

Contra Costa County

2026 URBAN LIMIT LINE RENEWAL

August 2025 | Initial Study



August 2025 | Initial Study

2026 URBAN LIMIT LINE RENEWAL

For Contra Costa County

Prepared for:

Contra Costa County

Contact: Will Nelson, Advance Planning Manager
30 Muir Road
Martinez, California 94553
925.655.2898

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks

Contact: Mark Teague, AICP
201 Parkshore Drive
Folsom, CA 95630
916.245.7500
info@placeworks.com
www.placeworks.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction	1
1.1 General Plan and GPEIR	1
1.2 65/35 Land Preservation Plan	4
1.3 Project Location	5
2. Project Description.....	11
2.1 Project Background.....	11
2.2 Proposed Project.....	21
3. Environmental Analysis	67
3.1 Environmental Procedures.....	67
3.2 Environmental Checklist & Analysis.....	69
4. List of Preparers	213
Lead Agency	213
PlaceWorks.....	213

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A	2026 Urban Limit Line Ballot Measure
--------------------	--------------------------------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures

Figure		Page
Figure 1	Regional Location.....	7
Figure 2	Current Adopted County Urban Limit Line	9
Figure 3	General Plan Land Use Map.....	17
Figure 4	Rural and Agricultural Areas	19
Figure 5	Proposed 2026 Urban Limit Line.....	31
Figure 6a	ULL Adjustments Where Development is Constrained	33
Figure 6b	ULL Adjustments to Align with City Limits	35
Figure 6c	ULL Adjustments for Shoreline Simplification	37
Figure 6d	ULL Adjustments to Align with Existing Development	39
Figure 7a	Proposed ULL Adjustments.....	41
Figure 7b	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area B	43
Figure 7c	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area C	45
Figure 7d	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area D	47
Figure 7e	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area E	49
Figure 7f	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area F.....	51
Figure 7g	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area G	53
Figure 7h	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area H	55
Figure 7i	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area I	57
Figure 7j	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area J	59
Figure 7k	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area K	61
Figure 7l	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area L.....	63
Figure 7m	Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area M	65

List of Tables

Table		Page
Table 1	Summary of ULL Adjustments by Type	26
Table 2a	ULL Contractions	27
Table 2b	ULL Expansions.....	28

Key Project Terms

The following list includes definitions of acronyms, terms, policies, and documents used throughout this Initial Study.

2045 General Plan: The most recent update of Contra Costa County’s General Plan. The 2045 General Plan was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors on November 5, 2024, under Resolution No. 2024-380 and has a horizon-year of 2045.

65/35 Land Preservation Plan (65/35 Plan): The 65/35 Plan, adopted by county voters through Measure C-1990, contains mechanisms to control urban sprawl and protect resources like agricultural land and scenic ridges. The 65/35 Plan is implemented under Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Chapter 82-1. The text in Chapter 82-1 of the Ordinance Code that outlines the provisions of the 65/35 Plan is also referred to as the “65/35 Land Preservation Ordinance.”

65/35 Land Preservation Standard (65/35 Standard): The 65/35 Standard, a component of the 65/35 Plan, which dictates that urban development in the county shall be limited to no more than 35 percent of the land within the county and at least 65 percent of all land within the county will be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks and other nonurban uses. The terms “land within the county” and “non-urban uses” are defined in Ordinance Code Section 82-1.032. Urban and non-urban General Plan land use designations are also listed in the Land Use Element of the 2045 General Plan.

City ULLs: The voter-approved urban limit lines for the Cities of Antioch and Pittsburg. The City ULLs serve a purpose similar to that of the UGB. The City ULLs (individually, City ULL) are distinct from the ULL adopted by the County and restrict development only within the cities.

Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA): A publicly funded agency that plans, funds, and implements transportation projects and programs in Contra Costa County.

Development Capacity or Development Projection: The quantity of future residential, commercial, and industrial development in the unincorporated county that was analyzed in the EIR for the 2045 General Plan.

Development Scenario: The physical changes that are anticipated to occur through implementation of the 2045 General Plan and were analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The Development Scenario includes build-out consistent with the development capacity/projection, construction of public infrastructure and facilities necessary to support projected development, avoidance and mitigation of hazards and impacts, and conservation of resources such as agricultural land and sensitive habitats. The Development Scenario also presumes implementation of General Plan policies and actions that influence physical development and conservation.

KEY PROJECT TERMS

General Plan Amendment (GPA): A change to the County’s adopted General Plan that requires adoption by the County Board of Supervisors.

General Plan Environmental Impact Report (GPEIR): The Environmental Impact Report that was prepared to assess the environmental impacts of implementing the 2045 General Plan and 2024 Climate Action and Adaptation Plan Update. (State Clearinghouse No. 2023090467) The GPEIR was certified by the County Board of Supervisors on November 5, 2024. Unless otherwise noted, this term refers to all components of the final certified EIR which includes the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and associated documents supporting its certification including the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Growth Management Program (GMP): The Contra Costa Growth Management Program administered by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority under voter-approved Measure C-1988 (initially) and Measure J-2004 (currently).

Housing Element: State-mandated element of the County General Plan (Chapter 6 of the 2045 General Plan) that outlines how the County will address its current and future housing needs. The County’s 6th Cycle 2023-2031 Housing Element was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 12, 2023, and certified by California Department of Housing and Community Development on January 22, 2024.

Land Use Element: An element of the 2045 General Plan (Chapter 4 of the 2045 General Plan) that includes the County’s Land Use Map and adopted ULL Map in addition to goals, policies, and actions that outline the County’s long-range vision for land use.

Land Use Map: Figure LU-1 in the Land Use Element of the 2045 General Plan. This map provides the land use designation for every parcel in the unincorporated county. The uses allowed under these designations are described in Table LU-1 of the Land Use Element.

Measure C-1988: Voter-approved County ballot measure that imposed a half-percent local transportation sales tax and established the County Growth Management Program (GMP). The GMP requires the County and cities in the county to adopt a Growth Management Element as part of their General Plan in accordance with various terms of the measure to receive funds from the sales tax for local street maintenance and improvements.

Measure C-1990: Voter-approved County ballot measure that established the 65/35 Plan, including the ULL.

Measure J-2004: Voter-approved County ballot measure that extended the transportation sales tax established under Measure C-1988 for 25 years until 2034. Measure J also added a requirement for the County and each city in the county to adopt and maintain a voter-approved ULL or equivalent growth control measure.

Measure L-2006: Voter-approved County ballot measure that extended the term of the 65/35 Plan to 2026, changed the procedures required to expand the ULL, required a review of the ULL in 2016 and allowed for additional periodic reviews, and adopted a revised ULL map.

Ordinance Code: Refers to the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, which is a codified version of County ordinances.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA): The quantity of housing units that each jurisdiction in California must plan for in their Housing Element. The RHNA is allocated by the California Department of Housing and Community Development and regional governments.

Section 15153: Refers to Section 15153 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15153). This section allows lead agencies to use an EIR to describe more than one project if the projects are the same in terms of environmental impact. Further, lead agencies may use an EIR prepared in connection with an earlier project to apply to a later project, if the circumstances of the projects are essentially the same. The lead agency must prepare an initial study that compares the proposed project's consistency with the impacts evaluated in the EIR.

Section 15162: Refers to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15162). This section outlines the conditions that allow for the preparation of a subsequent environmental document. A project is allowed to tier from the analysis of a previous environmental document if none of the conditions described in Section 15162 have occurred.

ULL Contraction: An adjustment to the County's adopted ULL that moves land outside the boundaries of the ULL.

ULL Expansion: An adjustment to the County's adopted ULL that moves land inside the boundaries of the ULL.

Urban Growth Boundary (UGB): Voter-approved urban growth boundary for the City of San Ramon. San Ramon's UGB was adopted in 1999 and remains in effect until 2035. Like the ULL, the UGB serves the purpose of limiting urban development in the city to areas within the UGB.

Urban Limit Line (ULL): The County Urban Limit Line, as described in Ordinance Code Section 82-1.010 and the 2045 General Plan, which establishes a regulatory boundary beyond which no urban land uses may be designated in the 2045 General Plan. The ULL includes changes to the ULL approved in accordance with Ordinance Code Chapter 82-1.

KEY PROJECT TERMS

This page is intentionally left blank.

1. INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study/Environmental Checklist was prepared to assist the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors in determining whether the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that evaluated the impacts associated with implementation of the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan and 2024 Climate Action and Adaptation Plan Update (CAAP) sufficiently analyzes the impacts of the proposed 2026 County Urban Limit Line Renewal (proposed project). Contra Costa County is the Lead Agency for the environmental review of the proposed project.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15153(a) states that a Lead Agency may employ a single EIR to describe more than one project, if such projects are essentially the same in terms of environmental impact. Further, the Lead Agency may use an earlier EIR prepared in connection with an earlier project to apply to a later project, if the circumstances of the projects are essentially the same. As a Section 15153 analysis, this Initial Study shall be used to determine whether the 2045 General Plan and CAAP EIR (referred to as the “GPEIR”) adequately describes: (1) the general environment of the proposed project; (2) the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project; and (3) alternatives and mitigation measures related to each significant effect. Additionally, pursuant to the procedures described in Section 15153, this Initial Study compares the impacts disclosed in the GPEIR to the impacts of the proposed project to determine whether it would result in any of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. The requirements of Section 15153 and 15162 analyses are further described in Section 3.1, *Environmental Procedures*, of this Initial Study, below.

Summary of the Conclusions in this Initial Study

As substantiated in the analysis in this Initial Study, the County has determined that the proposed project meets the criteria of CEQA Guidelines Section 15153, and therefore the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors may rely on the certified GPEIR when acting on the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project was found to result in no new or increased impacts when compared to the impacts identified in the GPEIR, and will not result in any of the conditions outlined in Section 15162 requiring subsequent environmental analysis.

1.1 GENERAL PLAN AND GPEIR

The GPEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2023090467) was certified by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on November 5, 2024, under Resolution No. 2024-380. The GPEIR was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the State’s CEQA Guidelines, and Contra Costa County’s CEQA Guidelines. Because of the relationship between the 2045 General Plan and

1. INTRODUCTION

CAAP, the GPEIR evaluated the impacts of implementing both plans with separate analyses in the GPEIR for each environmental checklist question. The analysis in this Initial Study focuses on the proposed project's consistency with the impacts specific to the 2045 General Plan.

The GPEIR, including the Draft EIR, Draft EIR Appendices, and Final EIR, is available at <https://envisioncontracosta2040.org/documents/>. A physical copy of the GPEIR is available for review at the offices of the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553.

1.1.1 2045 General Plan and CAAP

The County's 2045 General Plan is a comprehensive long-range planning document mandated by the State of California. It is the County's overarching policy document that defines a vision for future change and sets the "ground rules" for locating and designing new projects, expanding the local economy, addressing environmental injustices (in the context of land use), conserving resources, improving public services and safety, and fostering a healthy built environment. The adopted 2045 General Plan is the County's foundational land use planning document and is the basis for all planning-related decisions made by County staff, the Zoning Administrator, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors. In addition to the eight mandated topics of land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, environmental justice, and safety, the 2045 General Plan addresses two optional topics: growth management and public facilities and services.

All specific plans and zoning in the unincorporated county must be consistent with the General Plan. Similarly, all land use development approvals and environmental decisions made by the County must be consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan itself, however, does not approve or entitle any development project. Property owners have control over when they wish to propose a project, and final development approval decisions are made on a project-by-project basis by the aforementioned decision-makers.

The CAAP is a separate document that provides strategic implementation programs to show how the County will reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in support of the State's adopted GHG reduction targets. The CAAP implements the General Plan and its general policies and actions supporting reduction of GHG emissions. As an implementation document, the CAAP provides more specific direction to County decision-makers than the General Plan, and the CAAP is updated more often than the General Plan.

1.1.2 General Plan EIR

The GPEIR analyzed the impacts of implementing the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario and 2024 CAAP Update. As explained above, the Development Scenario includes the development capacity/projection (which is based on the land use designations on the General Plan Land Use Map), planned infrastructure and facilities, and the General Plan policies and actions that guide physical development. The Development Scenario also presumes continuation of the local regulatory environment in existence when the General Plan was adopted and the GPEIR was certified, including continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL.

The General Plan is self-mitigating to the extent feasible, meaning wherever possible the General Plan's policy framework aims to mitigate the impacts associated with the physical changes to the environment the General Plan allows. Mitigation measures were adopted for most impacts that could not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through policy implementation. The GPEIR's conclusions regarding impacts associated with the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario therefore are based not only on development being consistent with the development capacity/projection, but also on presumed adherence to regulations and implementation of the General Plan policies and actions designed to mitigate impacts.

For purposes of analysis in the GPEIR, the horizon-year development projection for the 2045 General Plan, including approved development projects and projects pending at the time of analysis, included the following:

- 23,200 new housing units
- 65,600 new residents
- 1.2 million square feet of new commercial and office space
- 5.0 million square feet of new industrial space

The horizon-year projection is an estimate of the amount of development that would occur in the unincorporated county by 2045. This estimate assumes that all vacant and underutilized parcels with residential land use designations in the unincorporated county would be developed at the maximum density allowed under the 2045 General Plan. The estimate of nonresidential (commercial and industrial) development is based on regional growth projections, historical County permitting data, and projects proposed at the time the estimate was formulated. Chapter 3 of the GPEIR provides a detailed explanation of the methodology used in formulating the horizon-year growth projection.

Based on the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, the GPEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts in the topic areas of agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, cultural and tribal cultural resources, mineral resources, noise, transportation, and wildfire. A

1. INTRODUCTION

description of each environmental impact and the mitigation measures incorporated to reduce the environmental impacts of the 2045 General Plan are included in Section 3.

1.2 65/35 LAND PRESERVATION PLAN

On November 6, 1990, Contra Costa County voters approved Measure C (Measure C-1990), the 65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Plan (the 65/35 Plan), which established various mechanisms aimed at containing urban sprawl and protecting resources like agricultural land and scenic ridges. The most significant and impactful of these mechanisms are the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard (the 65/35 Standard) and Urban Limit Line (ULL). Pursuant to the 65/35 Standard, no more than 35 percent of the land within the county may be designated for urban uses (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) in the General Plans of the County and the 19 cities, and at least 65 percent must be designated for non-urban uses, such as agriculture, open space, and parks. Meanwhile, the ULL establishes a regulatory boundary beyond which no land may be designated for urban land uses. Working together, the 65/35 Standard and ULL limit the geographic extent of urban development in the county.

Measure C-1990 was set to expire on December 31, 2010. On November 7, 2006, county voters approved Measure L (Measure L-2006), which carried forward most of the elements of Measure C-1990 while adopting the following changes to the original 65/35 Plan:

1. Extended the term of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2026.
2. Required a four-fifths vote of the County Board of Supervisors and voter approval to expand the ULL by more than 30 acres with a stipulation that voter approval is not required if four-fifths of the Board finds, after a public hearing, that there is substantial evidence in the record that the ULL expansion is necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of private property or is necessary to comply with State or federal law.
3. Provided for periodic ULL reviews by the Board of Supervisors, including a required mid-term review in 2016 involving an evaluation of anticipated housing and employment needs through 2036.
4. Adopted a new ULL Map.
5. Retained the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard and protections for prime agricultural land.

Measure C-1990 amended the General Plan Land Use Element and County Ordinance Code, specifically the Zoning Code (Title 8, Chapter 82-1), to establish the 65/35 Plan and ULL. Specific text was added to both documents and the voter-approved ULL map was added to the General Plan. Measure L-2006 amended the General Plan and Zoning Code to implement the changes described above.

1. INTRODUCTION

Another measure that assists in implementing the 65/35 Plan is the County's Growth Management Program (GMP) under Measure J-2004. In 1988, county voters approved Measure C-1988, which imposed a sales tax to fund local transportation projects and programs. In 2004, voters approved Measure J-2004, which extended that sales tax for an additional 25 years. A component of Measure J-2004 is the GMP which is administered by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA). The GMP requires the County and each city in the county to adopt a voter-approved ULL or equivalent growth management measure and maintain it in accordance with CCTA's "Principles of Agreement for Establishing the Urban Limit Line" to allow the jurisdiction to receive its share of CCTA Measure J-2004 sales tax proceeds, known as "return to source" funds. Sixteen of the 19 cities in the county adopted the County's Measure L-2006 voter-approved ULL as their own growth management measure. Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon adopted their own voter-approved measures (called the Urban Growth Boundary [UGB] in San Ramon). The County and cities are solely responsible for administering their respective ULLs/UGBs, which together contain approximately 47 percent of the total land area within Contra Costa County.

As described below, the County proposes renewing its ULL through a 2026 ballot measure that would amend the County's 2045 General Plan and Chapter 82-1 of the County Ordinance Code to extend the term of the ULL and 65/35 Plan through 2051, modify the requirements for periodic ULL review, revise the findings to expand or contract the ULL, adopt a revised ULL map, and update administrative sections of the Ordinance Code.

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

Contra Costa County is on the northeastern side of San Francisco Bay, adjacent to Alameda County to the south, San Joaquin County to the east, Solano and Sacramento Counties to the north across San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay, and San Francisco County to the west. North to south regional access is provided by Interstate 80, Interstate 680, and State Route 160; east to west regional access is provided by Interstate 580, State Route 4, and State Route 24. Figure 1, *Regional Location*, shows the County's regional location. The ULL extends across Contra Costa County. General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, is the official ULL map approved by the voters in 2006, as amended by action of the Board of Supervisors in 2009 and 2021. The existing ULL is shown on Figure 2, *Current Adopted County Urban Limit Line*.

1. INTRODUCTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Generated using ArcMap 2025.

Figure 1
Regional Location

1. INTRODUCTION

This page is intentionally left blank.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 2
Current Adopted County Urban Limit Line

1. INTRODUCTION

This page is intentionally left blank

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Purpose of the Urban Limit Line

The ULL is intended to protect resources and agricultural land; prevent sprawl and inefficient land use patterns that create traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, and pollution; and direct development, infrastructure, and services into areas where they already exist or are planned. It is integral to maintaining the 65/35 Standard, which operates on a countywide basis, accounting for urban and non-urban land use designations within the 19 cities as well as the unincorporated county.

The 65/35 Standard limits urban development to no more than 35 percent of the land within the county and requires at least 65 percent of the land to be designated for non-urban uses. All urban land use designations count equally against the 35 percent limit regardless of how, or even if, the land to which they are applied is developed. Likewise, all non-urban designations count equally toward the 65 percent requirement regardless of development. As of 2025, approximately 28 percent of the land countywide has been designated for urban uses. The non-urban land use designations in the unincorporated county include the following, as described in Table LU-1 of the Land Use Element of the 2045 General Plan:

- **Public and Semi-Public (PS).** Includes uses and facilities owned or operated by public entities or private entities serving the public. These include law enforcement and fire stations, schools, libraries, hospitals, water and sewage treatment plants, landfills, cemeteries, airports, and military installations. Also includes high-volume public and private transportation corridors (e.g., freeways, BART, railroads) and utility corridors.
- **Agricultural Core (AC).** Applies to the approximately 11,900 acres between Brentwood, Discovery Bay, and Byron composed primarily of soils rated Class 1 or 2 per the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Land Capability Classification. Agricultural production is the primary use in areas with this designation and takes precedent over other uses. Limited agricultural tourism activities that support the agricultural economy are consistent with this designation. “Ranchette” or estate-style residential development, and any other use that interferes with agricultural activities, is inconsistent with this designation.
- **Agricultural Lands (AL).** Applies to agricultural areas composed primarily of soils rated Class 3 or lower per the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Land Capability Classification. Most areas with this designation are non-irrigated, rural lands that may

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

support grazing and dryland farming, though it also includes non-prime, productive agricultural lands. Limited opportunities for recreation, lodging, food services, special events, and similar activities that support the county's agricultural economy are also allowed under this designation.

- **Parks and Recreation (PR).** Applies to publicly- and privately-owned parks and similar outdoor spaces. Includes local parks in urban areas as well as federal, State, and regional parks and historic sites that are managed primarily for conservation purposes and provide active or passive recreational activities. Ancillary amenities such as visitor centers, event spaces, amusements/rides, and eateries that support or enhance the primary recreational use are consistent with this designation.
- **Commercial Recreation (CR).** Allows privately-owned recreational uses where the primary activity is conducted outdoors, such as golf courses, recreational vehicle campgrounds, hunting clubs, and marinas. Ancillary commercial and service uses, as well as an on-site residential unit for a caretaker, harbor master, etc., are also consistent with this designation.
- **Resource Conservation (RC).** Applies to the watersheds of reservoirs owned by public utilities, mitigation banks, habitat restoration sites, ecologically significant or environmentally sensitive areas that are not within publicly-owned parkland, and hazardous or otherwise constrained areas that are unsuitable for development. Resource management, low-intensity agriculture, low-intensity recreation, and similar activities are consistent with this designation when conducted in a way that is not damaging to the resources being protected. Construction of public and semi-public infrastructure, and one single-family residence on an existing legal lot under private ownership, is consistent with this designation. All types of urban development and subdivisions that increase density are prohibited.
- **Water (WA).** Applies to approximately 41.5 square miles of water including the portions of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta that are within the county, large inland reservoirs, and other water bodies large enough to warrant designation. Typical uses include ferry terminals, shipping facilities associated with adjacent industry (marine terminals, wharves, etc.), docks, water-oriented recreation uses, and aquaculture.

General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-1, *General Plan Land Use Map*, is incorporated into this Initial Study (Figure 3). The proposed project would not change the land use designations on the County's adopted Land Use Map as shown in Figure 3. The proposed project also would not change any city-adopted ULL or land use designation.

