated above, the proposed project would comply with applicable water quality and discharge requirements. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control stormwater runoff. The Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) prepared for the proposed project includes stormwater controls as required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program and Municipal Regional Permit. Thus, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. 2023. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated July 18, 2023.*
- David Evans and Associates Inc. March 2, 2023. *Preliminary Hydrology Analysis.*

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The subject property is currently used for residential activities. The surrounding properties are primarily residential uses with some industrial activities further north and west. The project proposes 33 townhomes with two access points to the project site from Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Way. Thus, the project would not physically divide any of the nearby communities, or adversely impact the manner in which people enter or exit those communities.

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 project site has a General Plan land use designation of Multiple-Family Residential-High Density (MH). Primary land uses permitted in this designation include high-density residential uses and the associated accessory buildings and structures. The proposed project would subdivide the property into 33 townhome lots. There are no land use plans applicable to the subject site aimed at mitigating environmental impacts.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2005-2020. *Land Use Element.*
- Contra Costa County. *Title 8 – Zoning Ordinance.*

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY:

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

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

Pursuant to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located within any area of the County identified as a significant mineral resource area. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project resulting in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

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

Pursuant to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located within any area of the County identified as a significant mineral resource area. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project resulting in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020, *Conservation Element.*

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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?* ***(Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation)***

The Noise Element of the Contra Costa County General Plan discusses the County's goal to improve the overall environment in the County by reducing annoying and physically harmful levels of noise for existing and future residents, and for all land uses. According to the *Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments* chart (Figure 11-6) in the County General Plan, environments with ambient noise levels of up to 60 dBA (decibels) Ldn (day night average sound level) are considered "normally acceptable" and noise levels between 55 dB to 70 dB are "conditionally acceptable" in residential areas. Pursuant to Policy 11-4 of the Noise Element, an interior noise level standard of 45 dBA Ldn or less is appropriate for residential development.

According to the County's GIS and the County's General Plan Noise Contour map (Figure 11-5C), the subject property is located within a noise level of 60 dBA. The major noise sources affecting the project site are vehicular traffic along the local roadway network along Pacheco Boulevard. Windhover Way is a secondary roadway along the eastern frontage of the property. Vehicular traffic generated by the 33 proposed townhomes, along with noise typically associated with residential uses (e.g., yard maintenance, recreation, etc.), would increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. However, the types and levels of noise generated from the 33 proposed townhomes in the subdivision would be similar to noise levels from the existing residential developments in the area, and therefore, the impact on ambient noise levels in the vicinity would be less than significant.

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

Impact NOI-1: Construction related activities could generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project.

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

1. Unless specifically approved via prior authorization from the Zoning Administrator, all construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:

   New Year's Day (State and Federal)
   Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
   Washington's Birthday (Federal)
   Lincoln's Birthday (State)
   President's Day (State)
   Cesar Chavez Day (State)
   Memorial Day (State and Federal)
   Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)
   Independence Day (State and Federal)
   Labor Day (State and Federal)
   Columbus Day (Federal)
   Veterans Day (State and Federal)
   Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
   Day after Thanksgiving (State)
   Christmas Day (State and Federal)

   For specific details on the actual day the State and Federal holidays occur, please visit the following websites:

   Federal Holidays: Federal Holidays (opm.gov)
   California Holidays: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutftb/holidays.shtml

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

2. The applicant shall make a good faith effort to minimize project-related disruptions to adjacent properties, and to uses on the site. This shall be communicated to all project-related contractors.

3. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.

4. Large trucks and heavy equipment are subject to the same restrictions that are imposed on construction activities, except that the hours shall be limited to weekdays between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M. and prohibited on State and Federal holidays.

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

Project construction includes grading of approximately 100 cubic yards of fill and 10,100 cubic yards of export. Grading will occur temporarily at the site during construction, therefore, the amount of ground borne vibration or noise generated by the project will be less than significant.

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)***

As discussed in Section 9.e, the project site is located approximately 3.8 miles northwest from the Buchanan Field Airport. Thus, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2005-2020. *Noise Element.*

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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)? ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The proposed project would result in the construction of 33 townhomes, resulting in approximately 95 people being added to this location. This amount is a non-substantial increase in the population. The subject property is zoned for residential uses as are the surrounding properties. The proposed uses for this district would allow for residential uses and the project is consistent with the County's General Plan. Therefore, the potential to induce a substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, would be less than significant.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The subject property is currently developed with residential uses. The proposed project consists of constructing 33 townhomes that will provide much-needed housing to the area. The project is also subject to the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and the applicant has elected to pay the in-lieu fee. Therefore, the project has no potential for displacing any existing housing or people.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Finance 2024.
- Contra Costa County. *Title 8 – Zoning Ordinance.*