2.1.2 Relationship to the General Plan and Ordinance Code

Properties that are located outside the ULL may not obtain General Plan amendments that would redesignate them for urban land use. In addition, the following 2045 General Plan

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

policies and actions apply to development outside of the ULL and help to limit urban development:

- **LU-P2.2:** Enhance the ULL's effectiveness by supporting efforts to acquire and permanently protect land along the ULL boundary.
- **LU-P2.3:** Limit development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, such as agriculture, mineral extraction, wind and solar energy production, natural carbon sequestration, other resource-based uses, and essential infrastructure.
- **LU-P2.4:** Deny applications for major subdivisions outside the ULL. Discourage minor subdivisions outside the ULL that would subdivide any parcel created by a subdivision map recorded after November 5, 2024.
- **LU-P2.8:** Discourage extension of water and sanitary sewer lines into areas outside the ULL, except to serve public and semipublic uses that are not growth inducing, or when such extension is necessary to address a declared public health emergency. When lines are extended outside the ULL, they should be designed to service the intended use only, and not allow for additional future service connections.
- **LU-P10.3:** Preserve the rural character of the following areas, which are displayed in Figure LU-6 (see Figure 4, *Rural and Agricultural Areas*, in this document):
 - a) Alhambra Valley/Briones
 - b) Tassajara Valley
 - c) Delta Primary Zone
 - d) Agricultural Core between Brentwood and Discovery Bay
 - e) Crockett Hills between Crockett and State Route 4
 - f) Franklin Canyon/State Route 4 corridor between Hercules and Martinez
 - g) Bollinger Canyon Road corridor between Las Trampas Regional Wilderness and Crow Canyon Road
 - h) Norris Canyon Road corridor between San Ramon and the Alameda County line
Marsh Creek Road corridor between Clayton and
 - i) Byron Highway

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- j) Kirker Pass Road corridor
- k) Morgan Territory Road corridor
- l) Deer Valley Road corridor

Pay special attention to potential aesthetic impacts in these areas and ensure such impacts are adequately mitigated.

- **LU-P10.4:** Maintain agricultural preserves in the Briones Hills and Tassajara Valley areas through agreements with adjacent cities to retain these areas for agricultural, open space, and other non-urban uses.
- **COS-P1.3:** Discourage conversion of land designated Resource Conservation or Parks and Recreation to urban uses. If such conversion is to occur, require mitigation through permanent protection of other open space or park lands for habitat, scenic, or recreation benefits at a ratio to be determined based on the biological, scenic, or recreational value of the land, but not less than 3:1.
- **COS-P2.1:** Preserve large, contiguous areas of the county for agricultural production. Deny applications for projects that would lead to fragmentation of agricultural areas.
- **COS-P2.2:** Preserve and protect productive agricultural land from conversion to urban uses, especially land designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland on the Important Farmland Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation; land containing Class 1 or Class 2 soils; and land designated Agricultural Core.
- **COS-P2.3:** Require a 40-acre-minimum parcel size for subdivisions of prime productive agricultural land (i.e., Class 1 and Class 2 soils).
- **COS-P2.5:** Require new projects adjacent to agriculture to establish buffers on their properties as necessary to minimize conflicts and protect agriculture. Determine appropriate buffers in consultation with the County Agricultural Commissioner.
- **COS-A2.2:** Work with the agricultural community, Contra Costa LAFCO, and cities to establish programs and mechanisms to protect agricultural resources, such as preservation agreements, conservation easements, an agricultural soils trust fund, and agricultural mitigation fees.
- **COS-A2.3:** Conduct a study of potential Transfer or Purchase of Development Rights (TDR/PDR) programs to address development pressures and preserve agricultural land. The study should determine:

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- a) Overall feasibility and usefulness toward implementing the County's agricultural preservation goals.
 - b) Specific mechanisms that could be used.
 - c) Geographic areas where these mechanisms could be used.
 - d) Organizational and administrative requirements.
 - e) Cost to the County and potential revenue sources.
- **COS-P4.1:** Maintain ecologically significant resource areas in their natural state to the greatest extent possible. Limit development in and near these areas to compatible low-intensity uses with adequate provisions to protect sensitive resources, including setbacks around resource areas. Prohibit projects that would lead to fragmentation of ecologically significant resource areas.

The provisions of Measure L-2006 set to expire at the end of 2026 include the term of the 65/35 Plan and most procedures for expanding and periodically reviewing the ULL, but not the ULL itself. Were the provisions of Measure L-2006 to expire without a replacement voter-approved measure, then the 65/35 Plan and those procedures for expanding and reviewing the ULL would no longer be in effect, but the ULL and implementing General Plan policies would remain as part of the General Plan. The 65/35 Plan's prohibition on designating land for urban uses outside the ULL would sunset, but General Plan Policy LU-P2.3 provides a backstop by limiting development outside the ULL to non-urban uses. Without Measure L-2006's requirement for a four-fifths supermajority vote to expand the ULL, the County Board of Supervisors could expand it through the standard process to adopt a GPA, which requires a simple majority vote. Finally, without a voter-approved ULL, the County would be in violation of the Contra Costa Growth Management Program, jeopardizing approximately \$2 million the County receives annually to support road maintenance.

2.1.3 Process and Findings for Adjusting the Urban Limit Line


The County processes requests to adjust the ULL as GPAs. Measure L-2006 stipulates that no change to the ULL shall violate the 65/35 Standard. ULL expansions of 30 acres or less require approval by a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing after making one or more of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- A natural or man-made disaster or public emergency has occurred which warrants the provision of housing and/or other community needs within land located outside the ULL.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- An objective study has determined that the ULL is preventing the County from providing its fair share of affordable housing or regional housing as required by State law, and the Board of Supervisors finds that a change to the ULL is necessary and the only feasible means to enable the County to meet these requirements of State law.
- A majority of the cities that are party to a preservation agreement and the County have approved a change to the ULL affecting all or any portion of the land covered by the preservation agreement.
- A minor change to the ULL will more accurately reflect topographical characteristics or legal boundaries.
- An objective study has determined that a change to the ULL is necessary or desirable to further the economic viability of the East Contra Costa County (Byron) Airport, and either mitigate adverse aviation related environmental or community impacts attributable to Buchanan Field, or further the County's aviation-related needs.
- A change is required to conform to applicable California or federal law.
- A five-year cyclical review of the ULL has determined, based on the criteria and factors for establishing the ULL set forth above, that new information is available (from city or County growth management studies or otherwise) or circumstances have changed, warranting a change to the ULL.

ULL expansions exceeding 30 acres require approval by a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing after making at least one of these findings, then must also receive countywide voter approval, which has never occurred. Adjustments to the ULL are rare. Aside from the changes made through adoption of Measure L-2006, the ULL has been moved only six times (1993, 1996, 2000, 2005, 2009, and 2021) since its inception in 1990. Only once has it been moved as part of a private development project.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 3
General Plan Land Use Map

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 4
Rural and Agricultural Areas

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.

2.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is a 2026 ballot measure asking the voters of Contra Costa County to amend the Land Use Element of the 2045 General Plan and the 65/35 Contra Costa Land Preservation Plan Ordinance (Chapter 82-1 of the County Ordinance Code) to:

1. Extend the term of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance and the County's Urban Limit Line through December 31, 2051.
2. Modify the periodic ULL review requirements of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance to require review of the ULL boundary concurrently with each State-mandated Housing Element update cycle.
3. Modify the criteria and factors enumerated in the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance for determining whether land should be considered for placement outside the ULL.
4. Retain, during the extended term of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance and the County's Urban Limit Line, the requirement for voter approval to expand the County's Urban Limit Line by more than 30 acres, except as specifically authorized in the 2045 General Plan and 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance, and approved by the voters in this ballot measure, namely:

The Board of Supervisors may, without subsequent voter approval, expand the ULL by any acreage within the boundaries of the Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area illustrated on General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, after holding a public hearing at which the Board adopts the General Plan amendment for the expansion, by a four-fifths vote, after making each of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- a. The expansion is necessary to further the economic viability of Byron Airport and attain the County's goals related to economic development.
- b. The expanded ULL area will accommodate uses directly linked to aeronautics, such as aviation research and development, aircraft manufacturing/assembly, and aeronautical schools/training facilities.
- c. The expanded ULL area will not accommodate residential development, logistics/distributions centers, lodging, or any other use not directly linked to aeronautics except for minor ancillary uses necessary to support the airport workforce.
- d. The expansion will not induce sprawl.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

5. Retain in the General Plan and County Ordinance Code the requirement that a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors is necessary to place a measure on the election ballot to expand the ULL boundary by more than 30 acres through the year 2051.
6. Retain in the General Plan and County Ordinance Code the existing procedure for any expansion the County's ULL by 30 or fewer acres based on a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors after holding a public hearing and making at least one of seven findings, as proscribed in the General Plan and County Ordinance Code, based on substantial evidence in the record.
7. Modify the enumerated findings proscribed in the General Plan and County Ordinance Code required for a change to the County's ULL under 30 acres to reflect the modified periodic ULL reviews and to make other non-substantive changes.
8. Retain the 65/35 Standard for land preservation in Contra Costa County, whereby at least 65 percent of the overall County land area will be retained for non-urban uses through the year 2051.
9. Retain the protections for the County's prime agricultural land, specifically the area designated in the General Plan as the Agricultural Core, by maintaining the 40-acre minimum parcel size.
10. Approve a new ULL Map for the General Plan (Figure LU-2 in the 2045 General Plan Land Use Element), which reflects the following changes:
 - i. Moves 3,487 acres with significant development restrictions, such as ownership by government agencies or encumbrance with conservation or agricultural easements, outside the ULL.
 - ii. Moves 1,488 acres of buffer lands around subdivisions, cemeteries, and industrial facilities, outside the ULL.
 - iii. Moves 4,368 acres with significant development constraints, such as high fire hazards, steep slopes, and flood hazards, outside the ULL.
 - iv. Moves 873 acres outside the ULL and 923 acres inside the ULL to align the ULL with city limits.
 - v. Moves 847 acres outside the ULL and 421 acres inside the ULL to simplify and improve the understanding of the ULL along the county's shoreline.
11. Update administrative sections of the 65/35 Land Preservation Ordinance to correct outdated text and achieve consistency with the changes described in items 1-10 above.

The full text of the draft ballot measure is attached to this Initial Study as Attachment A. The proposed project does not change any General Plan land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

2.2.1 Urban Limit Line Term

Measures C-1990 and L-2006 each had 20-year terms. The proposed ULL ballot measure would have a 25-year term, with the ballot measure expiring December 31, 2051.

2.2.2 Periodic Urban Limit Line Reviews

Measure L-2006 contains two provisions for reviewing the ULL: optional 5-year reviews and a mandatory mid-term (year 2016) review. The proposed project would require review of the ULL boundary concurrently with State-mandated Housing Element update cycles. Pursuant to State law, every eight years the Housing Element of the General Plan must be updated. This includes demonstrating capacity (adequate sites) to meet the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation. Aligning ULL reviews with the Housing Element update cycle would result in three ULL reviews (2032, 2040, and 2048) during a 25-year ULL term.

2.2.3 Revisions to Factors for Determining Whether Land is Outside the ULL

Measure L-2006 contains several criteria and factors that guide the determination on whether land should be placed outside the ULL. As part of the proposed project, modifications to these criteria and factors would be made to better reflect contemporary planning considerations. The proposed ballot measure would contain the following criteria and factors for determining whether land should be outside the ULL:

1. Lands which qualify for rating as Class I or Class II in the National Resource Conservation System Land Use Capability Classification.
2. Lands designated as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones on maps published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.
3. Lands with slopes exceeding 26.0 percent.
4. Lands at risk of substantial inundation from flooding or anticipated sea level rise.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

5. Lands with formal development restrictions such as agricultural, conservation, or scenic easements, or deeded development rights.
6. Wetlands and undevelopable islands.
7. Major open space, park, and recreation areas.
8. Areas with inadequate water, sewer, and roadway infrastructure.
9. Other areas not appropriate for urban growth because of separation from existing development, unstable geologic conditions, likelihood of significant environmental damage or substantial injury to fish, wildlife, or their habitat, and other similar factors rendering the land physically unsuitable for intense development.

2.2.4 Revisions to the Urban Limit Line Map

General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, *Urban Limit Line*, (Figure 2 in this Initial Study) is the official ULL map approved by the voters in 2006, as amended by action of the Board of Supervisors in 2009 and 2021. A summary of all proposed adjustments to the ULL is shown in Figure 5, *Proposed Urban Limit Line*. Figures 6a through 6d depict the proposed ULL adjustments by the rationale for the adjustment.

The proposed adjustments to the ULL consist of contractions and expansions. **Contractions** involve moving land outside the boundaries of the ULL, thereby restricting redesignation of the land for future urban development. In total, 11,063 acres are proposed to be moved outside the ULL as contractions. **Expansions** involve moving land inside the ULL, thereby potentially allowing redesignation of the land for future urban development. Expansions of the ULL total 1,603 acres. As reflected in Figure 5 and further discussed below, areas proposed to be moved inside the ULL predominantly include land already developed with urban uses, land within cities (and therefore outside the County's planning jurisdiction), and water along the county shoreline. If adopted, the proposed adjustments would result in a net ULL contraction of 9,460 acres. This acreage does not include the approximately 500-acre Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area discussed in greater detail below.

Expansions and contractions of the ULL neither approve nor disapprove new development, nor do they change the types or intensities of uses allowed on any particular parcel. Subsequent GPAs would be required to change non-urban land use designations inside the ULL to urban land use designations to develop more intense land uses. The Board of Supervisors could adopt such GPAs only if they were consistent with the goals and policies of the 2045 General Plan and they would be subject to environmental review under CEQA.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed ULL adjustments are categorized as follows:

CONTRACTIONS

- **Restricted Development** (Figure 6a; 3,487 acres). These contractions would move land with permanent development restrictions to outside the ULL. These development restrictions include ownership by government agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) and the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District; scenic, conservation, and agricultural easements; and grant deeds of development rights or similar instruments in favor of the County or other government entities. Most of this acreage is already designated Resource Conservation (RC), Parks and Recreation (PR), or Public and Semi-Public (PS) in the General Plan. These designations are non-urban and drastically limit development potential. The remaining acreage is designated Agricultural Lands (AL), which is also non-urban.
- **Buffers** (Figure 6a; 1,488 acres). These contractions would move land that is set aside as buffers around subdivisions, cemeteries, and industrial facilities (e.g., refineries and quarries) to outside the ULL. Nearly all this acreage is already designated RC in the General Plan. A small amount is designated AL.
- **Constraints** (Figure 6a; 4,368 acres). These contractions would move land with development constraints such as steep slopes, high or very high fire hazards, severe flood hazards, high quality agricultural soil, access issues/isolation, or lack of access to utilities to outside the ULL. These lands are inappropriate for urban development. All this acreage has a non-urban land use designation in the General Plan except for approximately 20.5 acres in Diablo and 1.1 acres in Byron designated for residential development.
- **Align with City Limits** (Figure 6b, 873 acres). These contractions move the ULL inward to align with the incorporated limits of San Ramon, Pittsburg, and Antioch, the cities that adopted their own ULL/UGB instead of adopting the County's Measure L-2006 ULL. All land shown to be moved outside the ULL has a non-urban General Plan land use designation.
- **Shoreline Simplification** (Figure 6c, 847 acres). These contractions smooth out the ULL along the shoreline and place undevelopable breakwaters and islands in San Pablo Bay and the Delta outside the ULL. All areas shown to be moved outside the ULL are designated Water (WA), RC, or AL.

EXPANSIONS

- **Existing Development** (Figure 6d, 130 acres). These expansions would bring inside the ULL certain properties already developed with urban uses, including homes, businesses, a sports facility, and current and former fire stations. Some of these properties already have an urban General Plan land use designation despite being outside the ULL.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- **Improved Clarity** (Figure 6d, 129 acres). These expansions eliminate existing fragments or holes in the ULL that were created when land was annexed to cities over the years and new fragments that would be created by other recommended expansions and contractions. They also eliminate instances where the ULL unnecessarily splits parcels. Approximately 82 of these acres are owned and permanently protected by the National Park Service or East Bay Regional Park District. The remaining 47 acres are designated AL or RC in the General Plan. Approximately 42 of these acres have no realistic urban development potential. A 4.7-acre expansion in Byron to better align parcel boundaries with the ULL may lend itself to low-density residential development.
- **Align with City Limits** (Figure 6b, 923 acres). These expansions affect the ULL where it is inside cities; they move the ULL outward to align with city limits. Approximately 823 of these acres are within San Ramon's city limits. These expansions have no regulatory effect on the County because they are within cities.
- **Shoreline Simplification** (Figure 6c, 421 acres). These expansions smooth out the ULL along the shoreline. Approximately 387 acres are within cities and include water adjacent to existing ports and marinas. ULL changes within the cities have no regulatory effect on the County. The remaining 34 acres are in Rodeo and unincorporated Antioch and include water adjacent to existing marinas. These areas have a Water land use designation in the 2045 General Plan. The Water designation allows shipping terminals, marinas, docks, and other marine-oriented uses and may exist inside and outside the ULL. Moving these areas inside the ULL is therefore inconsequential.

SUMMARY

Table 1, *Summary of ULL Adjustments by Type*, summarizes the ULL adjustments by the types described above.

Table 1 **Summary of ULL Adjustments by Type**

Contractions		Expansions	
Type	Acreage	Type	Acreage
Simplify Shoreline	847	Simplify Shoreline	421
Align with City Limits	873	Align with City Limits	923
Restricted Development	3,487	Existing Development	130
Buffer	1,488	Improved Clarity	129
Constraints	4,368		
TOTAL	11,063	TOTAL	1,603
Note: The 500-acre Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area is not included in these acreages.			

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Figures 7a through 7m further depict and describe the individual ULL adjustments in specific locations across the county. Table 2a, *ULL Contractions*, summarizes the acreage of each category of contraction across each portion of the county shown in Figures 7a through 7m. Table 2b, *ULL Expansions*, summarizes the acreage of each category of expansion across each portion of the county shown in Figures 7a through 7m.

Table 2a ULL Contractions

	Restricted Development	Buffers	Constraints	Align with City Limits	Shoreline Simplification
Figure 7a	126	11	19	--	161
Figure 7b	7	115	61	--	--
Figure 7c	206	--	19	--	--
Figure 7d	235	--	440	168	--
Figure 7e	83	82	201	--	--
Figure 7f	67	41	71	--	--
Figure 7g	130	--	25	192	--
Figure 7h	954	--	220	--	--
Figure 7i	597	260	1	--	--
Figure 7j	--		2,797	1	1
Figure 7k	16	42	--	512	686
Figure 7l	589	448	494	--	--
Figure 7m	341	489	45	--	--
TOTAL	3,487	1,488	4,368	873	847

Notes:

Figure 7a, covers the communities of North Richmond, Kensington, East Richmond Heights, and Tara Hills near the Cities of Richmond, San Pablo, El Cerrito, and Pinole

Figure 7b, covers the communities of Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley near the Cities of Martinez, Pleasant Hill, and Lafayette

Figure 7c, covers the community of Canyon near the City of Orinda and Town of Moraga

Figure 7d, covers near City of San Ramon and the communities of Norris Canyon and Camino Tassajara and areas near the City of San Ramon and Town of Danville

Figure 7e, covers near the Town of Danville and the communities of Alamo, Diablo, and Blackhawk near the Town of Danville and city of Walnut Creek

Figure 7f, covers the community of North Gate and areas near the Cities of Concord and Clayton

Figure 7g, covers areas near the Cities of Brentwood and Antioch

Figure 7h, covers the community of Byron and the 500- acre -study area near Byron Airport

Figure 7i, covers the community of Discovery Bay and areas near the City of Brentwood

Figure 7j, covers the communities of Knightsen and Bethel Island and areas near the Cities of Oakley and Antioch

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

	Restricted Development	Buffers	Constraints	Align with City Limits	Shoreline Simplification
Figure 7k, covers areas near the Cities of Pittsburg and Antioch Figure 7l, covers the communities of Bay Point and Clyde and areas near the City of Concord and near the Military Ocean Terminal Concord Figure 7m, covers the communities of Rodeo and Crockett All individual acreages are rounded to the nearest whole number.					

Table 2b ULL Expansions

	Existing Development	Improved Clarity	Align with City Limits	Shoreline Simplification
Figure 7a	37	43	--	332
Figure 7b	40	77	7	--
Figure 7c		--	--	--
Figure 7d	19	--	823	--
Figure 7e	3	5	--	--
Figure 7f	--	--	--	--
Figure 7g	--	--	90	--
Figure 7h	24	5	--	--
Figure 7i	5	--	--	--
Figure 7j	--	--	--	53
Figure 7k	--	--	2	27
Figure 7l	--	--	--	
Figure 7m	--	--	--	9
TOTAL	130	129	923	421

Notes:

Figure 7a, covers the communities of North Richmond, Kensington, East Richmond Heights, and Tara Hills near the Cities of Richmond, San Pablo, El Cerrito, and Pinole

Figure 7b, covers the communities of Alhambra Valley and Reliez Valley near the Cities of Martinez, Pleasant Hill, and Lafayette

Figure 7c, covers the community of Canyon near the City of Orinda and Town of Moraga

Figure 7d, covers near City of San Ramon and the communities of Norris Canyon and Camino Tassajara and areas near the City of San Ramon and Town of Danville

Figure 7e, covers near the Town of Danville and the communities of Alamo, Diablo, and Blackhawk near the Town of Danville and city of Walnut Creek

Figure 7f, covers the community of North Gate and areas near the Cities of Concord and Clayton

Figure 7g, covers areas near the Cities of Brentwood and Antioch

Figure 7h, covers the community of Byron and the 500- acre -study area near Byron Airport

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

	Existing Development	Improved Clarity	Align with City Limits	Shoreline Simplification
Figure 7i, covers the community of Discovery Bay and areas near the City of Brentwood Figure 7j, covers the communities of Knightsen and Bethel Island and areas near the Cities of Oakley and Antioch Figure 7k, covers areas near the Cities of Pittsburg and Antioch Figure 7l, covers the communities of Bay Point and Clyde and areas near the City of Concord and near the Military Ocean Terminal Concord Figure 7m, covers the communities of Rodeo and Crockett All individual acreages are rounded to the nearest whole number.				

BYRON AIRPORT POTENTIAL ULL EXPANSION AREA

The County owns and operates two general aviation airports: Buchanan Field Airport in Concord, and Byron Airport south of the unincorporated community of Byron. The airports are self-funded and generate revenue from leases, licenses, aircraft tax, sales tax, and other sources related to activities on airport property. Byron Airport has historically operated at a deficit. The airport's potential as a job center and economic engine is limited by scarcity of developable land on and near the airport property and inadequate road and utility infrastructure at the airport and in the vicinity.


The ULL around Byron Airport was adopted several years before the airport opened and poorly reflects actual land use and development potential near the airport. About 75 percent of the land that surrounds the airport and is inside the ULL is owned by the County or East Bay Regional Park District and permanently protected. The remaining 25 percent is under private ownership and has a General Plan land use designation of AL, which does not allow urban development. Urban services such as water and sewer are unavailable in this area.

While the ULL around the airport has never been moved, the possibility of adjusting it to support economic activity at the airport has been contemplated since 1990. The General Plan and 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance provide a process for the Board of Supervisors to expand the ULL, upon making specified findings, to further the economic viability of Byron Airport. This grant of authority to the Board was established by Measure C-1990 and retained by Measure L-2006.

Because the land that is inside the ULL around Byron Airport has minimal development potential, the proposed project would authorize the Board of Supervisors, without subsequent voter approval, to expand the ULL by more than 30 acres within a defined area based on a four-fifths vote of the Board after holding a public hearing and making each of the findings enumerated in Section 2.2 above. The area in which the Board would be authorized to potentially expand the ULL is to the east and northeast of the airport, between the airport and

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Byron Highway, where several hundred acres of generally poor agricultural land remain mostly undeveloped. This area is flat, within the State Route 239 corridor being planned by CCTA, and not a conservation priority under the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan. The potential ULL expansion area is shown on Figure 7h.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 5
Proposed Urban Limit Line

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 6a
ULL Adjustments Where Development is Constrained

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 6b
ULL Adjustments to Align with City Limits

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 6c
ULL Adjustments for Shoreline Simplification

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 6d
ULL Adjustments to Align with Existing Development

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7a
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area A

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7b
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area B

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7c
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area C

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7d
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area D

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7e
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area E

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7f
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area F

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7g
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area G

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.





Figure 7h
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area H

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7i
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area I

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.




Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7j
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area J

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7k
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area K


2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.

Figure 71
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area L

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally left blank.



Source: Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2025.

Figure 7m
Proposed ULL Adjustments in Area M

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This page is intentionally

3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Initial Study utilizes the procedure outlined in Section 15153 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15153). This analysis is intended to aid decision-makers in their determination of whether the environmental setting, significant environmental impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures of the proposed project are adequately described by the GPEIR (15153[b][1][A-C]). Additionally, Section 15153(d) states that the EIR for an earlier project cannot be used for a later project if any of the conditions described in Section 15162 would require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. Therefore, this Initial Study also evaluates whether any of the following conditions described in Section 15162 exist such that the GPEIR could not be used as the CEQA environmental document for the proposed project:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects (15162[a][1]);
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects (15162[a][2]); or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following (15162[a][3]):
 - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration (15162[a][3][A]);
 - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR (15162[a][3][B]);
 - Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project,

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (15162[a][3][C])

- Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (15162[a][3][D]).

Section 15153 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that if the lead agency determines through an Initial Study that a prior EIR adequately describes the environmental setting, significant environmental impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures of the proposed project and none of the conditions necessitating the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR exist, then the lead agency may use the previously prepared EIR as the draft EIR for the proposed project.

The following analysis demonstrates that the GPEIR adequately establishes the environmental setting of the proposed project, identifies the significant impacts of the proposed project, and identifies mitigation measures or alternatives related to each significant effect identified in the GPEIR. Further, this Initial Study demonstrates that none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 exist. Therefore, the County is distributing this Initial Study, the notice specified in and required by Section 15153 of the CEQA Guidelines, together with links to the Draft and Final EIRs that constitute the GPEIR, for a 45-day public review and comment period. To be considered by the County, comments on the adequacy of the environmental analysis, including the use of the GPEIR as the Draft EIR for the proposed project, must be submitted to the following by **5:00 P.M. on Thursday, October 9, 2025**:

Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
Attn: Will Nelson

Alternatively, comments may be submitted via email. Comments submitted via email must be sent to advanceplanning@dcd.cccounty.us by the date indicated above. The Contra Costa County Zoning Administrator also will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the adequacy of the environmental analysis at **3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 15, 2025**, at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development located at 30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA, 94553.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

The Environmental Checklist (Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines) is a component of an Initial Study. Normally, the purpose of the Environmental Checklist is to aid in evaluating a project's environmental impacts to determine which CEQA document (EIR, negative declaration, etc.) is required. Here, the Environmental Checklist is used to determine whether the conditions described in Section 15153(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines are met and whether any of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines exist. This Environmental Checklist is not a stand-alone evaluation of the impacts of the proposed project; it evaluates the proposed project in the context of the GPEIR analysis to determine whether the 2045 General Plan and proposed project are "essentially the same" in terms of circumstances and environmental impacts. If the evaluation determines that they are essentially the same, then the County can rely on the GPEIR to satisfy the environmental review requirements for the proposed project.

The GPEIR identified several significant and unavoidable impacts that could result from implementation of the 2045 General Plan. When certifying the GPEIR and adopting the General Plan, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093. In doing so, the Board determined that implementation of the 2045 General Plan could result in significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, but that these potential impacts are outweighed by the General Plan's potential benefits. This Environmental Checklist states that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the same environmental topic areas as the 2045 General Plan. These impacts are not new or more severe than those analyzed in the GPEIR and addressed in the Board's Statement of Overriding Considerations. These significant and unavoidable impacts are the same as those that could result from implementation of the 2045 General Plan.

3.2.1 Project Information

Project Title: Contra Costa County 2026 Urban Limit Line Renewal

Lead Agency Name and Address:

Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553

Contact Person:

Will Nelson, Assistant Deputy Director/Advance Planning Manager

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

(925) 655-2898
will.nelson@dcd.cccounty.us

Project Location: Unincorporated Contra Costa County

Description of Project:

See Section 2, *Project Description*, above.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Contra Costa County has planning jurisdiction over the county's unincorporated areas. The proposed project affects the County's planning functions across the entirety of its planning jurisdiction. The surrounding land uses and setting therefore are all areas adjacent to the unincorporated county, to include incorporated cities in Contra Costa County, incorporated cities and unincorporated lands in bordering counties, and large expanses of water in some bordering counties. Land uses in areas adjacent to the unincorporated county vary in character and intensity from urban in the City of Berkeley, to suburban in many Contra Costa cities, to rural and undeveloped, such as parts of Alameda and San Joaquin Counties.

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participating agreement):

None

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

3.2.2 Evaluation of the Suitability of the GPEIR to Assess the Proposed Project

This Initial Study uses the standard Environmental Checklist categories in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The issue areas evaluated in the GPEIR are assessed for any “changed condition” (as described above) in the CEQA checklist categories according to the following index:

General Plan EIR		Initial Study	
5.1	Aesthetics	I.	Aesthetics
5.2	Agriculture/Forestry Resources	II.	Agriculture/Forestry Resources
5.3	Air Quality	III.	Air Quality
5.4	Biological Resources	IV.	Biological Resources
5.5	Cultural Resources & Tribal Cultural Resources	V.	Cultural Resources
5.6	Energy	VI.	Energy
5.7	Geology/Soils	VII.	Geology/Soils
5.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	VIII.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
5.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	IX.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
5.10	Hydrology/Water Quality	X.	Hydrology/Water Quality
5.11	Land Use/Planning	XI.	Land Use/Planning
5.12	Mineral Resources	XII.	Mineral Resources
5.13	Noise	XIII.	Noise
5.14	Population/Housing	XIV.	Population/Housing
5.15	Public Services & Recreation	XV.	Public Services
5.15	Public Services & Recreation	XVI.	Recreation
5.16	Transportation	XVII.	Transportation
5.5	Cultural Resources & Tribal Cultural Resources	XVIII.	Tribal Cultural Resources
5.17	Utilities/Service Systems	XIX.	Utilities/Service Systems
5.18	Wildfire	XX.	Wildfire

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

3.2.3 Determination (to be Completed by the Lead Agency)

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. Pursuant to Section 15153 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR prepared for a prior project adequately describes the environmental setting, significant environmental impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures of the proposed project and none of the conditions necessitating preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR exist. Accordingly, the previously prepared EIR will be used as the Draft EIR for the proposed project.
- ☐ 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.



Signature

August 20, 2025

Date

3.2.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IN THIS INITIAL STUDY

As described in Section 2, *Project Description*, the proposed project includes a suite of changes to the Land Use Element of the 2045 General Plan and 65/35 Land Preservation Ordinance. However, not all of these changes have potential to cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. Those elements of the proposed project with the potential to cause a change in the environment are: (1) extending the term of the 65/35 Standard and protections for prime agricultural land; (2) extending the term of the ULL; and (3) revisions to the ULL map. As such, while the term “proposed project” encompasses all parts of the proposed ballot measures and is used throughout the environmental evaluation below, the evaluation focuses on those aspects of the project with potential to affect the physical environment.

EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The following evaluation categories represent the required analyses needed to demonstrate that the proposed project is adequately covered by the GPEIR, pursuant to Sections 15153 and 15162. Determinations for each of these categories are listed in the evaluation checklist tables for each environmental topic.

GPEIR Summary

Conclusions of the GPEIR. This column identifies the GPEIR impact significance conclusion for the specific environmental issue. It also lists the pages of the Draft GPEIR where information and analysis for the issue may be found.

Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures. This column lists the mitigation measures that were incorporated into the GPEIR and adopted to reduce impacts specific to the associated environmental issue. The full mitigation measure text is included in the discussion following the evaluation checklist table for each impact category and indicates, pursuant to the other Section 15153 and Section 15162 questions, any changes to the mitigation measures needed to cover the impacts of the proposed project. The proposed project is not anticipated to require any changes to the GPEIR mitigation measures.

Section 15153 Categories

The following categories reflect the requirements outlined for a Section 15153 analysis in Section 15153 (b)(1)(A-C) of the CEQA Guidelines. A “yes” response to these evaluation categories in the evaluation checklist tables indicates that the GPEIR adequately covers the

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

proposed project. Further discussion of the specific environmental topic and how it relates to the determinations made in the GPEIR is provided below each evaluation checklist table.

Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting. Pursuant to Section 15153 (b)(1)(A), this column indicates whether the environmental setting of the GPEIR adequately describes the setting of the proposed project with respect to the environmental issue. Chapter 4 of the GPEIR, *Environmental Setting*, provides a detailed description of the physical and regulatory environmental setting for the 2045 General Plan. For most of the environmental impacts analyzed in GPEIR, the scale at which impacts were evaluated was the boundary of the county, exclusive of the incorporated cities, but including unincorporated communities and other unincorporated areas. For the environmental topic sections of air quality, biological resources, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and transportation, the setting is the regional context or larger area. Chapter 5 of the GPEIR, *Environmental Analysis*, provides a more detailed description of the environmental setting for each environmental topic area. A comparison of the environmental setting of the proposed project and 2045 General Plan is provided in the discussion following the table.

Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts. Pursuant to Section 15153 (b)(1)(B), this column indicates whether the impacts disclosed in the GPEIR adequately describe the impacts associated with the proposed project. This evaluation category is closely related to the Section 15162 analysis so a comparison of the impacts in the GPEIR and those associated with the proposed project are discussed with respect to both the Section 15153 and 15162 analyses in the discussion following the table.

For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives. Pursuant to Section 15153 (b)(1)(C), this column indicates whether the alternatives to the 2045 General Plan identified in the GPEIR adequately cover alternatives to the proposed project. Four alternatives were analyzed in detail within the GPEIR. These consisted of the “No Project/Existing Plans” Alternative, that would result no adoption of the 2045 General Plan and 2024 CAAP; the “Increased Density Near Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)” Alternative, which would require housing developments within the county’s TPAs to achieve at least 90 percent of their sites’ maximum allowed density; the “No Urban Development within High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs)” Alternative that would prohibit urban development in areas designated “High” or “Very High” FHSZs by the Office of the State Fire Marshal/California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; and the “Increased TPA Density and No Urban Development in FHSZs Combined” Alternative, that incorporates the changes under those two alternatives. The “Increased TPA Density and No Urban Development in FHSZs Combined” Alternative was determined to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative due to its ability to reduce the most environmental impacts.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

As substantiated in the sections below, the proposed project would not result in any new or increased impacts when compared to those evaluated in the GPEIR. Potential alternatives to the proposed project would be required if they would reduce the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. Since no new impacts exist and all impacts under the proposed project are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR, no new alternatives are needed to reduce the impacts of the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated in the GPEIR for the 2045 General Plan adequately cover the proposed project.

For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations. Pursuant to Section 15153 (b)(1)(C), this column indicates whether the mitigation measures adopted under the 2045 General Plan adequately cover the impacts of the proposed project pursuant to the conclusions of the Section 15162 evaluation. Since the GPEIR also discusses policies that would mitigate impacts associated with the GPEIR, a discussion of the relevant General Plan goals, policies, and/or actions that would also mitigate impacts associated with the proposed project is provided in the discussion following the table.

Section 15162 Categories

The following categories are based on the determinations needed to verify that the proposed project would not result in any circumstances requiring preparation of a subsequent EIR, as outlined in Section 15162(a)(1-3) of the CEQA Guidelines. A “no” response to these evaluation categories in the evaluation checklist tables indicates that proposed project does not include any of these circumstances and therefore does not require subsequent environmental review under a subsequent EIR or subsequent negative declaration. A discussion summarizing the reasoning behind these determinations is provided in the discussions below the tables.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts. Pursuant to Section 15162 (a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the proposed project will result in new impacts that have not already been considered and mitigated by the GPEIR or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts. Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates whether changes to the project area or vicinity (environmental setting) have occurred subsequent to certification of the GPEIR, which would result in the proposed project having significant impacts that were not considered or mitigated by the GPEIR or which substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Any New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification. Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the GPEIR was certified is available, requiring an update to the analysis of the GPEIR to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigations remain valid. If the new information shows that: (A)

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the certified GPEIR; or (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the certified GPEIR; or (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the certified GPEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, then the question would be answered “Yes,” thereby requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. However, if the additional analysis completed as part of this Initial Study finds that the conclusions of the GPEIR remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, and identified environmental impacts are not found to be more severe, and additional mitigation is not necessary, then the question would be answered “No” and no additional environmental documentation (supplemental or subsequent EIR) is required. If additional analysis is conducted as part of this Environmental Checklist and the environmental conclusion remains the same, no new or additional mitigation is necessary.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

I Aesthetics

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
I. Aesthetics									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Impact 5.1-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.1-12 through 5.1-14)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Impact 5.1-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.1-12 through 5.1-14)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual	Impact 5.1-2: Less than Significant	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	(pages 5.1-14 through 5.1-15)								
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Impact 5.1-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.1-14 through 5.1-15)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – AESTHETICS

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.1-1 to 5.1-6 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of aesthetics, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting the environment’s physical form, and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all land and water, which includes all potential development sites, across the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the setting for the proposed project with respect to aesthetics.

Impacts

The GPEIR determined that the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would not damage scenic vistas, or scenic resources in the vicinity of a State scenic highway, nor would it degrade existing visual character or quality of its environmental setting, or generate significant light and glare, resulting in impacts to existing development. Aesthetic impacts under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario were determined to be less than significant because of General Plan policies that protect the county’s scenic resources, including but not limited to, Policies LU-P4.5, LU-P10.3, COS-P12.1, COS-P12.2, COS-P12.3, and COS-P12.8; in addition to existing protections in the County Ordinance Code including Chapter 814-2 (hillside development), Chapter 816-6 (tree preservation), and Chapter 76-4 (light and glare standards).

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, General Plan EIR, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce aesthetic

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to aesthetic resources are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to aesthetics that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to aesthetic resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts or increase in the significance of impacts related to aesthetics. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to aesthetics. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.1.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P4.5:** Require shadow and solar access studies for new multiple-family residential, mixed-use, commercial, and industrial projects greater than three stories in height or with obvious potential to significantly shade parks, commercial nurseries, residential yards, solar arrays, and other uses that are sensitive to loss of sunlight.
- **LU-P10.3:** Preserve the rural character of the following areas, which are displayed in Figure LU-5 of the General Plan (See Figure 4 in this document):
 - (A) Alhambra Valley/Briones;
 - (B) Tassajara Valley;
 - (C) Delta Primary Zone
 - (D) Agricultural Core between Brentwood and Discovery Bay;
 - (E) Crockett Hills between Crockett and State Route 4;
 - (F) Franklin Canyon/State Route 4 corridor between Hercules and Martinez;
 - (G) Bollinger Canyon Road corridor between Las Trampas Regional Wilderness and Crow Canyon Road;

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

(H) Norris Canyon Road corridor between San Ramon and the Alameda County line;

(I) Marsh Creek Road corridor between Clayton and Byron Highway;

(J) Kirker Pass Road corridor;

(K) Morgan Territory Road corridor;

(L) Deer Valley Road corridor.

Pay special attention to potential aesthetic impacts in these areas and ensure such impacts are adequately mitigated.

- **COS-P12.1:** Deny applications for development that would destroy unique and irreplaceable natural features, such as distinctive rock formations.
- **COS-P12.2:** Require redesign of project components that negatively impact viewsheds or the visual quality of the area.
- **COS-P12.3:** Prohibit development within 100 vertical feet of the top of designated scenic ridges and within 50 vertical feet of other visually prominent ridgelines. Exceptions may be considered on existing legal lots where no other feasible building sites exist, and for infrastructure that requires high-elevation siting, such as wind turbines, communications towers, and water tanks. When siting buildings or infrastructure on or near ridges is unavoidable, require appropriate measures, such as screening, undergrounding, or camouflaging to mitigate visual impacts.
- **COS-P12.8:** Require a visual impact analysis for projects with potential to significantly impact public views along designated scenic routes.

AESTHETICS CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to aesthetics.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

II Agriculture and Forestry Resources

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of the GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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?	Impact 5.2-1: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.2-15 through 5.2-21)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict with existing zoning for	Impact 5.2-2:	No mitigation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Less than Significant (pages 5.2-21 through 5.2-22)	measures required.							
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))?	Impact 5.2-3: Less than Significant (page 5.2-22)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Impact 5.2-4: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.2-22 through 5.2-24)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Impact 5.2-5: Less than Significant (pages 5.2-24 through 5.2-25)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

DISCUSSION – AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.2-1 to 5.2-11 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of agriculture and forestry resources, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state and local regulations affecting these resources and is geographically limited to agricultural land and forest/timberland in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all Important Farmland, as designated by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), all forestland that meets the definition of Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), and timberland that meets the definition of Public Resources Code Section 4526, within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR determined that the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to conversion of Important Farmland to a non-agricultural use (Impact 5.2-1) and conversion of forestland to a non-forest use (Impact 5.2-4). However, several General Plan policies would contribute to reducing impacts including Policies LU-2.3, LU-10.4, COS-2.1, COS-2.2, and Actions COS-A3.1, COS-A6.1, and COS-A6.2. Impacts with respect to conflicts with Williamson Act contracts (Impact 5.2-2), conflicts with forestland/timberland land uses/zoning (Impact 5.2-3), and additional issues regarding agricultural and timberland (Impact 5.2-5) were determined to be less than significant without mitigation or have no impact.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Additionally, the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that no feasible alternatives or mitigation measures are available to mitigate impacts related to conversion of Important Farmland or forestland to less than significant. As explained below, several policies and actions in the 2045 General Plan help to reduce impacts. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to agricultural and forestry resources as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to agricultural and forestry resources are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR, with impacts related to conversion of Important Farmland remaining significant and unavoidable. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to agricultural and forestry resources that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to agricultural and forestry resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to agricultural and forestry resources. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.2.3.1, Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P2.1:** Continue implementing the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard, using the County ULL to focus future development in the county's established urban and suburban communities while preserving agricultural land, rangeland, natural habitats, watersheds, and open space.
- **LU-P2.3:** Limit development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, such as agriculture, mineral extraction, wind and solar energy production, natural carbon sequestration, other resource-based uses, and essential infrastructure.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **LU-P2.4:** Deny applications for major subdivisions outside the ULL. Discourage minor subdivisions outside the ULL that would subdivide any parcel created by a subdivision map recorded after November 5, 2024.
- **LU-P2.8:** Discourage extension of water and sanitary sewer lines into areas outside the ULL, except to serve public and semi-public uses that are not growth inducing, or when such extension is necessary to address a declared public health emergency. When lines are extended outside the ULL, they should be designed to service the intended use only, and not allow for additional future service connections.
- **LU-P10.4:** Maintain agricultural preserves in the Briones Hills and Tassajara Valley areas through agreements with adjacent cities to retain these areas for agricultural, open space, and other non-urban uses.
- **COS-P2.1:** Preserve large, contiguous areas of the county for agricultural production. Prohibit projects that would lead to fragmentation of agricultural areas.
- **COS-P2.2:** Preserve and protect productive agricultural land from conversion to urban uses, especially land designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland on the Important Farmland Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation; land containing Class 1 or Class 2 soils; and land designated Agricultural Core.
- **COS-A3.1:** Establish a mitigation program to offset conversion of working lands (irrigated and intensively cultivated agricultural lands and rangeland) to nonagricultural uses. The program will define the types of land conversions requiring mitigation, mitigation ratios, acceptable mitigation locations, allowable conservation instruments, and use of in-lieu fees.
- **COS-A6.1:** Update County Ordinance Code Chapter 816-6, Tree Protection and Preservation, to enhance protections and strengthen mitigation requirements/restitution for tree removal.
- **COS-A6.2:** Develop an Oak Woodland Conservation Program that establishes special mitigation ratios for removal of oak trees, along with specific tree replacement and planting standards to ensure long-term growth and survival. Amend the County Ordinance Code as needed to implement the program.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to agriculture and forestry resources.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

III Air Quality

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
III. Air Quality									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Impact 5.3-1: Less Than Significant (pages 5.3-44 through 5.4-54)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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?	Impacts 5.3-2 & 5.3-3: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.3-54 through 5.3-62)	MM AQ-1 MM AQ-2 No feasible alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Impacts 5.3-4 & 5.3-5: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.3-62 through 5.3-68)	MM AQ-3 MM AQ-4 No feasible alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Impact 5.3-6: Less Than Significant (pages 5.3-68 through 5.3-69)	No mitigation required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – AIR QUALITY

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.3-1 to 5.3-28 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of air quality, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting is the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which includes all areas regulated by the Bay Area Air District (Air District), including the entirety of Contra Costa County. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all existing location that could be at risk from changes to air quality, and all potential development sites that could cause air quality impacts, within the unincorporated county and the jurisdiction of the Air District. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to air quality.