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) *Fire Protection?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. In correspondence from the Fire Protection District dated August 11, 2023, the Fire District indicated that upon review of the application submittal, it was found that all applicable requirements have been satisfied. In addition, as detailed in the comment letter for the proposed project from the Fire District, the project is required to comply with the California Building Code, and applicable Contra Costa County Ordinances that pertain to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. Furthermore, prior to the issuance of building permits, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the Fire District. All townhomes will be equipped with an automatic fire suppression sprinkler system. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project relating to fire protection would be less than significant.

b) *Police Protection?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the Unincorporated Martinez area. The County General Plan Policy 7-57 indicates a Sheriff facility standard of 155 square feet of Sheriff station space per 1,000 persons of population. The proposed project would increase the population of unincorporated Contra Costa County by approximately 95 persons, which is less than the facility standard and is a non-substantial increase. Thus, the addition of 33 townhomes to the project area would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the area.

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

The project site is within the Martinez Unified School District. The average size of a household in the Contra Costa County area is approximately 2.85 persons per household. The project consists of 33 townhomes and would result in approximately 95 people. Conservatively, an estimated 1 in 3 persons per household may be children between the ages of five to 19. The project would result in approximately 33 school-age children. This increase of 33 students would not significantly impact the district. Furthermore, the applicant would be required to pay school impact fees to Martinez Unified, which would assist to support facilities to address increased demand.

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

The average size of a household in the Contra Costa County area is approximately 2.85 persons per household. The proposed project would increase the population by approximately 95 people.

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

As a result, there would be an increase in use of parks in the surrounding area. These parks provide recreational facilities such as playgrounds, picnic and barbecue areas, and youth and adult recreational programs. A Park Impact Fee is required to be paid by the applicant prior to issuance of a building permit. Given the project's negligible addition to the population, the impact of the proposed project on parks would be less than significant.

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

Libraries:

The Contra Costa Library operates 28 facilities in Contra Costa County. The Contra Costa Library system is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. A portion of the property taxes on the project site will contribute to the Contra Costa Library system. Accordingly, the impact of the use of the public libraries by the residents of the 33 lots created would be less than significant.

Health Facilities:

The Contra Costa County Health Services Department (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 11 health centers and clinics in the County. County health facilities generally serve low income and uninsured patients. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes, including a portion of the taxes on the project site. Thus, the impact of the use of public health facilities by the residents of the 33 lots created would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Finance 2024.
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. 2023. *Agency Comment Letter dated August 11, 2023.*

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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)***

The proposed project involves a subdivision of a 1.57-acre project site into 33 townhome lots. The population in the project area would be increased by approximately 95 people. This population growth could incrementally increase use of parks and recreational facilities in the area. However, the negligible increase in population is not expected to impact recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. The 33 new townhome residences are also subject to a Park Impact Fee, paid by the applicant prior to issuance of a building permit. Therefore, the increase in use of the parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

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

As described above, use of public recreational facilities by potential new residents would incrementally increase use of existing facilities, but would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Finance 2024.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

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)***

Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis of any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more additional AM or PM peak-hour trips. The proposed project consisting of a 33-lot subdivision would generate an estimated 35-45 AM and PM peak-hour trips, and therefore, is not required to have a project-specific traffic impact analysis. Since the project would yield less than 100 peak hour AM or PM trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the circulation system in the Martinez area.

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is responsible for ensuring local government conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP), a program aimed at reducing regional traffic congestion. The CMP requires that each local jurisdiction identify existing and future transportation facilities that will operate below an acceptable service level and provide mitigation where future growth degrades that service level. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority has review responsibility for proposed development projects that are expected to generate 100 or more additional peak-hours trips. As the project would yield less than 100 additional peak hour AM or PM trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the CMP and would result in a less than significant impact.

The proposed subdivision will gain access via two private roads off Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Way. One private road ranging from 21 feet and 26 feet wide will provide internal vehicular circulation for residents and guests. Access at the Pacheco Boulevard driveway will be restricted to right turn ingress and egress only to avoid any turning movement or line-of-sight conflicts. Overall, the project would not cause unacceptable traffic related impacts in the immediate vicinity or area.

The goal of the CCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) is to encourage biking and walking through improvements to the countywide bicycle and pedestrian network. The CBPP identifies the existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities network throughout Contra Costa County. The project would not conflict with future implementation of any paths or pedestrian facilities.