Impacts

The GPEIR determined that implementation of the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction and operational regional air pollutant emissions and health risks from new sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs). Impacts concerning conflicts with an applicable air quality plan and health risks associated with diesel particulate matter and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, while impacts concerning CO hotspots, permitted stationary sources, and odors were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation required. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 is required under the GPEIR to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. Several General Plan policies also contribute to reducing air quality impacts of the 2045 General Plan, including, Policies TR-P4.2, COS-P14.1, HS-P1.3 through HS-P1.9, and HS-P2.1.

The air quality impacts identified in the GPEIR are attributable to new development that could occur under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated four mitigation measures to reduce impacts with respect to air quality including AQ-1, which targets the reduction of construction-related impacts including fugitive dust; AQ-2, which would reduce operational emissions by requiring applicable projects to incorporate long-term emissions reductions measures; and AQ-3 and AQ-4 which would require applicable projects to prepare construction (AQ-3) and operational (AQ-4) health risk assessments in accordance with the Air District's guidelines. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to air quality as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to air quality are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to air quality that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to air quality requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to air quality. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce air quality impacts associated with implementing the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR and therefore no new mitigation measures or revisions to existing mitigation measures would be required. The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies would continue to apply to new development, as applicable, under the proposed project:

- AQ-1** Prior to discretionary approval by the County for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), future development involving construction on 1 acre or more shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the County Department of Conservation and Development for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the Bay Area Air

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Quality Management District (BAAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts identified in their CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD-adopted construction screening criteria and thresholds of significance, the Department of Conservation and Development shall require feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions. Potential measures may include:

- Require implementation of the BAAQMD Best Management Practices for fugitive dust control, such as:
 - All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
 - All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
 - 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.
 - All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
 - 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.
 - All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
 - All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
 - Unpaved roads providing access to sites located 100 feet or further from a paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch layer of compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.
 - Publicly visible signs shall be posted with the telephone number and name of the person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's General Air Pollution Complaints number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Measures shall be incorporated into appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the County and shall be verified by the Department of Conservation and Development.

AQ-2 Prior to discretionary approval by the County for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), future project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation-phase-related air quality impacts to the Department of Conservation and Development for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts identified in their CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD–adopted operational screening criteria and thresholds of significance, the Department of Conservation and Development shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to the following:

- Implementing commute trip reduction programs.
- Unbundling residential parking costs from property costs.
- Expanding bikeway networks.
- Expanding transit network coverage or hours.
- Using cleaner-fueled vehicles.
- Exceeding the current Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards.
- Establishing on-site renewable energy generation systems.
- Requiring all-electric buildings.
- Replacing gas-powered landscaping equipment with zero-emission alternatives.
- Expanding urban tree planting.

AQ-3 Prior to discretionary approval by the County for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), future development involving construction on 1 acre or more within 1,000 feet of

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

residential and other sensitive land uses (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and day care centers) in the unincorporated county, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the County Department of Conservation and Development for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds the respective threshold established by the BAAQMD—project-level risk of six in one million in Impacted Communities, BAAQMD's Overburdened Communities, and within 1,000 feet of a BAAQMD Overburdened Community; ten in a million in all other areas; PM_{2.5} emissions that exceed 0.3 µg/m³; or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0—the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks below the respective threshold, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include, but are not limited to:

- Use of construction equipment rated as US EPA Tier 4 Interim for equipment of 50 horsepower or more.
- Use of construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters for all equipment of 50 horsepower or more.

Measures identified in the HRA shall be included in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project. Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the construction contractor shall ensure that all construction plans submitted to the Department of Conservation and Development clearly show incorporation of all applicable mitigation measures.

AQ-4 Prior to discretionary approval by the County, project applicants for new industrial or warehousing development projects that 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes) or Impacted Community, as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the Department of

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Conservation and Development for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the cumulative and project-level incremental cancer risk, noncancer hazard index, and/or PM_{2.5} exceeds the respective threshold, as established by BAAQMD (all areas of the unincorporated county) and project-level risk of six in one million in Impacted Communities, BAAQMD's Overburdened Communities, and within 1,000 feet of a BAAQMD Overburdened Community; ten in a million in all other areas; PM_{2.5} emissions that exceed 0.3 µg/m³; or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the project applicant will be required to identify best available control technologies for toxics (T BACTs) and appropriate enforcement mechanisms, and demonstrate that they are capable of reducing potential cancer, noncancer risks, and PM_{2.5} to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include but are not limited to:

- Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions
 - Electrifying warehousing docks
 - Requiring use of newer equipment
 - Requiring near-zero or zero-emission trucks for a portion of the vehicle fleet based on opening year
 - Truck Electric Vehicle (EV) Capable trailer spaces
 - Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes
 - T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.
- **TR-P1.13:** Require designs for new parking facilities to incorporate ZEV charging/fueling infrastructure and maximize opportunities for adaptive reuse.
 - **TR-P4.2:** Require transportation infrastructure serving new development to be designed using best practices, contemplating existing and planned land uses, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, and connections to adjoining areas.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **COS-P14.1:** Implement Climate Action and Adaptation Plan strategies to improve energy efficiency and conservation, promote carbon-free energy sources, and reduce energy-related GHG emissions.
- **HS-P1.3:** Require new development to adhere to BAAQMD's Planning Healthy Places guidance when local conditions warrant.
- **HS-P1.4:** Require new industrial development to locate significant pollution sources at the maximum distance possible from sensitive receptors.
- **HS-P1.5:** Require new sources of air pollution that will generate significant new air quality impacts or expose sensitive receptors to substantial increases in harmful emissions of TAC to prepare a Health Risk Assessment that identifies appropriate mitigation consistent with BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Guidelines, based on the findings of the Health Risk Assessment.
- **HS-P1.6:** Require that any mitigation of air quality impacts occur on-site to the extent feasible to provide the greatest benefit to residents in unincorporated communities. For mitigation that relies on offsets, require that the offsets be obtained from sources as near to the project site as possible or from sources that would improve air quality in an Impacted Community. If the project site is within or adjacent to an Impacted Community, require offsets/mitigation within that community unless determined infeasible by the County.
- **HS-P1.7:** Require construction activities that involve large grading operations to implement additional construction measures identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines to reduce air pollutant emissions.
- **HS-P1.8:** Require new or expanded commercial and industrial projects resulting in 25,000 square feet or more of gross habitable floor area, such as warehouses and other large enclosed buildings, to be near zero-emission operations, including the facilities themselves and the associated fleets. Require all necessary measures, such as the following, to achieve near zero emissions:
 - a. Reduce on-site energy consumption and increase on-site energy generation and energy storage.
 - b. Provide adequate on-site zero-emission vehicle parking for all anticipated truck traffic to prevent idling and off-site queuing.
 - c. Provide electrified loading docks with receptacles allowing plug-in of refrigerated trailers.
 - d. Use heavy-duty trucks that are model year 2014 or later and expedite a transition to zero-emission trucks by establishing a clear timeline for electrification of trucks as they

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

become commercially available. Ensure contracts with motor carriers include air quality incentives or requirements, such as providing incentives to fleets that meet United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SmartWay standards or requiring use of zero-emission or near zero-emission trucks.

- e. Use a “clean fleet” of delivery vehicles as they become commercially available, but no later than 2025.
- f. Use zero-emission yard equipment, such as forklifts, pallet trucks and jacks, and stackers.
- g. Implement practices to control and remove fugitive dust and other contaminants from paved areas.

Uses with fewer than five vehicles domiciled on-site are exempt from this policy.

- **HS-P1.9:** Prohibit nonessential diesel engine idling countywide and nonessential idling of all vehicles within 100 feet of sensitive receptors.
- **HS-P2.1:** When evaluating health risk impacts of projects in Impacted Communities, use an excess cancer risk of 6.0 per million and a non-cancer (acute and chronic) hazard index greater than 1.0 as thresholds for finding that the project could cause a cumulatively considerable contribution and a significant impact.

AIR QUALITY CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to air quality.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

IV Biological Resources

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
IV. Biological Resources									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Impact 5.4-1: Less Than Significant (5.4-25 through 5.4-26)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Impact 5.4-2: Less Than Significant (pages 5.4-27 through 5.4-29)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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?	Impact 5.4-3: Less Than Significant (pages 5.4-29 through 5.4-30)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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 native wildlife nursery sites?	Impact 5.4-4: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (pages 5.4-30 through 5.4-33)	MM BIO-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Impact 5.4-5: Less Than Significant (pages 5.4-33 through 5.4-35)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation	Impact 5.4-5: Less Than Significant (pages 5.4-33 through 5.4-35)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?									

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.4-1 to 5.4-18 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of biological resources, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, and local regulations affecting these resources and is geographically limited to all land and water within Contra Costa County containing protected biological resources, including habitats and species, that could be impacted by development in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all potential development sites, habitats, and wildlife movement corridors within the unincorporated county and the jurisdictions of the agencies that regulate impacts to biological resources, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to biological resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR determined that implementation of the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario could impact special-status plant and wildlife species through habitat loss or fragmentation; however, numerous General Plan policies and compliance with State and federal regulations would reduce these effects to less than significant. Sensitive natural communities may also be affected, but protective measures like wetland setbacks, requirements for use of native landscaping, and invasive species management help minimize impacts. Development could disturb protected wetlands, though permitting requirements and mitigation under the Clean Water Act would ensure impacts remain less than significant. Wildlife movement corridors may be fragmented by future development, and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, which requires wildlife-friendly design and habitat connectivity assessments, is necessary to reduce this impact to less than significant.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated one mitigation measure to reduce impacts to biological resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires that for any future development not exempt from CEQA, a habitat connectivity and wildlife corridor evaluation must be conducted before issuance of a building permit if the project could affect existing connectivity areas or wildlife linkages. This measure ensures that impacts related to wildlife movement are less than significant. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to biological resources as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to biological resources, including potential conflicts with plans, policies, or ordinances adopted for the purpose of protecting biological resources, are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to biological resources that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to biological resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to biological resources. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts related to biological resources associated with 2045 General Plan. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in any new or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR. Thus, no new mitigation measures or modifications to existing mitigation measures would be required. The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies would continue to apply to new development, as applicable, under the proposed project:

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- BIO-1 Prior to the issuance of a building permit for projects not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, the County shall require a habitat connectivity/wildlife corridor evaluation for future development that may impact existing connectivity areas and wildlife linkages. The evaluation shall identify project design features that would reduce potential impacts and maintain habitat and wildlife movement. To this end, the County shall incorporate the following measures, to the extent practicable, for projects impacting wildlife movement corridors:
- Encourage clustering of development
 - Avoid known sensitive biological resources
 - Provide shielded lighting adjacent to sensitive habitat areas
 - Encourage development plans that maximize wildlife movement
 - Provide buffers between development and wetland/riparian areas
 - Protect wetland/riparian areas through regulatory agency permitting process
 - Encourage wildlife-passable fence designs (e.g., three-strand barbless wire fence) on property boundaries.
 - Encourage preservation of native habitat on developed parcels
 - Minimize road/roadway development to help prevent loss of habitat due to roadkill and habitat loss
 - Use native, drought-resistant plant species in landscape design
 - Encourage participation in local/regional recreational trail design efforts
- **LU-P2.1:** Continue implementing the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard, using the County ULL to focus future development in the county's established urban and suburban communities while preserving agricultural land, rangeland, natural habitats, watersheds, and open space.
 - **LU-P2.2:** Enhance the ULL's effectiveness by supporting efforts to acquire and permanently protect land along the ULL boundary.
 - **LU-P2.3:** Limit development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, such as agriculture, mineral extraction, wind and solar energy production, natural carbon sequestration, other resource-based uses, and essential infrastructure.
 - **COS-P1.3:** Discourage conversion of land designated Resource Conservation or Parks and Recreation to urban uses. If such conversion occurs, require mitigation through permanent

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

protection of other open space or park lands for habitat, scenic, or recreation benefits at a ratio to be determined based on the biological, scenic, or recreational value of the land, but not less than 3:1.

- **COS-P1.4:** Require new projects adjacent to protected open space areas, such as EBRPD lands, to establish buffers on their properties as necessary to minimize conflicts and protect the open space. If conflicts arise between protected open spaces and other uses, prioritize maintaining the viability of the open space functions.
- **COS-P4.1:** Maintain ecologically significant resource areas in their natural state to the greatest extent possible. Limit development in and near these areas to compatible low-intensity uses with adequate provisions to protect sensitive resources, including setbacks around resource areas. Prohibit projects that would lead to fragmentation of ecologically significant resource areas.
- **COS-P4.3:** Require a biological resources assessment prepared according to State and federal protocols for projects with the potential to impact rare, threatened, endangered, or special-status wildlife species or their habitat, and implement appropriate mitigation for identified impacts.
- **COS-P4.4:** Protect wildlife migration corridors, including natural and channelized creeks providing habitat in urban settings, and support projects that enhance these areas.
- **COS-P4.5:** Discourage use of fencing that poses risks to wildlife.
- **COS-P4.6:** Require projects impacting Pacific Flyway habitat in the Delta Primary Zone to incorporate mitigation that ensures no net loss of habitat function, including temporal loss. Impacts to Pacific Flyway habitat will be determined based on best available information at the time of environmental review..
- **COS-P4.9:** Require avoidance and protection of sensitive ecological resources not approved for disturbance or removal during project entitlement, and require restitution in exceedance of standard mitigation ratios for deliberate or inadvertent damage to these resources.
- **COS-P4.10:** Require majority use of California native plant species in landscaping for new developments, and require construction practices that avoid spread of invasive plant species by minimizing surface disturbance; seeding, and mulching disturbed areas with certified weed-free native mixes; disinfecting/ decontaminating equipment; and using native, noninvasive, drought-resistant species in erosion-control plantings.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **COS-P5.2:** Require public infrastructure and private development projects to preserve, and whenever possible restore and enhance, natural watercourses, floodplains, and riparian habitat.
- **COS-P5.3:** Require avoidance, minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation for development that would impact a wetland, wetland species, or adjacent upland habitat areas. Where feasible, compensation shall be in-kind (i.e., the same type of habitat), provided on-site, and based on a ratio that provides a margin of safety reflecting the expected degree of success and accounting for the relative functions and values of the lost and created wetlands.
- **COS-P5.4:** Require new buildings and structures on private property be set back at least 75 feet from the edge of any wetland area, unless a peer-reviewed, site-specific evaluation indicates that a different setback is appropriate for protecting the wetland and adjacent upland habitat areas. Allow encroachment into a required wetland setback area only when a parcel would otherwise be rendered unbuildable, or impacts have been adequately mitigated.
- **COS-P5.5:** Acquire deeded development rights to setback areas surrounding wetlands, floodplains, and natural watercourses to ensure preservation of the resource and protect adjacent improvements.
- **COS-P5.6:** Require increased setbacks for animal-handling uses whenever necessary to protect natural watercourses, riparian habitat, or erosion-prone soils. Setback increases can be applied to all aspects of the use, such as manure storage areas, and are not limited to buildings and structures.
- **COS-P5.11:** Prohibit direct runoff of pollutants and siltation into marsh, creek, and wetland areas from outfalls serving urban development.
- **COS-P8.1:** Protect public water supplies by denying applications for projects that would introduce significant new pollution sources in groundwater basins and watersheds feeding major reservoirs, and support efforts to acquire and permanently protect reservoir watersheds.
- **COS-P8.2:** Coordinate with other agencies to control point and non-point sources of water pollution and maintain water quality standards
- **COS-P8.4:** Require new development to retain natural vegetation and topography whenever feasible and require projects involving erosion-inducing activities to use best management practices to minimize erosion.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **COS-P9.4:** Plan for land uses along shorelines that do not pose a threat to Bay or Delta resources, including water quality and shoreline and marshland habitats.
- **COS-P12.1:** Prohibit destruction of unique and irreplaceable natural features.
- **COS-P12.5:** Require restoration of natural contours and vegetation after grading and other land disturbances.
- **COS-P12.6:** Prohibit extreme topographic modification, such as filling in canyons or removing prominent hilltops. Exemptions may be considered for landfills, mining operations, and public or semi-public projects that necessitate such modifications.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to biological resources.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

V Cultural Resources

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
V. Cultural Resources									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	Impact 5.5-1: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.5-11 through 5.5-13)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	Impact 5.5-2: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (pages 5.5-13 through 5.5-15)	MM CUL-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Impact 5.5-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.5-13 through 5.5-15)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.5-1 to 5.5-7 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of cultural resources (historic resources, archaeological resources, and human remains), including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, and local regulations affecting these resources and is geographically limited to cultural resources in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all designated cultural resources and resources eligible for designation, along with all undiscovered cultural resources, within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to cultural resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the 2045 General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to historical resources resulting from potential demolition, alteration, or relocation of these resources (Impact 5.5-1). While existing federal and State regulations, along with General Plan policies such as COS-P10.1 and COS-P10.2, encourage preservation and adaptive reuse, impacts remain significant and unavoidable at the program level. The GPEIR also concluded that ground-disturbing activities under the General Plan could damage undiscovered archaeological resources (Impact 5.5-2). Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires pre-construction cultural records searches and tribal consultation, reducing impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, policies from the 2045 General Plan, such as COS-P10.5 and COS-P10.7, would reduce impacts to archaeological resources. Compliance with this mitigation measure and local regulations ensures protection of sensitive sites. Finally, the GPEIR concluded that construction activities risk disturbing Native American burials, particularly in areas with no prior records (Impact 5.5-3). Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 is required for the treatment of Native American burials. In addition, policies from the 2045 General Plan, such as Policy POS-P11.11, would reduce impacts.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated one mitigation measure to reduce impacts with respect to archaeological resources. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires project applicants to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor such activities for non-CEQA-exempt projects involving disturbance of previously developed sites or as directed by the County. This measure ensures that any potential archaeological resources are identified and protected, reducing archaeological impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to archaeological resources as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to historical resources, archaeological resources, or resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or local register, are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to these resources that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to these resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to historical resources, archaeological resources, or resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or local register. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measure and 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to cultural resources associated with 2045 General Plan. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in any or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR and therefore no new mitigation measures or revisions to existing mitigation measures would be required. These mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies would continue to apply to new development, as applicable, under the proposed project:

- CUL-1 Prior to initiation of construction activities for discretionary projects that are not exempt from CEQA and would involve ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed sites, or as otherwise directed by the County, the project applicant shall

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

be required to retain an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professionally Qualified Standards to conduct a cultural records search. If the records search identifies sensitivity for archaeological resources, the archaeologist shall be retained on an on-call basis. The project applicant shall defer to the recommendations of the consulting archaeologist, in consultation with culturally affiliated tribes and their designated monitors, regarding the evaluation and treatment of any cultural resources discovered on the project site.

- **Policy COS-P10.1:** Prioritize preservation and adaptive reuse of buildings, sites, and areas having identifiable archaeological, cultural, or historic significance. Require new construction and renovation projects in historic areas to incorporate compatible and high-quality design that protects the overall historic integrity of the area and adjacent historic resources.
- **Policy COS-P10.2:** Encourage sensitive restoration and adaptive reuse of historic resources following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, including additions and alterations to buildings that do not diminish historic integrity.
- **Policy COS-P10.5:** When a project involves a resource that is listed in the County's Historic Resources Inventory, or as otherwise necessitated by the CEQA process, require applicants to engage a qualified consultant to prepare an evaluation of potential and previously identified archaeological, cultural, and historic resources that may be present on the project site.
- **Policy COS-P10.7:** Require significant historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources to be either preserved onsite or adequately documented as a condition of removal. Any documentation of historic resources shall be conducted in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level III standards, as defined by the US Secretary of the Interior.
- **Policy POS-P11.11:** Upon discovery of a burial, human remains, or suspected human remains, require immediate halt to ground-disturbing activities such as excavation and grading, protection of the area surrounding the find, notification of the County Coroner, and compliance with the provisions of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, including California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if applicable. If human remains are determined to be Native American, require the applicant to consult with the Most Likely Descendants list to determine appropriate treatment, as prescribed in Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

CULTURAL RESOURCES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to cultural resources.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

VI Energy

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
VI. Energy									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Impact 5.6-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.6-25 through 5.6-31)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Impact 5.6-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.6-32 through 5.6-33)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
c) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded energy facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. ¹	Impact 5.6-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.6-33 through 5.6-35)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

¹ This checklist question which typically appears in the Utilities and Service Systems resource section, was addressed in Section 5.6, *Energy*, of the GPEIR. Therefore, this impact is discussed in Section VI, *Energy*, of this Initial Study.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – ENERGY

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.6-1 to 5.6-16 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of energy, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, regional, and local regulations affecting energy and is geographically limited to sources of energy generation and consumption in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all major sources of generation and consumption of electricity, natural gas, propane, and transportation fuels within the service areas of Pacific Gas and Electric Company and MCE (formerly Marin Clean Energy) within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to energy.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that while development under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would result in a net energy consumption increase, compliance with federal, State, and local regulations would gradually increase building energy efficiency and vehicle fuel efficiency in addition to reducing building energy demand and transportation-related fuel usage over time. Implementation of policies and actions in the 2045 General Plan would also contribute to minimizing building and transportation-related energy demands, resulting in a reduction in per capita energy consumption at the horizon year of the 2045 General Plan. The GPEIR also concluded that the 2045 General Plan would comply with all applicable energy plans and regulations and would not require relocation or construction of new energy infrastructure that would result in significant environmental impacts.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR determined all impacts related to energy would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce energy impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to energy are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to energy that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to energy requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to energy. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce energy impacts associated with implementing the 2045 General Plan. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.6.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **TR-P1.13:** Require designs for new parking facilities to incorporate ZEV charging/fueling infrastructure and maximize opportunities for adaptive reuse.
- **COS-P14.8:** Design and construct new County facilities to be zero-net energy to the extent feasible.
- **HS-P1.8:** Require new or expanded commercial and industrial projects exceeding 25,000 square feet of gross floor area to be near zero-emissions (NZE) operations, including the facilities themselves and the associated fleets. Require all necessary measures, such as the following, to achieve NZE:
 - a. Reduce on-site energy consumption and increase on-site energy generation and energy storage.
 - b. Provide adequate on-site ZE vehicle-capable parking for all anticipated truck traffic to prevent idling and off-site queuing.
 - c. Provide electrified loading docks with receptacles allowing plug-in of refrigerated trailers.
 - d. Use heavy-duty trucks that are model year 2014 or later and expedite a transition to ZE trucks by establishing a clear timeline for electrification of trucks as they become

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

commercially available. Ensure contracts with motor carriers include air quality incentives or requirements, such as providing incentives to fleets that meet United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SmartWay standards or requiring use of ZE or NZE trucks.

- e. Use a “clean fleet” of delivery vehicles as they become commercially available, but no later than 2025.
- f. Use ZE yard equipment, such as forklifts, pallet trucks and jacks, and stackers.
- g. Implement practices to control and remove fugitive dust and other contaminants from paved areas.

Uses with fewer than five vehicles domiciled on-site are exempt from this policy.

ENERGY CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to energy.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

VII Geology and Soils

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
VII. Geology and Soils									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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	Impact 5.7-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-16 through 5.7-18)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.									
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?	Impact 5.7-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-18 through 5.7-19)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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?	5.7-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-19 through 5.7-20)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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?	Impact 5.7-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-19 through 5.7-20)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where	Impact 5.7-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-20 through 5.7-21)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?									
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Impact 5.7-5: Less than Significant (pages 5.7-20 through 5.7-21)	MM GEO-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.7-1 to 5.7-13 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of geology and soils, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state and local regulations affecting these resources and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all potential development within the unincorporated county that could be at risk from geologic hazards (such as earthquake or liquefaction) or could cause geologic/soils impacts. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to geology and soils.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that development pursuant to the 2045 General Plan would not result in significant geologic or seismic hazards due to compliance with existing laws and codes, General Plan policies, and mitigation. Potential impacts from soil erosion, unstable soils, and wastewater disposal are also reduced through regulatory compliance and best practices, resulting in less-than-significant impacts. Although ground-disturbing activities during construction of individual projects could affect undiscovered paleontological resources, required policies and mitigation measures ensure these impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, General Plan EIR, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated one mitigation measure to reduce impacts related to paleontological resources. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires that prior to initiation of construction activities for discretionary projects that are not exempt from CEQA and would involve ground-disturbing

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

activities on previously undisturbed sites, or as otherwise directed by the County, project applicants shall be required to retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist to determine the project's potential to significantly impact paleontological resources according to Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards and if necessary, recommend mitigations to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level. This measure ensures that any potential paleontological resources are identified and protected, reducing paleontological impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to geology and soils as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to seismicity, geologic instability, soil instability (including erosion or loss), expansive soil, or septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts with respect to these topics that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to these topics requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts with respect to seismicity, geologic instability, soil instability, expansive soil, or septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measure and 2045 General Plan policies would reduce geology and soils impacts associated with implementing the 2045 General Plan. As explained above, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR and therefore no new mitigation measures or revisions to existing mitigation measures would be required. These mitigation measures and policies would continue to apply to new development, as applicable, under the proposed project:

- GEO-1 Prior to initiation of construction activities for discretionary projects that are not exempt from CEQA and would involve ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed sites, or as otherwise directed by the County, the project applicant shall be required to retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist to determine the project's potential to significantly impact paleontological resources according to Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. If necessary, the Qualified Professional Paleontologist shall recommend mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **HS-P4.2:** Discourage new below-market-rate housing in High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, the Wildland-Urban Interface, and Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones. If below-market-rate housing must be constructed within these zones, require it to be hardened or make use of nature-based solutions to remain habitable to the greatest extent possible.
- **HS-P11.1:** For projects in Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones or Seismic Hazard Zones (areas considered to be at risk of earthquake triggered liquefaction or landslide displacement) delineated by the California Geological Survey, as well as any other areas of steep slopes or areas of suspected ground failure known to the County, require submittal of appropriately detailed engineering geologic or geotechnical investigations. The reports must be compliant with State Guidelines and include:
 - a) (A map showing the outline of any geologic or potentially hazardous soil condition and areas subject to inundation.
 - b) Recommended means of mitigation of any adverse condition representing a hazard to improvements.
 - c) Recommendations to assure proper implementation of mitigation measures during construction.
- **HS-P11.2:** Prohibit construction of buildings intended for human occupancy in areas where seismic and other geologic hazards (e.g., landslides, liquefaction, and fault lines) cannot be adequately mitigated.
- **HS-P11.3:** Discourage construction of critical facilities and buildings intended for human occupancy in Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones. Where such development already exists, encourage earthquake retrofitting. If there is no feasible alternative to siting critical facilities and buildings intended for human occupancy in the Fault Zones, buildings must be sited, designed, and constructed to withstand the anticipated seismic stresses.
- **HS-P11.5:** Discourage development on slopes exceeding 15 percent, and prohibit development on slopes of 26 percent or greater, to avoid slope instability, unnecessary grading, and extensive land disturbance and facilitate long-term control of erosion and sedimentation. Exceptions may be considered for infrastructure projects and development on existing legal lots where no other feasible building sites exist. Because the risk of unsatisfactory performance can never be eliminated, any proposed hillside development must join an existing Geologic Hazard Abatement District (GHAD) or form a new GHAD.
- **HS-P11.6:** Do not accept public road dedications or allow construction of private roads on unstable hillsides or in landslide hazard areas unless potential hazards have been mitigated to the County's satisfaction. All private roads constructed in such areas must be fully

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

compliant with private road standards adopted by the County and local fire protection district.

- **COS-P10.6:** Upon discovery of significant historic or prehistoric archaeological artifacts or fossils during project construction, require ground-disturbing activities to halt within a 50-foot radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a qualified historian, archaeologist, or paleontologist and appropriate protection and preservation measures developed.
- **COS-P10.7:** Require significant historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources to be either preserved onsite or adequately documented as a condition of removal. Any documentation of historic resources shall be conducted in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level III standards, as defined by the US Secretary of the Interior.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to geology and soils.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

VIII Greenhouse Gas Emissions

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Impact 5.8-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.8-30 through 5.8-35)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Impact 5.8-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.8-35 through 5.8-37)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.8-1 to 5.8-18 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting these emissions and is geographically limited to the entire county and state. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all potential sources of GHG emissions in the unincorporated county, which contribute to state and ultimately worldwide GHG levels. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to GHG emissions.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the 2045 General Plan would achieve local GHG reduction targets that align with GHG reduction regulations established by Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 1279 and contribute toward meeting the State’s carbon neutrality targets, mainly due to implementation of the CAAP. In addition, implementation of the CAAP was projected to reduce GHG emissions when compared to existing conditions by the horizon year of the 2045 General Plan despite the anticipated population and employment growth under the 2045 General Plan. The 2045 General Plan was also determined to be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans including the Statewide Scoping Plan and the Association of Bay Area Government/Metropolitan Transportation Commission (ABAG/MTC) Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) (known as Plan Bay Area 2050).

The GHG impacts analyzed in the GPEIR were primarily driven by the development projections under the 2045 General Plan in addition to implementation of the strategies outlined in the CAAP. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Additionally, the proposed project would not impact implementation of the CAAP. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR determined all impacts related to energy would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce energy impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to GHG emissions are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to GHG emissions that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to GHG emissions requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to GHG emissions. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to GHG emissions. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.8.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P3.3:** Encourage extremely high-density, mixed-use development that combines employment, housing, and services near major transit facilities. Such development should be planned and designed to encourage walking, micromobility, and transit use; shorter commutes; and reduced dependency on single-occupant vehicles.
- **LU-P3.7:** Welcome development that supports the countywide goal of reducing VMT, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions, to meet climate change targets. Require projects that do not support the County's VMT-reduction goals to incorporate necessary changes (e.g., design, land use mix) to ensure they support those goals.
- **TR-P1.3:** Ensure emerging transportation technologies and travel options, such as autonomous and ZEVs and transportation network companies, support the County's goals for reducing emissions, adapting to climate change, improving public safety, and increasing equitable mobility.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **TR-P1.4:** Reduce single-occupant vehicle usage and VMT by significantly enhancing the availability and safety of other travel modes through infrastructure investment, policy support (Vision Zero, TDM Ordinance, and other best practices), and support for public transit.
- **TR-P1.11:** Support transitioning all on-road vehicles, including personal vehicles and business, government, and public transit fleets, to electric power from renewable sources or other zero-emission fuels.
- **TR-P1.12:** Continue to improve ZEV (including electric bicycle) charging/fueling infrastructure within new development and public rights-of-way, incorporating new technologies whenever possible.
- **TR-P1.13:** Require designs for new parking facilities to incorporate ZEV charging/fueling infrastructure and maximize opportunities for adaptive reuse.
- **TR-A1.4:** Implement programs to encourage transit use, bicycling, walking, telecommuting, and use of alternative vehicle fuels by County employees.
- **TR-A1.11:** Coordinate with CCTA and other local and regional agencies to implement the Contra Costa Electric Vehicle Readiness Blueprint and related policies and apply best practices in ZEV charging/fueling infrastructure requirements.
- **TR-A1.12:** Update the County Ordinance Code as necessary to support advances in ZEV charging/fueling infrastructure.
- **COS-P14.1:** Implement Climate Action and Adaptation Plan strategies to improve energy efficiency and conservation, promote carbon-free energy sources, and reduce energy-related GHG emissions.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to GHG emissions.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Impact 5.9-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-37 through 5.9-41)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions	Impact 5.9-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-37 through 5.9-41)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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?	Impact 5.9-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-37 through 5.9-41)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Impact 5.9-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-41 through 5.9-42)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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?	Impact 5.9-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-42 through 5.9-43)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Impact 5.9-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.9-43 through 5.9-45)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of	Impact 5.18-5: Significant and	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? ²	Unavoidable (pages 5.18-33 through 5.18-35)								

² This checklist question is addressed within Section 5.18, *Wildfire*, of the GPEIR. Therefore, analysis specific to this checklist is included in the discussion of Wildfire impacts in Section XX, *Wildfire*, of the Initial Study.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.9-1 to 5.9-28 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of hazards and hazardous materials, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, regional, and local regulations affecting hazards and hazardous materials and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all existing development within the unincorporated county that could be at risk from hazards and all sites whose development could create hazardous situations and impacts. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Impacts

The GPEIR determined that demolition, construction, and operational activities under the 2045 General Plan would involve use of hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, solvents, asbestos, and lead-based paint); however, compliance with federal, State, and local regulations would minimize associated risks. Industrial and commercial developments would be required to implement proper hazardous waste handling, containment, and cleanup procedures. Additionally, if development occurs on contaminated sites, Phase I Environmental Site Assessments and adherence to cleanup standards established by agencies such as Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency would be required prior to construction. Policies in the 2045 General Plan, including Policy HS-P9.10, which prohibits new hazardous waste facilities in ecologically sensitive areas and areas at risk of flooding or geological hazards, and Policies HS-P9.10, HS-P9.11, and HS-P9.12, further ensure hazardous waste facilities are evaluated and sited in accordance with SB 673 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25200.21(b) and (c)). With these regulatory safeguards in place, impacts were determined to be less than significant.

The GPEIR concluded that development near Buchanan Field Airport and Byron Airport must comply with numerous regulations including the County's Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) height restrictions to avoid safety hazards, 2045 General Plan policies preventing incompatible land uses near airports, and Chapter 86-4 of the County Ordinance Code. Additionally, under Section 21096 of the Public Resources Code, environmental reviews for individual projects proposed near airports must evaluate whether the project would create a safety hazard or noise issue for airport users or nearby residents and

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

workers. Since all projects near airports must comply with these regulations, impacts related to airport safety were found to be less than significant.

The GPEIR concluded that increased development under the 2045 General Plan could place additional strain on evacuation routes, particularly in areas with high wildfire or flood risk. The General Plan mitigates this by requiring at least two evacuation routes for new development in hazard-prone areas. In addition, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, Emergency Operations Plan, and Community Wildfire Protection Plan guide emergency response efforts. Impacts related to emergency response and evacuation were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant except impacts related to exposure of people and structures to wildfires, which are discussed in Section XX, *Wildfire*, below. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce hazards and hazardous materials impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to public hazards, release of hazardous materials into the environment, handling of hazardous materials within one quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school, being located on a hazardous materials site, being located within two miles of an airport, creating a safety hazard for neighbors, and impairment of an adopted emergency plan are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to these topics that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to these topics requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to these topics. The proposed project would not result in any

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.8.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **HS-P7.1:** Deny applications for subdivisions creating additional residential lots in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Discourage such subdivisions in High Fire Hazard Severity Zones unless adequate fire protection services are provided
- **HS-P7.2:** Require any construction of buildings or infrastructure within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA, as shown on Figure HS-10, or in areas that may be designated as the WUI to incorporate fire-safe design features that meet the State Fire Safe Regulations and Fire Hazard Reduction Around Buildings and Structures Regulation for road ingress and egress, fire equipment access, and adequate water supply.
- **HS-P7.3:** Require new development within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA (as shown on Figure HS-10) or in areas that may be designated as the WUI, and on a residential parcel with evacuation constraints (as shown on Figure HS-21), to prepare a traffic control plan to ensure that construction equipment or activities do not block roadways or interfere with evacuation plans during the construction period. Work with the appropriate fire protection district to review and approve the traffic control plan prior to issuance of building permits.
- **HS-P9.10:** Prohibit new hazardous waste facilities in the following areas:
 - (a) Watersheds of an existing or planned drinking water reservoir.
 - (b) Ecologically significant resource areas.
 - (c) Within 200 feet of an active or potentially active fault.
 - (d) Within a 100-year floodplain.
 - (e) Within a setback distance determined in accordance with DTSC guidance under SB 673, once final.
- **HS-P9.11:** Require design and operation of new or expanded hazardous waste facilities to adhere to the following criteria, as well as the permitting criteria established by the DTSC for vulnerable communities and cumulative impacts pursuant to SB 673, once final:
 - a) Minimize risk to the surrounding area in the case of a hazardous waste accident or spill.
 - (b) Ensure spills of waste will not reach the Bay, Delta, streams, creeks, reservoirs, or

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

other bodies of water or environmentally sensitive resources by incorporating buffers as appropriate and/or using engineered structural design features (e.g., spill containment and monitoring devices).

- b) Avoid known or suspected groundwater recharge areas or areas where residential uses rely on wells. If located in such areas, facilities must provide properly engineered spill containment features, inspection measures, and other environmental protection controls.
 - c) In areas with unstable soils, such as steep slopes and areas subject to liquefaction or subsidence, ensure structural stability through engineered design features.
 - d) Use access roads leading to major transportation routes that:
 - Do not traverse residential neighborhoods.
 - Minimize, buffer, or employ physical barriers to residential frontages.
 - Demonstrate road network safety through road design, construction, accident rates, and traffic flow.
 - e) Minimize noise impacts on the surrounding area.
- **HS-P9.12:** Require hazardous waste facilities to prepare a cumulative risk assessment that analyzes, characterizes, and quantifies the combined risks to human health and the environment from the facility, in combination with other off-site hazardous materials risks. The assessment must consider risks in the absence of actions to control or mitigate a potential release and determine whether buffers or other mitigation is necessary to protect residential uses, immobile populations (e.g., schools, hospitals, behavioral health facilities, convalescent homes, and prisons), other places where people gather, environmentally sensitive resources, and other sensitive areas from adverse emissions or contamination. The assessment must also be guided by DTSC guidance for vulnerable communities and cumulative impacts pursuant to SB 673, once final. Require that project applicants fund the needed technical review for the assessment.
 - **HS-P10.2:** Require development of contaminated sites to comply with all clean-up plans, land use covenants, and deed restrictions imposed by the DTSC or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
 - **HS-A10.1:** Support public access to the inventory of contaminated sites published by the DTSC and SWRCB by posting links to this information on the County's website.
 - **HS-P12.1:** Continue implementing the Contra Costa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and certified by FEMA and is incorporated by reference into this Health and Safety Element.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **HS-A12.1:** Update the Contra Costa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as necessary to remain compliant with State and federal laws and reflect changing climate conditions.
- **HS-A12.2:** Incorporate the assessments and projections for future emergency service needs from the most recent Municipal Services Reviews into updates of the Contra Costa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- **HS-A12.4:** Identify and, as feasible, retrofit critical County-owned buildings and facilities in areas prone to flooding (including sea level rise and emergent flooding), seismic hazards, landslides and debris flows, tsunamis, or wildfires to maximize defensible space and outdoor fireproofing, improve drainage systems, stabilize nearby slopes, and take other actions as appropriate to minimize the hazard.
- **HS-P13.1:** Except for infill sites, require new development in High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, the WUI, and 100-year or 200-year floodplains to have access to at least two emergency evacuation routes, and encourage the same for existing development.
- **HS-A13.2:** At least once every five years, update maps identifying neighborhoods with only one emergency evacuation route.
- **HS-A13.3:** Coordinate with local fire districts to develop and maintain minimum roadway, ingress, and egress standards for evacuation of residential areas in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.
- **TR-P7.4:** Protect the County's airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and minimize the public's exposure to safety hazards and excessive noise by ensuring that all future development within each Airport Influence Area is consistent with the Contra Costa County ALUCP.
- **TR-P7.5:** Partner with the cities of Concord and Pleasant Hill in making land use decisions that support Buchanan Field Airport's ongoing viability while protecting public safety, consistent with the Airport Master Plan and ALUCP.
- **TR-P7.6:** Enhance Byron Airport's viability by protecting it from incompatible urban encroachment, such as large-scale residential development, and providing infrastructure that supports existing and planned airport activities, consistent with the Airport Master Plan and ALUCP.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

X Hydrology and Water Quality

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 – Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 – Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
X. Hydrology and Water Quality									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Impact 5.10-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.10-47 through 5.10-50)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable	Impact 5.10-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.10-50 through 5.10-52)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 – Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 – Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
groundwater management of the basin?									
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or 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 a 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 offsite;	Impact 5.10-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.10-53 through 5.10-55)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 – Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 – Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?									
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Impact 5.10-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.10-56 through 5.10-58)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of	Impact 5.10-5:	No mitigation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 – Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 – Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than Significant (pages 5.10-58 through 5.10-59)	measures required.							