The County's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance requires a residential project with 13 or more units to develop a TDM program. Since the project involves 33 lots, submittal of a TDM Program would be required for the review and approval of the Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division, prior to issuance of a building permit for the project. Overall, the project will not interfere with existing transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and therefore, would have a less-than-significant impact.

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

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

In analyzing land use projects under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. On June 23, 2020, in compliance with SB 743 (2013), the Board of Supervisors adopted Transportation Analysis Guidelines (TAG)1, which defines the County's approach to analyzing VMT impacts from certain projects. As a result of SB 743, VMT is the metric used to define transportation impacts in a CEQA review. The VMT screening criteria for projects consisting of 20 residential or less will not require a VMT analysis. The proposed project consists of a 33-lot subdivision, which would generate an estimated 35-45 AM and PM peak-hour trips. Based on the CCTA Travel Model, the Countywide average daily VMT per resident is currently 17.3 miles. The proposed project is forecast to have an average VMT of 13.6 miles and the impact threshold is 15% below the County Average which equates to a threshold of 14.7 miles. Therefore, the project would be expected to have a less than significant impact or 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 subdivision will gain access via two private roads off Pacheco Boulevard and Windhover Way. One private road ranging from 21 feet and 26 feet wide will provide internal vehicular circulation for residents and guests. Access at the Pacheco Boulevard driveway will be restricted to right turn ingress and egress only to avoid any turning movement or line-of-sight conflicts. Overall, the project would not cause unacceptable hazards or design features.

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

The site plan was reviewed by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) in August 2023. As indicated in their letter dated August 11, 2023, the CCCFPD concluded that site access as shown on the site plan appears to comply with the Fire District's requirement. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element.*
- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated July 18, 2023.*
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. *Agency Comment Letter dated August 11, 2023.*
- *Abrams Associates Traffic Engineering, Inc., VMT Analysis dated March 23, 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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUMMARY:

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?* ***(Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation)***

As discussed in the Cultural Resources section of this Initial Study, no historical resources are known to exist on the project site. Further, according to the County's Archaeological Sensitivities Map, Figure 9-2, of the County General Plan, the subject site is located in an area that is considered "largely urbanized area." Given all of these factors, there is little potential for the project to impact cultural resources on the site. Nevertheless, the expected construction and grading would cause ground disturbance which may impact heretofore undocumented cultural resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce this impact during project related work to a level that would be considered less than significant.

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?* ***(Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation)***

While unlikely, subsurface construction activities always have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources such as wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse, if

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

encountered. This would represent a potentially significant impact related to historic resources if not mitigated.

Impact TRIBAL CUL-1: The project could potentially have a significant impact related to historic resources during construction related activities.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce the impact to undiscovered historical resources to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element.*
- WSA Archaeological Survey and Assessment, dated January 16, 2006.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 is considered an in-fill project surrounded by similar residential uses. All utility providers have been contacted and responded with confirmation that capacity exists within their respective systems to serve the project. Therefore, the project would not require construction of new off-site wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities.

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)***

The project site currently receives water service from the Contra Costa Water District. In a letter dated December 13, 2023, the District provided requirements indicating that service exists for the project and that final plans will need to be reviewed prior to construction. Accordingly, the impact of providing water service to the proposed project would be less than significant.

c) *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?* ***(Less than Significant Impact)***

The site currently receives wastewater services from Mountain View Sanitary District. In a letter dated October 6, 2022, District staff lists the requirements that the project will need to meet to connect to the existing infrastructure (e.g., submit final plans for review). District staff suggests that capacity remains in the system by providing the steps needed to connect with existing sewer infrastructure.

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

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

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

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

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

Sources of Information

- CalRecycle (Webpage) http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Government/default.htm
- CalRecycle, Facility/Site Summary Details: Keller Canyon Landfill (07-AA-0032) (Webpage) http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail/

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 Impact)***

The project site is located within a "Urban Unzoned" Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area as indicated in the County's mapping system in Accela. The fire hazard severity zones reflect the degree of severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail in the area. The construction of the new townhomes would be subject to building standards required for structures within "Urban Unzoned" Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The building standard for the Fire Hazard Severity Zones would be enforced as the project goes through the plan checking process with the Building Inspection Division and the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact

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 Impact)***

Please refer to the discussion and response for subsection-a above.

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 project site is currently developed with residential uses. However, new electrical power and natural gas lines on site and connecting to the project site would be installed underground, minimizing potential ignition and related fire risk above ground, at the project site according to the California Building Code, Uniform Fire Code, and the Contra Costa County General Plan Implementation Measure 7-au. The project plans will be reviewed and approved by the Fire District prior to issuance of a building permit. Lastly, off-site improvements, including frontage sidewalks and driveway curbs would not exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment is less than significant.