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.10-1 to 5.10-38 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of hydrology and water quality, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, regional, and local regulations affecting hydrology and water quality and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all potential development within the unincorporated county that could be at risk from hydrologic hazards (such as flooding or tsunامي) or cause hydrology and water quality impacts. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to hydrology and water quality.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that development under the 2045 General Plan would not violate water quality standards or significantly degrade surface or groundwater quality due to strict adherence to regulatory measures such as Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs), Best Management Practices (BMPs), and Low Impact Development (LID) techniques. It would also avoid substantial groundwater depletion or interference with recharge, as most of the county's water supply comes from surface water and groundwater basins managed under approved Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs). Increased impervious surfaces from future development would be mitigated through LID measures like permeable paving and bioretention, while hydromodification controls ensure stormwater flows are managed to prevent erosion and flooding. Development in flood-prone areas would comply with FEMA and County standards, while adaptation strategies such as sea-level rise planning and dam failure protocols further reduce risk. The GPEIR also determined that the 2045 General Plan aligns with regional water quality control plans and groundwater management policies. All impacts were found to be less than significant.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce hydrology and water quality impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to hydrology and water quality are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to hydrology and water quality that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to hydrology and water quality requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.10.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **Policy HS-P5.1:** Prohibit urban development in areas designated 100- or 200-year (or 500-year when used as a proxy for the 200-year) floodplain, as shown on Figure HS-2, or in areas subject to increased flood hazards due to subsidence or other changes, unless appropriate mitigations to reduce flood risk to the standards of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 or above are implemented.
- **Policy HS-P5.2:** Require flood-proofing of new and expanded buildings and structures in any area subject to flooding. Flood-proofing methods will be determined on a project-by-project basis by the Floodplain Manager, and may include, but not be limited to:
 - (a) Anchoring to prevent flotation, collapse, or lateral movement.
 - (b) Using flood-resistant construction materials.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- (c) Elevating building pads and habitable building floors above the base flood elevation plus required freeboard.
- (d) Providing adequate venting to allow for equalization of hydrostatic forces.
- (e) Employing any other construction methods and practices appropriate to minimize flood damage.
- **Policy HS-P5.3:** For any development project in a FEMA- or DWR-designated floodplain, require review by the Floodplain Manager to consider potential downstream flood damage that may result from the project.
- **Policy HS-P6.1:** Require new development to locate habitable areas of buildings above the highest water level expected, based on Figures HS-6 through HS-9, accounting for sea level rise and other changes in flood conditions, or construct natural and nature-based features, or a levee if necessary, adequately designed to protect the project for its expected life.
- **Policy HS-P6.3:** Work with property owners in areas prone to emergent groundwater flooding to pre-emptively harden properties using methods that minimize erosion, subsidence, and structural damage from rising waters.
- **Policy HS-P9.5:** Require industrial projects involving use, management, or generation of hazardous materials or waste, particularly those utilizing stationary or fixed storage tanks, in areas at risk from sea-level rise, surface or emergent groundwater flooding, or tsunami to incorporate best management practices to reduce risk and prepare plans for prevention and remediation of hazardous materials/waste releases resulting from inundation. Remediation plans must meet regulatory standards for protection of people and the environment in the event of permanent inundation and include financial assurances to guarantee implementation.
- **Policy HS-P9.10:** Prohibit new hazardous waste facilities in the following areas:
 - a) Watersheds of an existing or planned drinking water reservoir.
 - b) Ecologically significant resource areas.
 - c) Within 200 feet of an active or potentially active fault.
 - d) Within a 100-year floodplain.
 - e) Within a setback distance determined in accordance with DTSC guidance under SB 673, once final.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect hydrology and water quality.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XI Land Use and Planning

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XI. Land Use and Planning									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Physically divide an established community?	Impact 5.11-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.11-14 through 5.11-15)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an	Impact 5.11-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.11-16 through 5.11-21)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
environmental effect?									

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – LAND USE AND PLANNING

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.11-1 to 5.11-6 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of land use and planning, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting land use and planning and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses the area under the County's land use jurisdiction (the unincorporated county). Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to land use and planning.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the 2045 General Plan would not divide any established communities. Rather than encouraging or creating physical barriers such as freeways or large-scale disruptive development, the General Plan emphasizes connectivity and integration through infill and transit-oriented development. Policies such as LU-P2.5, which encourages infill, LU-P3.3, which promotes transit-oriented development, and LU-P7.7, which requires new residential projects to provide convenient access/connections to transit, local destinations, and trails, help ensure that new growth complements and connects with existing neighborhoods.

The GPEIR concluded that the 2045 General Plan is consistent with applicable regional and State plans aimed at protecting the environment and guiding sustainable development. These include Plan Bay Area 2050, the Delta Plan, the Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta, the San Francisco Bay Plan, the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), and the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Because the 2045 General Plan adheres to and in many cases enhances existing environmental protection, its impact related to plan consistency is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

The proposed project supports environmental protection goals and regional planning efforts identified in the GPEIR. Specifically, by limiting urban expansion and guiding development toward the most suitable areas of the county through ULL contractions, the project upholds the regional goals of containing sprawl, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and preserving open space and sensitive habitats. For example:

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- The proposed ULL changes are consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050's priority to direct growth toward existing communities.
- By restricting urban development in areas with environmental constraints, the proposed project aligns with the Delta Plan and HCP/NCCP goals of managing risk and protecting ecological resources.
- The shoreline adjustments improve consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan by clarifying boundaries and removing undevelopable areas from within the ULL.

Overall, the proposed project reinforces the 2045 General Plan's emphasis on sustainable growth and environmental stewardship.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce land use and planning impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project involving physical division of an established community and conflicts with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects would be the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to these topics that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to these topics requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to these topics. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to land use and planning. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.11.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P2.3:** Limit development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, such as agriculture, mineral extraction, wind and solar energy production, natural carbon sequestration, other resource-based uses, and essential infrastructure.
- **LU-P2.4:** Deny applications for major subdivisions outside the ULL. Discourage minor subdivisions outside the ULL that would subdivide any parcel created by a subdivision map recorded after November 5, 2024.
- **LU-P4.2:** Continuously improve community appearance by requiring high-quality designs and materials that complement their surroundings, with emphasis on enhancing public spaces and historic and cultural resources.
- **COS-P1.3:** Discourage conversion of land designated Resource Conservation or Parks and Recreation to urban uses. If such conversion occurs, require mitigation through permanent protection of other open space or park lands for habitat, scenic, or recreation benefits at a ratio to be determined based on the biological, scenic, or recreational value of the land, but not less than 3:1.
- **COS-P4.1:** Maintain ecologically significant resource areas in their natural state to the greatest extent possible. Limit development in and near these areas to compatible low-intensity uses with adequate provisions to protect sensitive resources, including setbacks around resource areas. Prohibit projects that would lead to fragmentation of ecologically significant resource areas.
- **COS-P9.4:** Plan for land uses near shorelines that do not pose a threat to Bay or Delta resources, including water quality and shoreline and marshland habitats.

LAND USE AND PLANNING CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to land use and planning.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XII Mineral Resources

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XII. Mineral Resources									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	Impact 5.12-1: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.12-12 through 5.12-13)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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?	Impact 5.12-1: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.12-12 through 5.12-13)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – MINERAL RESOURCES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.12-1 to 5.12-10 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of mineral resources, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state and local regulations affecting mineral resources and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses important mining sites and areas of the unincorporated county containing mineral resources of value to the region and state. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to mineral resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the 2045 General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to the loss of availability of mineral resources of importance to the State. The 2045 General allows incompatible development in designated mineral resource zones delineated by the California Department of Conservation and in areas that overlie natural gas and oil deposits. Although compliance with the State's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) is required, development that would hinder extraction of these resources in these areas would permanently limit access to mineral, oil, and gas deposits of importance to the State. Because there are no feasible mitigation measures that can fully offset this loss, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that no feasible alternatives or mitigation measures are available to mitigate impacts associated with the loss of mineral resources of value to the State to less than significant. As explained below, several policies and actions in the 2045 General Plan help to reduce impacts. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to mineral resources as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to mineral resources are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts to mineral resources that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to mineral resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to mineral resources. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to land use and planning. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.12.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **COS-P13.1:** Protect valuable mineral resources by prohibiting incompatible projects and land uses (i.e., those that would directly or indirectly interfere with extraction, processing, or transportation of mineral resources) within the MRAs identified in Figure COS-11 (see 2045 General Plan).
- **COS-P13.2:** Encourage compact design and layout for mineral resource processing areas, preserving as much land as possible for buffering between these areas and adjacent land uses.
- **COS-P13.3:** For residential subdivisions within one mile of the MRAs depicted in Figure COS-11, require deed disclosures indicating the presence of the mineral resource and explaining potential disturbances (e.g., noise, dust, heavy truck traffic) associated with mineral extraction activities.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **COS-P13.4:** Require applications for new or expanded quarrying operations adjacent to Mount Diablo State Park to include an analysis of potential impacts to the park's natural features, including viewsheds, and operations.
- **COS-P13.5:** Ensure that quarry reclamation plans, including bonding requirements, are maintained in compliance with SMARA.
- **COS-A13.1:** Update County Ordinance Code Chapter 88-11, Surface Mining and Reclamation, as necessary to maintain consistency with SMARA.
- **COS-A14.1:** Amend County Ordinance Code Chapter 88-14 – Oil and Gas Drilling and Production to:
 - a) Prohibit new and expanded oil and gas production wells in the following:
 - i) Sensitive ecological areas, such as wetlands and habitat for rare, threatened, endangered, or special-status species.
 - ii) Areas subject to 100-year flood hazards or sea-level rise, as shown in Figures HS-2 and HS-6 through HS-9.
 - iii) Areas within 3,200 feet of sensitive receptors or urban land use designations unless project-specific exceptions are granted by the California Department of Conservation, Geologic Energy Management Division.
 - b) Restrict oil and gas drilling operations to agricultural zoning districts only.
 - c) Require a land use permit for all new and expanded oil and gas wells.
 - d) Require a reclamation plan for oil and gas well sites that includes bonding for site clean-up.
 - e) Include performance standards related to surface water and groundwater quality and quantity, air quality, odors, noise, and aesthetics.

In parallel, study the feasibility of amending the County Ordinance Code to prohibit development of new oil and gas wells and phase out existing oil and gas well operations.

MINERAL RESOURCES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to mineral resources.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XIII Noise

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives ?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XIII.Noise									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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	Impact 5.13-1: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.13-30 through 5.13-33) Impact 5.13-2: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.13-33 through 5.13-52	MM N-1 No feasible alternatives .	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
other agencies?									
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Impact 5.13-3: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (pages 5.13-53 through 5.13-55)	MM N-2 MM N-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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	Impact 5.13-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.13-55 through 5.13-56)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
to excessive noise levels?									

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – NOISE

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.13-1 to 5.13-26 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of noise, including noise and vibration fundamentals, regulatory background, and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, and local regulations affecting noise and vibration and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all areas of the unincorporated county that could be impacted by noise and vibration and all development within the unincorporated county that could cause noise and vibration impacts. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to noise.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that impacts with respect to construction and roadway noise would be significant and unavoidable. While Mitigation Measure N-1 was incorporated to reduce potential noise impacts during construction, the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses, the number of construction projects occurring simultaneously, and the potential duration of construction activities, could result in a temporary substantial increase in noise levels above ambient conditions. Additionally, due to the increase in vehicle trips under the 2045 General Plan, traffic noise levels on several roadways across the county would increase at residences located along these roadways. As described in the GPEIR, no feasible or practical mitigation measures are available to reduce project-generated traffic noise to less-than-significant levels in all cases. Vibration impacts from construction and operational activities under the 2045 General Plan were determined to be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measures N-2 and N-3, which require applicable projects to assess vibration levels and incorporate appropriate mitigations. Compliance with the ALUCPs for the County's two airports and applicable General Plan policies ensures that impacts from noise associated with airports would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not introduce new or different sources of noise and vibration not previously analyzed in the GPEIR. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated three mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to noise and vibration including N-1, which requires implementation of measures to reduce construction noise; N-2, which requires assessment and mitigation of construction vibration impacts; and N-3, which requires assessment and mitigation of operational vibration impacts. The GPEIR concluded that no feasible alternatives or additional mitigation measures are available to reduce impact N-1 to less than significant; it remains significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to noise and vibration as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new alternatives or mitigation measures are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to noise and vibration are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to noise and vibration that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to noise and vibration requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to noise and vibration. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts related to noise and vibration associated with 2045 General Plan. As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR and therefore no new mitigation measures or revisions to existing mitigation measures would be required. These mitigation measures and policies would continue to apply to new development, as applicable, under the proposed project:

- N-1 Require construction contractors to implement the following measures for construction activities. Demolition, grading, and construction plans submitted to the County shall identify these measures and the County Department of Conservation and Development

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

shall verify that the submitted plans include these notations prior to issuance of demolition, grading, and/or construction permits:

- During the entire active construction period, equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best-available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment re-design, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) available.
- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers and breakers) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible. Where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used along with external noise jackets on the tools.
- Stationary equipment, such as generators and air compressors, shall be as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses.
- Stockpiling shall be as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors.
- Construction traffic shall be limited, to the extent feasible, to approved haul routes approved by the County Conservation and Development and Public Works Departments.
- At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the County's and contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, they shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the County.
- Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the on-site construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes.
- During the entire active construction period and to the extent feasible, the use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

noise level or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws.

- Erect temporary noise barriers (at least as high as the exhaust of equipment and breaking line-of-sight between noise sources and sensitive receptors), as necessary and feasible, to maintain construction noise levels at or below the performance standard of 80 dBA Leq. Barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 4 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier.

N-2 Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction within 135 feet of fragile structures, such as historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); or a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed FTA architectural damage thresholds (i.e., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV] for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed this threshold, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving and static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded.

N-3 During the project-level CEQA process for industrial development projects or other projects that could generate substantial vibration levels near sensitive uses, such as residential uses, a noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to the operations of that individual development. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer and shall follow the latest CEQA guidelines, practices, and precedents.

- **TR-P7.3:** Regulate the location of private airfields and heliports to protect public safety and minimize impacts on nearby residents and sensitive receptors.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **TR-P7.4:** Protect the County’s airports from encroachment by incompatible uses and minimize the public’s exposure to safety hazards and excessive noise by ensuring that all future development within each Airport Influence Area is consistent with the Contra Costa County ALUCP.
- **HS-P14.1.** Require projects that would locate noise-sensitive land uses in areas where the projected ambient noise level is greater than the “normally acceptable” noise level indicated in Table HS-3 of the General Plan to provide an acoustical analysis that recommends appropriate mitigation to meet the noise compatibility standards.
- **HS-P14.2.** Require new housing developments, hotels, and motels exposed to a DNL of 60 dB or greater to provide a detailed acoustical analysis describing how the project will provide an interior DNL of 45 dB or less.
- **HS-P14.3.** Require new nonresidential uses exposed to a DNL of 65 dB or greater to provide a detailed acoustical analysis describing how the project will provide an interior sound level of 50 Leq (1-hr)
- **HS-P14.4.** Require new residential development in areas exposed to a DNL in excess of 65 dB due to single events, such as train operation, to provide an acoustical analysis describing how indoor noise levels from these single events will not exceed a maximum A-weighted noise level of 35 dB in bedrooms and 55 dB in other habitable rooms. In areas exposed to a DNL in excess of 65 dB, use an indoor residential noise-level threshold of 45 dB CNEL.
- **HS-P14.5.** Protect noise-sensitive land uses listed in Table HS-3 (see 2045 General Plan) from adverse noise impacts by requiring mitigation to the degree feasible for projects that would increase long-term noise in excess of the following thresholds, when measured at the sensitive use’s property line:
 - a) Greater than 1.5 dBA DNL increase for ambient noise environments of 65 dBA DNL and higher.
Greater than 3 dBA DNL increase for ambient noise environments of 60 to 64 DNL.
Greater than 5 dBA DNL increase for ambient noise environments of less than 60 dBA DNL.
- **HS-P14.6.** Design County projects to minimize long-term noise impacts on existing residents and follow best practices to minimize short-term impacts from construction noise.
- **HS-P14.7.** Condition entitlements to limit noise-generating construction activities to the following:
 - a) Weekdays and non-holidays unless site-specific conditions warrant exception

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Within 1,000 feet of noise-sensitive uses: 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Over 1,000 feet from noise-sensitive uses: 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

- **Policy HS-P14.8.** Require a traffic noise analysis for development projects where the project would generate more than 40 percent of daily trips over existing average daily traffic (ADT) on impacted roadway segments. Projects below this threshold are assumed to have no significant traffic noise impact because they would increase noise levels by less than 1.5 dBA DNL, which is the most restrictive threshold for determining a significant traffic noise impact. This screening policy does not apply to projects involving a substantial number of new operational truck trips (e.g., warehouses).
- **HS-P14.9.** Require effective measures along major transportation facilities/corridors to reduce impacts on adjacent noise-sensitive land uses.

NOISE CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to noise.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XIV Population and Housing

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XIV. Population and Housing									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Impact 5.14-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.14-11 through 5.14-14)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing,	Impact 5.14-2: Less than Significant (pages	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	5.14-14 through 5.14-15)								

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – POPULATION AND HOUSING

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.14-1 to 5.14-7 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of population and housing, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting population and housing and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The environmental setting also includes all projected growth for the Bay Area under Plan Bay Area 2050. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses the area where the County has land use jurisdiction (the unincorporated county) and responsibility to plan for housing production and population growth. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to population and housing.

Impacts

The population and housing growth anticipated under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would exceed the Plan Bay Area 2050 regional growth forecasts for the unincorporated county. However, policies and actions in the 2045 General Plan guide development toward areas already planned for urban uses and direct the County to monitor growth and conduct additional environmental analysis before allowing the development capacity analyzed in the GPEIR to be exceeded. The GPEIR also noted that the County's adopted 6th Cycle Housing Element includes policies that help to prevent new development from displacing existing residents. The GPEIR concluded that population and housing impacts under the 2045 General Plan were less than significant.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce population and housing impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new alternatives or mitigation measures are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to population and housing are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to population and housing that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to population and housing requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to population and housing. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to population and housing. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.14.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P.1.1:** The General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) assumes the following maximum development projections for the year 2045:

- a) 23,200 new dwelling units.

1.2 million square feet of new commercial and office space.

5 million square feet of new industrial space.

If new development approved within the unincorporated county reaches the maximum number of residential units and commercial/office and industrial square feet projected in the General Plan EIR, require that environmental review conducted for any subsequent development project address growth impacts that would occur from development exceeding the General Plan EIR's projections.

- **LU-A1.1:** Track growth to ensure it does not exceed the development projections analyzed in the General Plan EIR and described in Policy LU-P1.1 without subsequent environmental review.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **LU-P2.1:** Continue implementing the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard, using the County ULL to focus future development in the county's established urban and suburban communities while preserving agricultural land, rangeland, natural habitats, watersheds, and open space.
- **LU-P2.3:** Limit development outside the ULL to non-urban uses, such as agriculture, mineral extraction, wind and solar energy production, natural carbon sequestration, other resource-based uses, and essential infrastructure.
- **LU-P2.4:** Deny applications for major subdivisions outside the ULL. Discourage minor subdivisions outside the ULL that would subdivide any parcel created by a subdivision map recorded after November 5, 2024.
- **LU-P2.5:** Encourage infill development.
- **LU-P2.6:** Encourage clustering of allowable densities to reduce development footprints; protect scenic resources, natural features, and open spaces; and avoid hazardous areas (e.g., floodplains).
- **LU-P3.1:** Support regional efforts to achieve a jobs-housing balance within the county and within subregions of the county by maintaining an adequate supply of developable land designated for job-generating uses. For any General Plan amendment proposing to convert commercial, industrial, or office land uses to residential or non-urban land uses, evaluate the project's effect on the local and countywide jobs-housing balance.
- **LU-P5.1:** Allow development only where requisite community services, facilities, and infrastructure can be provided.
- **LU-P5.2:** Consider the potential locations of planned public infrastructure projects (e.g., transit lines, major roadways, drainage improvements) when evaluating development proposals and deny development applications that would interfere with implementation of such projects.
- **LU-A5.2:** Work with LAFCO and utility service providers to:
 - a) Annex lands planned for urban development by this General Plan into their service areas.

Detach private lands, especially agricultural or rural lands, from district boundaries if they are not planned for urban development and are not currently served.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

POPULATION AND HOUSING CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to population and housing.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XV Public Services

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XV. Public Services									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) 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	Impacts 5.15-1 through 5.15-5								

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:									
Fire protection?	Impact 5.15-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.15-12 through 5.15-13)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Police protection?	Impact 5.15-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.15-17 through 5.15-18)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Schools?	Impact 5.15-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.15-23 through 5.15-25)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Parks?	Impact 5.15-5:	No mitigation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
	Less than Significant (pages 5.15-41 through 5.15-43)	measures required.							
Other public facilities?	Impact 5.15-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.15-26 through 5.15-27)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

DISCUSSION – PUBLIC SERVICES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Section 5.15 of the GPEIR provides the environmental setting specific to the analysis of public services, including regulatory background and existing conditions. This section is organized differently from most other sections in Chapter 5 of the GPEIR and the description of the environmental setting is found throughout. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting public services and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses the service areas of the various public service providers (fire districts, school districts, etc.) within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to public services.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the growth anticipated under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would increase demand for public services. While this increased demand could require additional personnel, equipment, and facility expansions for fire and police protection services, the 2045 General Plan includes policies ensuring that new development pays appropriate development impact fees (Policy PFS-P3.2 and Policy PFS-3.3). Additional policies and actions ensure that wildfire safety risks are minimized (Policy PFS-P6.3); incorporate new standards in the County Ordinance Code to increase public safety through environmental design (Action PFS-A6.1); support access to parks, programs, and amenities (PFS-P8.1, PFS-P8.2, and PFS-P8.4); require coordination with school districts (Policy PFS-P9.1); and require adoption of new standards and fees for libraries (PFS-A10.1 and PFS-A10.2). As a result, impacts on public services were determined to be less than significant.

Impacts with respect to public services are generally driven by increases in the population or workforce of service areas. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to public services would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce public services impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new alternatives or mitigation measures are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to public facilities and services that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to public facilities and services requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to public facilities and services. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to public services. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Sections 5.15.1.3, 5.15.2.3, 5.15.3.3, 5.15.4.3, and 5.15.5.3, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **PFS-P3.2:** Require new development to pay its fair share of public improvement costs for infrastructure, facilities, maintenance, and services based on the proportionate cost of serving the project.
- **PFS-P3.3:** When new development cannot adequately be served by existing infrastructure and facilities or through the County's impact fee programs, require a public facilities financing plan that identifies the necessary public improvements and establishes an equitable plan to pay for and develop the required improvements.
- **PFS-P6.3:** During the discretionary review process for projects with potential to increase demand on fire protection services, consult with the applicable fire district to identify any upgrades to fire protection facilities, infrastructure, and equipment needed to reduce fire risk and improve emergency response.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **PFS-P8.2:** Provide a local park within a safe 10-minute walk for all residents in urban communities or within a 5-minute drive for residents in suburban communities, as indicated in Figures PFS-9 and PFS-10.
- **PFS-P8.5:** Require projects subject to the Park Dedication or Park Impact Fee Ordinances to develop parks and recreation amenities identified in, or proposed for addition to, the County's Park Capital Improvement Plan. Park Impact fees or in-lieu fees should be assessed only when the County determines developer improvements are not feasible.
- **PFS-P9.1:** When reviewing new development proposals, coordinate with affected school districts to ensure adequate school capacity is or will be available, school sites are designated or dedicated if necessary, and adequate access is provided.
- **PFS-P10.3:** Provide adequate funding for maintaining and improving library operations.
- **PFS-A10.1:** Develop library service and facility standards, identify standards not being met, and seek necessary resources to achieve those standards.

PUBLIC SERVICES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to public services.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XVI Recreation

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XVI. Recreation³									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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?	Impact 5.15-5: Less than Significant (pages 5.15-41 through 5.15-43)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Does the project include	Impact 5.15-5:	No mitigation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

³ Both Recreation checklist questions are addressed in Section 5.15, *Public Services*, of the GPEIR.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than Significant (pages 5.15-41 through 5.15-43)	measures required.							

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – RECREATION

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Section 5.15 of the GPEIR provides the environmental setting specific to the analysis of recreation, including regulatory background and existing conditions. This section is organized differently from most other sections in Chapter 5 of the GPEIR and the description of the environmental setting is found throughout. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting recreation and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses National Historic Sites, State Parks, and the service areas of the recreation and park districts within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to recreation.

Impacts

Impacts with respect to parks and recreation services are generally driven by increases in population. The GPEIR concluded that impacts to parks and recreation services would be less than significant under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to parks and recreation would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce parks and recreation impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new alternatives or mitigation measures are required.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to parks and recreation are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to parks and recreation that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to parks and recreation requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to parks and recreation. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to parks and recreation. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.15.5.3, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **PFS-P3.2:** Require new development to pay its fair share of public improvement costs for infrastructure, facilities, maintenance, and services based on the proportionate cost of serving the project.
- **PFS-P3.3:** When new development cannot adequately be served by existing infrastructure and facilities or through the County's impact fee programs, require a public facilities financing plan that identifies the necessary public improvements and establishes an equitable plan to pay for and develop the required improvements.
- **PFS-P8.2:** Provide a local park within a safe 10-minute walk for all residents in urban communities or within a 5-minute drive for residents in suburban communities, as indicated in Figures PFS-9 and PFS-10.
- **PFS-P8.5:** Require projects subject to the Park Dedication or Park Impact Fee Ordinances to develop parks and recreation amenities identified in, or proposed for addition to, the County's Park Capital Improvement Plan. Park Impact fees or in-lieu fees should be assessed only when the County determines developer improvements are not feasible.

RECREATION CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to recreation.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XVII Transportation

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XVII. Transportation									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Impact 5.16-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.16-37 through 5.16-39)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Impact 5.16-2: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.16-40 through 5.16-46)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Impact 5.16-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.16-46 through 5.16-47)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Impact 5.16-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.16-47 through 5.16-48)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – TRANSPORTATION

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.16-1 to 5.16-22 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of transportation, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting transportation and is geographically limited to local and regional transportation and circulation systems that could be impacted by development in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment that was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all potential development sites in the unincorporated county whose development could impact local and regional transportation and circulation systems. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to biological resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that impacts with respect to plans, policies, ordinances, or programs that address the circulation system would be less than significant since the 2045 General Plan includes measures that ensure consistency with the transportation planning efforts of other agencies in the region and other County transportation plans. Similarly, impacts with respect to roadway hazards and emergency access were considered less than significant due to compliance with relevant provisions of the County Ordinance Code and 2045 General Plan policies which ensure future projects would be designed to minimize hazards and provide adequate emergency service access. The GPEIR also concluded that impacts related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) under the 2045 General Plan would be significant and unavoidable due to the projected VMT per service population under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario exceeding the County's threshold of 15 percent below existing VMT per service population. While VMT per service population under the 2045 General Plan would exceed the County's threshold, the VMT per service population projected under the County's previous General Plan was higher than the 2045 General Plan, meaning the 2045 General Plan represents an improvement.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development and therefore would have the same impacts as those analyzed in the GPEIR, including a significant and unavoidable impact related to VMT. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that no feasible alternatives or mitigation measures are available to mitigate VMT-related impacts to less than significant. As explained below, several policies in the 2045 General Plan help to reduce impacts. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to transportation as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to transportation are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR, with VMT-related impacts remaining significant and unavoidable. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to transportation that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to transportation requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to transportation. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies would reduce impacts with respect to transportation. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.16.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P7.7:** Require new residential projects to provide convenient access/connections to public transit, local destinations, and multiuse trails whenever possible.
- **TR-P3.2:** Coordinate planning, construction, and maintenance of streets, transit infrastructure, non-motorized rights-of-way and associated facilities, the countywide bicycle network, and Pedestrian Priority Areas with neighboring jurisdictions and CCTA.
- **TR-P4.1:** Plan, design, and maintain improvement projects involving County roadways in accordance with the County's adopted Complete Streets Policy, other applicable policies

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

(e.g., Vision Zero and other safety initiatives), planning documents such as the County Active Transportation Plan and CCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and best practices (e.g., Caltrans, American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials, and National Association of City Transportation Officials guidance).

- **TR-P4.2:** Require transportation infrastructure serving new development to be designed using best practices, contemplating existing and planned land uses, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, and connections to adjoining areas.
- **TR-P4.10:** Design roadway infrastructure, including traffic-calming and complete streets features, to accommodate emergency response vehicles while maintaining the safety of vulnerable road users.
- **TR-P5.4:** Ensure that fee programs include active transportation facilities, and require new development to contribute funds, right-of-way, and/or provide active transportation facilities themselves.
- **HS-P7.3:** Require new development within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA (as shown on Figure HS-10) or in areas that may be designated as the WUI, and on a residential parcel with evacuation constraints (as shown on Figure HS-21), to prepare a traffic control plan to ensure that construction equipment or activities do not block roadways or interfere with evacuation plans during the construction period. Work with the appropriate fire protection district to review and approve the traffic control plan prior to issuance of building permits.
- **HS-P7.4:** Require subdivisions in the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA and projects requiring a land use permit in the High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA, as shown in Figure HS-10 (see 2045 General Plan), to complete a site-specific fire protection plan. Work with the appropriate fire protection district to review and revise the fire protection plans. The fire protection plan shall include measures for fire-resistant construction materials and modifying fuel loading, as well as a plan to maintain that protection over time. The fire protection plan shall include:
 - a) A risk analysis
 - b) Fire response capabilities
 - c) Defensible space requirements
 - d) Fire safety requirements for infrastructure
 - e) Building ignition resistance
 - f) Mitigation measures and design for non-conforming fuel modification
 - g) Wildfire education

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- h) Maintenance and limitations
- i) A plan for emergency preparedness, response, and evacuation

TRANSPORTATION CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to transportation.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XVIII Tribal Cultural Resources

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (pages 5.5-16 through 5.5-18)	MM TCR-1 MM TCR-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or ii) 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 § 5024.1. In									

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.									

DISCUSSION – TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.5-1 to 5.5-7 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of tribal cultural resources, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, and local regulations affecting these resources and is geographically limited to cultural resources in the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all known tribal cultural resources and all areas containing undiscovered tribal cultural resources within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to tribal cultural resources.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that development under the 2045 General Plan could adversely affect tribal cultural resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, which were developed in consultation with local tribes during the process of drafting the 2045 General Plan and GPEIR, would require applicable projects to enter into a cultural resources treatment agreement with culturally affiliated tribes (TCR-1) in addition to allowing tribal monitoring during construction activities (TCR-2). Compliance with these measures would reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR incorporated two mitigation measures to ensure that tribal cultural resources are handled and treated in accordance with the standards of culturally affiliated tribes and reduce impacts to less than significant. These include TCR-1, which may require project applicants to

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

enter into a cultural resources treatment agreement with culturally affiliated tribes to protect resources, and TRC-2, which requires project applicants to allow tribal monitors to monitor all grading, excavation, and ground-breaking activities. These mitigation measures reduce impacts to less than significant. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to tribal and cultural resources are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to tribal and cultural resources that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to tribal and cultural resources requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to tribal and cultural resources. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following mitigation measures and 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts related to tribal cultural resources associated with the 2045 General Plan. As explained above, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe impacts when compared to those analyzed in the GPEIR and therefore no new mitigation measures or revisions to existing mitigation measures would be required.

- TCR-1 Prior to initiation of construction activities for discretionary projects that are not exempt from CEQA and would involve ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed sites, or as otherwise directed by the County, the project applicant may be required to enter into a cultural resources treatment agreement with the culturally affiliated tribe. If required, the agreement would address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources and human remains that may be impacted as a result of the development as well as provisions for tribal monitors. If an agreement is required, the applicant must provide a copy of the cultural resources treatment agreement to the County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. Regardless of whether an agreement is required, if cultural resources are discovered during project construction, all work in the area shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the culturally affiliated tribe shall be retained by

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

the project sponsor to investigate the find and make recommendations as to treatment and mitigation.

TCR-2 Tribal monitors from the culturally affiliated tribe shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation, and ground-breaking activities, including archaeological surveys, testing, and studies for discretionary projects that are not exempt from CEQA and that would involve ground-disturbing activities on previously undisturbed sites, or as otherwise directed by the County.

- **COS-P10.11:** Partner with other agencies, culturally affiliated tribes, private entities, and nonprofit organizations to establish programs and funding mechanisms to preserve, restore, and enhance cultural, historic, and archaeological sites.
- **COS-P11.1:** Respect and protect tribal cultural resources, including historic, cultural, and sacred sites; cultural landscapes; views of or access to resources; and objects with cultural value to California Native American tribes.
- **COS-P11.2:** Establish and maintain collaborative relationships with local Native American tribal representatives to facilitate tribal consultation and preservation of tribal cultural resources.
- **COS-P11.3:** Consult with culturally affiliated tribes on General Plan and Specific Plan amendments with potential to impact tribal cultural resources. If an amendment redesignates a tribal cultural resource site on private land for open space purposes, evaluate the appropriateness of developing a treatment and management plan for tribal cultural resources in the affected area.
- **COS-P11.4:** Consult with culturally affiliated tribes to identify and appropriately address tribal cultural resources through the discretionary development review process.
- **COS-P11.5:** Consult with culturally affiliated tribes to assess the sensitivity of sites and protect recorded and unrecorded tribal cultural resources.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to tribal cultural resources.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XIX Utilities and Service Systems

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of Applicable Sections of GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives ?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XIX.Utilities and Service Systems									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
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 telecommunications facilities, the	Impact 5.17-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.17-12 through 5.17-14) Impact 5.17-2: Less than Significant (pages 5.17-31 through 5.17-33) Impact 5.17-4:	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant (pages 5.17-47 through 5.17-49) Impact 5.17-7: Less than Significant (page 5.17-69)								
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Impact 5.17-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.17-34 through 5.17-35)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
c) Result in a determination by the waste water	Impact 5.17-1: Less than Significant	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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?	(pages 5.17-12 through 5.17-14)								
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	Impact 5.17-5: Less than Significant (pages 5.17-62 through 5.17-64)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
of solid waste reduction goals?									
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Impact 5.17-6: Less than Significant (page 5.17-64)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Section 5.17 of the GPEIR provides the environmental setting specific to the analysis of utilities and service systems, including regulatory background and existing conditions. This section is organized differently from the other sections in the Chapter 5 of the GPEIR and the description of the environmental setting is found throughout. The environmental setting includes state, regional, and local regulations affecting utilities and service systems and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses the service areas of the various utility and service system providers (water districts, sewer districts, etc.) within the unincorporated county. Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to public services.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that the growth anticipated under the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario would increase demand for utilities and service systems. However, the projected demands for water, electricity, and natural gas, and increased generation of wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste would not exceed the existing or future projected capacities or supplies of the respective service providers. Therefore, no expansions or construction of new utility facilities that could cause additional environmental effects would occur. Impacts related to utilities and service systems were determined to be less than significant under the 2045 General Plan.

Impacts with respect to utilities and service systems are generally driven by increases in the population or workforce of service areas. The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that all impacts related to utilities and service systems would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures were adopted and no alternatives to reduce utility and service systems impacts were evaluated. Because the impacts of the proposed project are the same as those analyzed in the GPEIR, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to water supply and conveyance, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and telecommunications facilities are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to these topics that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts, and there is no new information related to these topics requiring new impact analysis or verification. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to utilities and service systems. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES /RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to utilities and service systems. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Sections 5.17.1.3, 5.17.2.3, 5.17.3.3, 5.17.4.3, and 5.17.5.3, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **LU-P5.1:** Allow development only where requisite community services, facilities, and infrastructure can be provided.
- **COS-P7.2:** Consult applicable GSPs and local GSAs before making land use decisions that could impact groundwater resources.
- **COS-P7.3:** For projects in areas with a water service provider, require proof of adequate on-site groundwater during the development review process. In addition to requiring compliance with the County's well regulations related to water quality and flow rate, require documentation that the proposed project will not have a significant cumulative impact on the aquifer or negatively affect development that already relies on the same groundwater supply.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **COS-P7.4:** Prohibit new development that would create or significantly aggravate groundwater overdraft conditions, land subsidence, or other “undesirable results,” as defined in Section 354.26 of the California Water Code.
- **COS-P7.7:** Require landscaping for new development to filter and retain runoff, and support flood management, and groundwater recharge.
- **COS-A7.2:** For areas that are not covered by an adopted GSP, amend the County Ordinance Code to include sustainability indicators, defined by the SGMA, as a guide for development to maintain and protect the quality and quantity of groundwater supplies within the county.
- **PFS-P1.4:** Encourage, and whenever possible require, co-location and undergrounding of new utility infrastructure, such as transmission and distribution lines, fiber-optic cables, and pipelines, in existing rights-of-way to minimize visual, operational, and environmental impacts on the community.
- **PFS-A2.6:** Pursue public-private partnerships that improve access to reliable, fast, and affordable internet in Impacted Communities.
- **PFS-P3.1:** Coordinate LAFCO, infrastructure and service providers, and cities to ensure infrastructure and services are reliable and provided in a cost-effective and equitable manner.
- **PFS-P3.2:** Require new development to pay its fair share of public improvement costs for infrastructure, facilities, maintenance, and services based on the proportionate cost of serving the project.
- **PFS-P3.3:** When new development cannot adequately be served by existing infrastructure and facilities or through the County’s impact fee programs, require a public facilities financing plan that identifies the necessary public improvements and establishes an equitable plan to pay for and develop the required improvements.
- **PFS-P3.4:** When communities request levels of County services that exceed the countywide standard, require creation of (or annexation into) a County Service Area, community facilities district, or equivalent mechanism to fund the supplemental service costs. Allow exceptions for enhanced services in Impacted Communities if alternative funding sources can be identified.
- **PFS-P3.5:** When new development needs ongoing infrastructure maintenance that exceeds County standards or existing funding levels, require creation of or annexation to a County service area, community facilities district, benefit assessment district, or other special funding unit to pay for those maintenance activities.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **PFS-A3.2:** Regularly update development impact fees to ensure new development pays its fair share of infrastructure.
- **PFS-P4.5:** Require new development to demonstrate the availability of a safe, sanitary, and environmentally sound water delivery system with adequate capacity.
- **PFS-P5.7:** When developing new or revised regional drainage and flood management plans, including plans to protect against sea-level rise, incorporate adequate setbacks and alternative drainage system improvements that provide aesthetic, recreational, and environmental benefits. Improvements should avoid structural modifications to watercourses and preserve riparian habitat and floodplains, and convert engineered drainage systems to more natural systems, when and where possible. In areas at risk of temporary or permanent inundation from sea-level rise, ensure that improvements can continue to provide adequate protection for the projected level of inundation by 2100 or the expected operational life of the project, whichever is later.
- **PFS-P5.8:** Incorporate green infrastructure into new and retrofitted flood-control and streetscaping projects, including replacing existing asphalt and other hardscapes with green infrastructure, as feasible.
- **PFS-A5.3:** Develop watershed management plans incorporating best management practices that slow, spread, and sink water runoff to flatten the hydrograph (i.e., water flow over time) where erosion is a concern, while also enhancing wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities where feasible.
- **PFS-P7.4:** Ensure that new development complies with the requirements of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan.
- **PFS-P7.5:** Require new residential and commercial uses to provide adequate space for trash, recycling, and organics collection, as well as edible food recovery when applicable.
- **PFS-P7.13:** Extend the life of landfills by continually striving to:
 - (a) Reduce the amount of solid waste generated.
 - (b) Reuse and recycle as much solid waste as possible.
 - (c) Utilize the energy and nutrient value of soil waste (i.e., waste to energy and composting).
 - (d) Properly dispose of remaining soil waste.
- **PFS-P7.15:** Ensure transfer stations provide adequate capacity to accommodate recovery of recyclables and organic materials and encourage organics processing.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- **PFS-P7.16:** Include a condition of approval in land use permits for solid waste facilities requiring review for compliance with permit conditions every three to five years.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to utilities and service systems.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

XX Wildfire

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
Environmental Issue	Conclusion of the GPEIR	Applicable GPEIR Mitigation Measures	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Setting?	Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Impacts?	For Significant Impacts, Does the GPEIR Adequately Describe Alternatives?	For Significant Impacts, Does GPEIR Adequately Describe Mitigations?	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	Are There New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	Is There New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
XX. Wildfire									
<i>Would the project:</i>									
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Impact 5.18-1: Less than Significant (pages 5.18-26 through 5.18-27)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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	Impact 5.18-2: Significant and Unavoidable (pages 5.18-27 through 5.18-30)	No feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
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?	Impact 5.18-3: Less than Significant (pages 5.18-30 through 5.18-31)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
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	Impact 5.18-4: Less than Significant (pages 5.18-31 through 5.18-33)	No mitigation measures required.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

			CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 - Can an EIR From an Earlier Project be Used?				CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 - Is a Subsequent EIR Needed?		
drainage changes?									

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

DISCUSSION – WILDFIRE

Section 15153 Analysis:

Environmental Setting

Pages 5.18-1 to 5.18-20 of the GPEIR provide the environmental setting specific to the analysis of wildfire hazards, including regulatory background and existing conditions. The environmental setting includes federal, state, and local regulations and is geographically limited to the unincorporated county. The proposed project is occurring in substantially the same regulatory and geographic/physical environment as was analyzed for the 2045 General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project encompasses all land in the unincorporated county, including areas within High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or the Wildland-Urban Interface, as mapped and defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Therefore, the GPEIR adequately describes the environmental setting for the proposed project with respect to wildfire.

Impacts

The GPEIR concluded that impacts with respect to impairment of an emergency response or evacuation plan, risks exacerbated by installation or maintenance of infrastructure, and exposure of people or structures to downslope flooding and landslides as a result of post-fire conditions, would be less than significant. Each of these impacts would be reduced through compliance with existing regulatory measures and 2045 General Plan policies which help to ensure, to the extent feasible, that development under the 2045 General Plan does not result in these conditions. Impacts related to wildfire exposure were determined to be significant and unavoidable because communities already exist in areas subject to high fire danger and the County cannot completely prohibit development in at-risk areas.

The proposed project does not change any land use designations or authorize any new development. The proposed project facilitates implementation of the 2045 General Plan as intended, through continuation of the 65/35 Plan and ULL, and does not change the development capacity/projection described in Section 1.1.2, *General Plan EIR*, above. Nor does the proposed project modify the 2045 General Plan policies that will regulate, and in some cases mitigated impacts from, the projected future development under the 2045 General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario utilized in the 2045 GPEIR. Development would continue to comply with existing regulations including the 2045 General Plan policies and County Ordinance Code provisions. For these reasons, the GPEIR adequately describes the potential impacts of the proposed project.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

The GPEIR concluded that no feasible alternatives or mitigation measures (beyond compliance with existing regulations) are available to mitigate impacts associated with wildfire exposure to less than significant. As explained below, several policies and actions in the 2045 General Plan help to reduce impacts. The proposed project would result in the same impacts with respect to wildfires as analyzed in the GPEIR. Therefore, no new mitigation measures or alternatives are required.

Section 15162 Analysis:

The impacts of the proposed project with respect to wildfire are the same as those evaluated in the GPEIR. Since the proposed project does not change the 2045 General Plan Development Scenario, it does not involve new impacts related to wildfire that were not considered in the GPEIR. There are no new circumstances involving new impacts. There would be no new impacts and no increase in the significance of impacts related to wildfire. The proposed project would not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162 that would warrant preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. From May through July 2025, fire protection districts in the county adopted new Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps for the Local Responsibility Area (LRA), as recommended by CAL FIRE. While the maps themselves constitute new information, the County has verified that this information does not result in any circumstances outlined in Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) and a new impact analysis is not required.

The recently adopted LRA maps changed the fire hazard severity designation for parcels across the unincorporated county. The GPEIR analyzed wildfire hazards at a programmatic level and the analysis continues to be valid. The GPEIR concluded that development authorized by the 2045 General Plan within a Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI), or High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the State Responsibility Area (SRA) or LRA, would be at risk from wildfire hazards and this constitutes a significant and unavoidable impact. Areas with these designations were not quantified and the severity of the impact is not tied to the acreage with these designations. Similar to flood hazard zones or earthquake fault zones, wildfire impacts are considered inherent to the designated areas and development within these areas is presumed to be at risk.