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 Impact)***

A SWCP with C.3 compliant storm water controls including pervious areas, bio-retention basins, and storm drains that would collect storm water was prepared for the project. The C.3 measures would decrease the amount of surface runoff discharged from the site by metering the outflow. The County Public Works Department has reviewed the applicant's preliminary SWCP and determined that it is pre-liminary complete. Furthermore, the project site is located within a "Urban Unzoned" Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area as indicated in the County's mapping system in Accela. Therefore, any impacts would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map.*
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. Safety Element.
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, *Agency Comment Letter dated August 11, 2023.*
- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated July 18, 2023.*

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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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)***

The project to subdivide the property into 33 lots and construct a townhome on each lot and associated improvements. The property is located in a developed area of the County and contains primarily residential land uses, while industrial uses are also located in the surrounding area. Impacts to the quality of the environment related to Aesthetic, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources are identified, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the adoption of the mitigation measures that are specified in the respective sections of this initial study. Thus, the measures will be conditions of approval of the proposed project and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures.

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

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 Impact)***

The proposed project to allow 33 residential lots and a townhome on each lot would not create substantial cumulative impacts. The project site is located within the Urban Limit Line in an area that is surrounded primarily by single-family residential development. In addition, there will be no significant increase in the demand for public services such as water, sewage disposal, or solid waste disposal that would require new or significantly expanded infrastructure improvements that could impact the environment. The project is consistent with the Multi-Family Residential-High Density (MH) General Plan land use designation. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the existing residential development at and surrounding the project site.

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)***

This Initial Study has disclosed impacts that would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures. All identified Mitigation Measures will be included in the conditions of approval for the proposed project, and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures. The project would also comply with all applicable General Plan policies, County Codes, and other applicable local and state regulations. As a result, there would not be any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

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

1. Project Application and Plans
2. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
3. Contra Costa County General Plan (2005 – 2020)
4. Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map
5. Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title 8)
6. Contra Costa County Accela
7. County Geographic Information System (GIS) Data Layers
8. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan.*
9. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Guidelines.*
10. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - "Cortese List" (Website)
11. Contra Costa County, 2015. *Climate Action Plan.*
12. Contra Costa County. 2008. *Municipal Climate Action Plan*.
13. California Department of Finance. 2024.
14. Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. July 18, 2023. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval.*
15. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. *Agency Comment Response dated August 11, 2023*.
16. California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center. 2006. *Agency comment letter dated February 28, 2006*.
17. Native American Heritage Commission, *letter dated December 16, 2005*.
18. Darwin Myers Associates, County Geologist. 2021. *Geologic Peer Review for County File #CDSD06-09628 and CDDP22-03036.* March 29, 2006.

19. HortScience, *Tree Inventory, dated January 22, 2006.*

20. Terrasearch Inc.. *Geotechnical Investigation,* February 21, 2006.

21. Terrasearch, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, dated January 16, 2006.*

22. Terrasearch, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, dated February 24, 2006.

23. Public Resources Code

24. CalRecycle (Webpage) *http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Government/default.htm*

25. CalRecycle, Facility/Site Summary Details: Keller Canyon Landfill (07-AA-0032) (Webpage) http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail/

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans
3. Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
County File #CDSD22-09628 and CDDP22-03036

3835, 3845 and 3855 Pacheco Blvd.,
Martinez, CA 94553

June 2024

SECTION 1: AESTHETICS	
Impact AES-1: New exterior lighting from the project site could adversely affect nighttime views in the area.	
Mitigation Measure AES-1: Proposed exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent glare or excessive light spillover.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Prior to, during, and post construction.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	If proposed, include on construction plan set for CDD review.

SECTION 2: AIR QUALITY

Impact AIR-1: Exhaust emissions and particulate matter produced by construction activities related to the project may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
C. 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.
D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
E. 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.
F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
H. The applicant shall post a publicly visible sign with the developer/project manager's name and telephone number regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and

take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Prior to and during construction.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set for CDD review.
SECTION 3: CULTURAL RESOURCES	
Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities could have the potential to damage previously undiscovered historical resources.	
Mitigation Measure CUL-1: If during the course of construction activities there is accidental discovery, the following steps shall be taken and included on the face all construction plans: All construction personnel, including operators of equipment involved in grading, or trenching activities will be advised of the need to immediately stop work if they observe any indications of the presence of an unanticipated cultural resource discovery (e.g. wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; deposits of wood, glass, ceramics). 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 and a qualified archaeologist contacted to evaluate the finds and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the appropriate County and other agencies. If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If eligible, deposits 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 NWIC and appropriate Contra Costa County agencies.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal of archaeologist report in the event of a find, for CDD review.

Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities may have a significant impact to previously undiscovered archaeological resources.
See **Mitigation Measure CUL-1.**
Impact CUL-3: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered human remains.
Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If during the course of construction activities there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken and included on the face of all construction plans: If human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation. If the human remains are of a Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the property and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. The MLD will work with the Applicant and a qualified archaeologist to determine the proper treatment of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. Construction activities will not resume until either the human remains are exhumed, or the remains are avoided via project construction design change. Upon completion of the assessment by an archaeologist, the archaeologist should prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report should be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa agencies.

Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal of archaeologist report in the event of a find, for CDD review.

SECTION 4: GEOLOGY/SOILS
Impact GEO-1: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1*:* Should any significant fossils (e.g., bones, teeth, or unusually abundant and well-preserved invertebrates or plants) be unearthed, the construction crew shall not attempt to remove them, as they could be extremely fragile and prone to crumbling, and to ensure their occurrence is properly recorded; instead, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be diverted at least 15 feet until a professional paleontologist assesses the find and, if deemed appropriate, salvages it in a timely manner. All recovered fossils shall be deposited in an appropriate repository, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), where they would be properly curated and made accessible for future study.

Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Throughout grading and project, review of information submitted.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal of paleontologist report in the event of a find, for CDD review.

SECTION 5: NOISE

Impact NOI-1: Construction related activities could generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project.

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

1. Unless specifically approved via prior authorization from the Zoning Administrator, all construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:

   New Year's Day (State and Federal)
   Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
   Washington's Birthday (Federal)
   Lincoln's Birthday (State)
   President's Day (State)
   Cesar Chavez Day (State)
   Memorial Day (State and Federal)
   Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)
   Independence Day (State and Federal)
   Labor Day (State and Federal)
   Columbus Day (Federal)
   Veterans Day (State and Federal)

Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
Day after Thanksgiving (State)
Christmas Day (State and Federal)

For specific details on the actual day the State and Federal holidays occur, please visit the following websites:

Federal Holidays: Federal Holidays (opm.gov)
California Holidays: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutftb/holidays.shtml

2. The applicant shall make a good faith effort to minimize project-related disruptions to adjacent properties, and to uses on the site. This shall be communicated to all project-related contractors.

3. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.

4. Large trucks and heavy equipment are subject to the same restrictions that are imposed on construction activities, except that the hours shall be limited to weekdays between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M. and prohibited on State and Federal holidays.

Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project Proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set for CDD review.

SECTION 6: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES
Impact TRIBAL-1: The project could potentially have a significant impact related to historic resources during construction related activities.
See **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the impact to undiscovered historical resources to a less than significant level.

From:	Ben Johanson
To:	Francisco Avila
Cc:	Carl Campos; Mohammad Ahmadieh; Morgan Kuhn
Subject:	Re: 3835 Pacheco Boulevard - Villas at Pacheco
Date:	Monday, April 29, 2024 11:39:35 AM

Francisco,

We have reviewed the documents and concur with the mitigations.

Thanks,
Benjamin L. Johanson | Associate | Architect
925.944.1626 | bjohanson@lca-architects.com

LCA ARCHITECTS | www.lca-architects.com
590 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 310
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

a california corporation

LCA Architects | 590 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 310, Walnut Creek, CA 94596
www.lca-architects.com | (925) 944-1626 office

TRANSMITTAL NOTICE
This communication from LCA Architects, along with any attachments, is covered by federal and state law governing electronic communications and may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, use, and/or copying of this message and/or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please reply immediately to the sender and delete this message. LCA Architects shall not be responsible for any modifications made to the information and/or any products derived from the information contained in this communication.

From: Francisco Avila <Francisco.Avila@dcd.cccounty.us>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2024 9:54 AM
To: Ben Johanson <bjohanson@lca-architects.com>
Cc: Carl Campos <ccampos@lca-architects.com>; Mohammad Ahmadieh <mahmadieh@icloud.com>; Morgan Kuhn <mkuhn@lca-architects.com>
Subject: RE: 3835 Pacheco Boulevard - Villas at Pacheco

Hello,

Attached is the project Initial Study and MMRP. Please review the documents for accuracy and provide any comments that you feel are necessary.

Upon review, please provide your concurrence with the mitigations or any questions you may have.

Once concurrence is obtained, I will post the environmental review for public review and comment.