It was widely known in November 2024 when the GPEIR was certified and the 2045 General Plan was adopted that CAL FIRE was preparing new LRA maps. Anticipating adoption of the LRA maps relatively soon after the General Plan was adopted and recognizing the County has little to no control over where and how the WUI, SRA, and LRA are designated, the 2045 General Plan policies and actions that mitigate wildfire impacts were written to apply wherever and whenever the WUI, SRA, and LRA are designated. As intended, adoption of the new Fire Hazard Severity Zone boundaries automatically applied those policies and actions to areas of high or very high wildfire risk to mitigate the impact to the extent feasible. Adoption of the new Fire

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

Hazard Severity Zones therefore did not result in new or more severe impacts than those analyzed in the GPEIR, nor did it affect the feasibility of mitigation measures or alternatives.

MITIGATION MEASURES/RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following 2045 General Plan policies and actions would reduce impacts with respect to wildfire. A full list of relevant policies and actions are included in Section 5.18.3.1, *Proposed General Plan Goals, Policies and Actions*, of the GPEIR.

- **HS-P4.2:** Discourage new below-market-rate housing in High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, the Wildland-Urban Interface, and Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones. If below-market-rate housing must be constructed within these zones, require it to be hardened or make use of nature-based solutions to ensure it remains habitable to the greatest extent possible.
- **HS-P7.1:** Deny applications for subdivisions creating additional residential lots in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Discourage such subdivisions in High Fire Hazard Severity Zones unless adequate fire protection services are provided.
- **HS-P7.2:** Require any construction of buildings or infrastructure within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA, as shown on Figure HS-10, or in areas that may be designated as the WUI to incorporate fire-safe design features that meet the State Fire Safe Regulations and Fire Hazard Reduction Around Buildings and Structures Regulation for road ingress and egress, fire equipment access, and adequate water supply.
- **HS-P7.3:** Require new development within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA (as shown on Figure HS-10) or in areas that may be designated as the WUI, and on a residential parcel with evacuation constraints (as shown on Figure HS-21), to prepare a traffic control plan to ensure that construction equipment or activities do not block roadways or interfere with evacuation plans during the construction period. Work with the appropriate fire protection district to review and approve the traffic control plan prior to issuance of building permits.
- **HS-P7.4:** Require subdivisions in the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA and projects requiring a land use permit in the High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the LRA or SRA, as shown in Figure HS-10, to complete a site-specific fire protection plan. Work with the appropriate fire protection district to review and revise the fire protection plans. The fire protection plan shall include measures for fire-resistant construction materials and modifying fuel loading, as well as a plan to maintain that protection over time. The fire protection plan shall include:
 - a) A risk analysis

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

- b) Fire response capabilities
 - c) Defensible space requirements
 - d) Fire safety requirements for infrastructure
 - e) Building ignition resistance
 - f) Mitigation measures and design for non-conforming fuel modification
 - g) Wildfire education
 - h) Maintenance and limitations
 - i) A plan for emergency preparedness, response, and evacuation
- **HS-P7.9:** Construct critical facilities, such as Office of Emergency Services facilities and other uses on the County's designated critical facilities list, with fire-resistant materials, defensible space, and fire-resistant landscaping that allows them to maintain structural integrity and ensure functional operation to the greatest extent feasible. Avoid locating these facilities in high fire risk areas to the extent possible.
 - **HS-P13.1:** Except for infill sites, require new development in High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, the WUI, and 100-year or 200-year floodplains to have access to at least two emergency evacuation routes, and encourage the same for existing development.
 - **HS-A13.2:** At least once every five years, update maps identifying neighborhoods with only one emergency evacuation route.
 - **HS-A13.3:** Coordinate with local fire districts to develop and maintain minimum roadway, ingress, and egress standards for evacuation of residential areas in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

WILDFIRE CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation above, the County has determined that the criteria under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15153 and 15162 are satisfied and the GPEIR analysis is adequate for the proposed project with respect to wildfire.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & ANALYSIS

This page intentionally left blank.

4. LIST OF PREPARERS

LEAD AGENCY

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development

PLACEWORKS

Mark Teague, Principal

Lexie Zimny, Associate

Jessica Mendoza, Project Planner

4. LIST OF PREPARERS

This page is intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT A

2026 ULL Renewal Ballot Measure

ATTACHMENTS

This page is intentionally left blank.

**FULL TEXT OF
MEASURE ##**

2026 VOTER-APPROVED
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
URBAN LIMIT LINE

SECTION 1. TITLE

This measure shall be titled the **2026 Voter-Approved Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line**.

SECTION 2. SUMMARY

This measure amends the Land Use Element of the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan and the 65/35 Contra Costa Land Preservation Ordinance in the following ways: (1) It extends the term of the current 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance, which establishes a countywide Urban Limit Line, from December 31, 2026, to December 31, 2051. (2) It provides that, through December 31, 2051, the General Plan cannot be amended to expand the Urban Limit Line by more than 30 acres without a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors and approval of the voters, except under limited circumstances. (3) It provides for review of the Urban Limit Line concurrently with General Plan Housing Element update cycles. (4) It updates and expands the criteria and considerations for moving land outside the Urban Limit Line. (5) It incorporates a revised Urban Limit Line map that reflects non-substantive expansions and contractions of the Urban Limit Line at various locations across the County and delineates the area of potential future expansion in the vicinity of Byron Airport. (6) Finally, the measure retains the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard and protections for the County's prime agricultural land.

SECTION 3. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND FINDINGS

The voters approve this measure based on the following facts and considerations:

- A. In November 1990 the voters approved Measure C-1990, the 65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Plan Ordinance (Chapter 82-1 of the County Ordinance Code), which limited urban development in Contra Costa County to no more than 35 percent of the land in the county and required that at least 65 percent of all land in the County would be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks, and other non-urban uses. Measure C-1990 also established a countywide Urban Limit Line a regulatory boundary beyond which no urban land use could be designated during the term of the County's 1990-2010 General Plan.
- B. In November 2006 the voters approved Measure L-2006, which extended the term of the 65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Plan Ordinance and Urban Limit Line, established different procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, provided for periodic reviews of the Urban Limit Line boundary, and revised the Urban Limit Line map.
- C. County Ordinance Code Section 82-1.028 currently provides that the 65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Plan Ordinance and Urban Limit Line will remain in effect until December 31, 2026. This measure would extend the duration of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan (which includes the Urban Limit Line) through December 31, 2051, thus extending the protection to the County's non-urban and open space areas for an additional 25 years. Because the factors contributing to the need to adopt the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan still exist, it is appropriate to extend these protections through the year 2051.
- D. The procedure by which the Urban Limit Line may be changed, either by the Board of Supervisors or by action of the voters, is described at pages 4-13 to 4-14, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, and in Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Section 82-1.018. To provide additional protection to the County's non-urban and open space areas, this measure would maintain the requirement that, through December 31, 2051, the General Plan cannot be amended

to expand the Urban Limit Line by more than 30 acres without a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors and approval of the voters except under limited circumstances. Among these limited circumstances, the Board of Supervisors, without subsequent voter approval, may expand the Urban Limit Line by more than 30 acres within a defined area in the vicinity of Byron Airport by a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors after a public hearing and after making required findings.

- E. This measure would provide for a Board of Supervisors review of the Urban Limit Line concurrent with each State-mandated General Plan Housing Element update cycle to determine whether sufficient land remains available inside the Urban Limit Line to satisfy housing needs for unincorporated Contra Costa County. Because housing needs and State-mandated housing requirements may change over the years, it is appropriate to provide for periodic review concurrent with the General Plan Housing Element update to determine whether expansion of the Urban Limit Line should be considered to meet the changing needs of the County.

SECTION 4. IMPLEMENTATION

To implement this measure, the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan and Chapter 82-1 (65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance) of the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, are amended as described below.

A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

1. CHANGES TO GENERAL PLAN URBAN LIMIT LINE MAP

At page 4-12, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, Figure LU-2 Urban Limit Line is hereby amended, as shown on Figure One: Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line Map, which is attached to this measure. Figure LU-2 will be titled "Urban Limit Line" and be adopted to show the boundary of the Urban Limit Line, as approved by this measure. Other figures in the 2045 General Plan depicting all or portions of the Urban Limit Line are hereby amended to be consistent with Figure LU-2 to maintain internal consistency throughout the 2045 General Plan.

2. CHANGES TO GENERAL PLAN TEXT

Text shown in bold italics and underline **[example]** is added to the existing General Plan text while text in strikethrough font ~~[example]~~ is deleted from the existing text. Text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure.

At page 4-4, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, text in the section titled "Balanced Development and Conservation," is amended as follows:

Contra Costa County was an early implementer of smart growth and compact development principles, embodied in the 65/35 Land Preservation **Plan, which contains the 65/35 Land Preservation** Standard (65/35 Standard) and Urban Limit Line (ULL). These land use controls, which are integral to long-range planning in the county, were established by voter approval of Measure C-1990 and their necessity was reaffirmed through voter approval of Measure L-2006 **and Measure ##-2026**.

At page 4-4, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, text in the section titled "65/35 Land Preservation Standard," is amended as follows:

One of two fundamental components of Measures C-1990, ~~and~~ L-2006, **and ##-2026** is the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard, which limits the footprint of urban development by restricting urban land use designations to no more than 35 percent of the land in the county and requiring at least 65 percent of the land to be designated for non-urban uses. Table LU-2 indicates which County land use designations are urban and non-

urban. The 65/35 Standard does not regulate land use intensity. ~~All urban land use designations count equally against the~~ The 35 percent limit **applies equally to all urban land use designations** regardless of how, or even if, **the designated** land they are applied to is developed. Similarly, all non-urban land use designations count equally toward the 65 percent limit **requirement** regardless of development **whether the land is developed**. The 65/35 Standard ~~operates~~ **is determined** on a countywide basis, accounting for urban and non-urban designations within the 19 cities as well as the unincorporated county. As of ~~2024~~ **2026**, approximately 28 percent of the land countywide has been designated for urban uses.

At page 4-11, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, text in the section titled "Urban Limit Line," is amended as follows:

The ULL, shown in Figure LU-2, is the second fundamental component of Measures C-1990, ~~and L-2006,~~ **and ##-2026**. It prevents sprawl by establishing a boundary beyond which no urban land uses can be designated. The ULL and 65/35 Standard together ensure that urban development occurs within established communities where infrastructure and services already exist or are planned.

In addition to Measures C-1990, ~~and L-2006,~~ **and ##-2026**, the voter-approved Measure J-2004 Growth Management Program administered by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority requires the County and each city in the county to adopt a voter-approved ULL or equivalent. Sixteen of the 19 cities adopted the County's 2006 voter-approved ULL as their own. Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon adopted their own voter-approved ULLs (~~known~~ **referred to** as the Urban Growth Boundary [UGB] in San Ramon). The County and cities are solely responsible for administering their respective ULLs/UGBs, which together contain approximately 47 percent of the total land area within Contra Costa County. Because the 65/35 Standard limits urban land use designations to no more than 35 percent of the county's total land area, the County and cities must work cooperatively to ensure that over 60,000 acres within the ULLs/UGBs remain under non-urban land use designations. Fortunately, a significant portion of this acreage already is permanently protected as local parks, regional parks and open spaces, reservoirs, and other public facilities. Examples of protected lands within the ULLs/UGBs include several regional parks within Richmond's city limits (4,000 acres), Lafayette Reservoir and its surrounding recreation area (900 acres), Thurgood Marshall Regional Park (2,500 acres), Lime Ridge Open Space (1,200 acres), and Big Break Regional Shoreline (1,600 acres).

At page 4-13, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, text in the section titled "Urban Limit Line," is amended as follows:

The County considered several criteria and factors when establishing the initial ULL location in 1990 **and new considerations have emerged**. Factors ~~which~~ **that** contributed to properties being located outside the ULL **in 2026** included:

- ~~Lands which qualifies~~ **that qualify** for rating as Class I ~~and or~~ Class II in the National Resource Conservation System (NRCS) Land Use Capability Classification.
- **Lands designated as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones on maps published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.**
- Lands with slopes of 26 percent or greater.
- **Lands at risk of substantial inundation from flooding or anticipated sea level rise.**

- **Lands with recorded development restrictions, including but not limited to agricultural, conservation, or scenic easements, or deeded development rights.**
- Wetlands **and undevelopable islands.**
- Major open space, park, and recreational areas.
- **Areas with inadequate water, sewer, and roadway infrastructure.**
- Other areas not appropriate for urban growth because of physical unsuitability for development **separation from existing development**, unstable geological conditions, inadequate water availability, lack of appropriate infrastructure, distance from existing development, likelihood of substantial **significant** environmental damage or substantial injury to fish, or wildlife, or their habitat, and other similar factors **rendering the land physically unsuitable for intense development.**

At pages 4-13 and 4-14, Land Use Element, Contra Costa County 2045, text in the section titled "Changes to the Urban Limit Line" is amended as follows:

The following text is from Measure L-2006 ~~##-2026~~, which requires **inserted** specific language ~~to be included in into~~ the Land Use Element and is why the 2016 ULL review conducted by the Board of Supervisors is discussed in future tense:

There shall be no change to the ULL that would violate the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard. **The County processes changes to the ULL, both expansions and contractions, as General Plan amendments.** ~~There will be no change~~ **Changes** to the ULL except **may occur only** in the manner specified herein.

(a) Expansions. ~~There will be no change to expansion of~~ the ULL unless the Board of Supervisors first holds a public hearing at which it approves **adopts** the change or changes **General Plan amendment for the expansion** by a four-fifths vote **of the Board**, after **holding a public hearing** and making one or more of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- (1) ~~A natural or man-made disaster or public emergency has occurred which warrants the~~ **that necessitates the** provision of housing and/or other community needs within **assets on** land located outside the ULL.
- (2) An objective study has determined **demonstrated** that the ULL is preventing the County from providing **identifying adequate sites to meet** its fair share of affordable housing or **Regional Housing Needs Allocation** as required by State law, and the Board of Supervisors finds that a change to **an expansion of** the ULL is necessary and the only feasible means to enable the County to meet these requirements of State law.
- (3) ~~A majority of the cities that~~ **The County and at least one city** are party **parties** to a preservation agreement and the County have approved a change to the ULL affecting all or any portion of the land **that (i) affirms the parties' growth boundaries in the areas** covered by the preservation agreement **and affected by the ULL expansion, and (ii) provides that all parties support the ULL expansion.**
- (4) A minor change to the ULL **expansion** will more accurately reflect

topographical characteristics or align with legal boundaries.

~~(5) An objective study has determined that a change to the ULL is necessary or desirable to further the economic viability of the east Contra Costa County Airport, and either (i) mitigate adverse aviation related to environmental or community impacts attributable to Buchanan Field, or (ii) further the County's aviation related needs.~~

(5) A ULL expansion is required to conform to applicable California State or federal law.

~~(6) A five (5) year cyclical review of the ULL has determined, based on criteria and factors for establishing the ULL set forth above, that nNew information is has become available (from city or County growth management studies or otherwise) or circumstances have changed, warranting a change to an expansion of the ULL.~~

(7) The expansion occurs only within the boundaries of the Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area illustrated on General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, and the Board of Supervisors makes each of the additional following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

(i) The expansion is necessary to further the economic viability of Byron Airport and attain the County's goals related to economic development.

(ii) The expanded ULL area will accommodate uses directly linked to aeronautics, such as aviation research and development, aircraft manufacturing/assembly, and aeronautical schools/training facilities.

(iii) The expanded ULL area will not accommodate residential development, logistics/distribution centers, lodging, or any other use not directly linked to aeronautics except for minor ancillary uses necessary to support the airport workforce.

(iv) The expansion will not induce sprawl.

A **Any** General Plan amendment that would expand the ULL by more than 30 acres ~~shall require~~ voter approval of the proposed General Plan amendment, following the ~~a~~ public hearing and the ~~a~~ four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors ~~approving~~ **adopting** the General Plan amendment ~~after~~ **and** making one or more of the findings set forth in subsections (a)~~(1)~~ through ~~(g)~~**(a)(6)** above. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a proposed General Plan amendment to expand the ULL by more than 30 acres does not require voter approval if, after a public hearing, the Board of Supervisors by a four-fifths vote ~~approves~~ **adopts** the General Plan amendment and makes ~~either~~ **one or more** of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record: (i) the expansion of the ULL is necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of private property; ~~or~~ (ii) the expansion of the ULL is necessary to comply with State or federal law; **or (iii) the expansion occurs only within the boundaries of the Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area illustrated on General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, and the Board of Supervisors has made each of the required findings set forth in subsection (a)(7) above.** Expansions of the ULL totaling 30 acres or less do not require voter approval.

(b) Contractions. There will be no contraction of the ULL unless the Board of Supervisors adopts the General Plan amendment for the contraction by a four-fifths vote of the Board, after holding a public hearing and making one or more of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- (1) The contraction will more accurately reflect topographical characteristics, areas at high risk from natural hazards, or an area's conservation status.**
- (2) The contraction will more accurately align with legal boundaries.**
- (3) The contraction is necessary to implement the terms of a preservation agreement to which the County is a party.**
- (4) The contraction will limit urban sprawl or protect natural resources.**
- (5) The contraction is necessary to comply with applicable State or federal law.**
- (6) New information has become available or circumstances have changed, warranting a contraction of the ULL.**

The Board of Supervisors may adopt a General Plan amendment contracting the ULL by any acreage through the process described above.

The Board of Supervisors may conduct a cyclical review of the ULL every five years.

(c) ULL Boundary Review. The Board of Supervisors will review the boundary of the ULL in the year 2016 **concurrently with each State-mandated General Plan Housing Element update cycle.** The purpose of the year 2016 **these** reviews is to determine whether a change to **expanding** the boundary of the County's Urban Limit Line Map **ULL** is warranted, based on facts and circumstances resulting from the County's participation with the cities in a comprehensive review of the availability of land in Contra Costa County sufficient to satisfy housing and jobs needs for 20 years thereafter **necessary to enable the County to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation.** This **These** reviews of the ULL is **are** in addition to any other **ULL** reviews of the ULL **that** the Board of Supervisors may conduct **deem necessary.**

Any change to the ULL proposed as a result of any review authorized by this section must be adopted pursuant to the procedures set forth in this section. These provisions are effective until **through** December 31, 2026 **2051.**

B. ORDINANCE CODE CHANGES

1. To be consistent with the amendments to the General Plan that change the boundary of the Urban Limit Line, the People of the County of Contra Costa hereby enact Ordinance No. 2026-01 as follows:

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Ordinance No. 2026-01

Section 1. Title. This ordinance shall be titled the "2026 Voter-Approved Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line."

Section 2. Summary. This ordinance amends Chapter 82-1 of the County Ordinance Code to extend the term of the County's Urban Limit Line through the year 2051, establish updated procedures for reviewing and adjusting the boundaries of the Urban Limit Line, and retain the prohibition on expanding the line by more than 30 acres without voter approval except as specifically provided.

Section 3. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.002 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline example, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.002 ~~**RESERVED**~~ ~~New General Plan. The county shall adopt a new general plan by December 31, 1990 (the "new general plan") or as soon thereafter as possible, in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.~~

Section 4. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.004 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline example, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.004 - 65/35 Land Preservation Plan. The policies contained in this chapter shall be reflected in the ~~new~~ general plan, as ~~ultimately~~ adopted and periodically amended by the board of supervisors in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and State Planning Law.

(Ords. 2026-01 § 4, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 5. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.006 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline example, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.006 - 65/35 Land Preservation Standard. Urban development in the county shall be limited to no more than ~~thirty-five~~ 35 percent of the land in the county. At least ~~sixty-five~~ 65 percent of all land in the county shall be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks, and other non-urban uses.

(Ords. 2026-01 § 5, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 6. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.008 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline example, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.008 - Changes to the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan. No change shall be made in the ~~new~~ general plan ~~after its adoption~~ that would result in greater than ~~thirty-five~~ 35 percent of the land in the county being permitted for urban development. This limitation shall not prevent any increase in agriculture, open space, parks, wetlands or other non-urban uses to greater than ~~sixty-five~~ 65 percent of the land in the county.

(Ords. 2026-01 § 6, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 7. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.010 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline example, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.010 - Urban Limit Line. To ensure the enforcement of **enforce** the 65/35 standard set forth in Section 82-1.006, ~~an~~ **the** urban limit line shall be **is** established, in approximately the location depicted on the "Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line Map" adopted by the voters on November 7, 2006 **June 2, 2026**. The urban limit line is incorporated into the county's open space conservation plan **Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element of the County General Plan**. The urban limit line limits potential urban development in the county to ~~thirty-five~~ **no more than 35** percent of the land in the county and prohibits the county from designating any land located outside the urban limit line for an urban land use. The criteria and factors for determining whether land should be considered for location outside the urban limit line should include (a) lands ~~which qualifies~~ **that qualify** for rating as Class I ~~and~~ **or** Class II in the Soil **National Resource Conservation Service System** Land Use Capability Classification; (b) open space, parks and other recreation areas, **lands designated as High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones on maps published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection**; (c) lands with slopes in excess of twenty-six ~~26~~ percent **or greater**; (d) **lands at risk of substantial inundation from flooding or anticipated sea level rise**; (e) **lands with recorded development restrictions such as agricultural, conservation, or scenic easements, or deeded development rights**; (f) wetlands, and **undevelopable islands**; (g) **major open space, park, and recreational areas**; (h) **areas with inadequate water, sewer, and roadway infrastructure**; (i) other areas not appropriate for urban growth because of physical unsuitability for **separation from existing** development, unstable geological conditions, inadequate water availability, the lack of appropriate infrastructure, distance from existing development, likelihood of substantial **significant** environmental damage or substantial injury to fish, or wildlife, or their habitat, and other similar factors **rendering the land physically unsuitable for intense development**.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 7**, 2006-06 § 3, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 8. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.012 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example**, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.012 - Growth Management **Redesignation of Land within the Urban Limit Line**. In accordance with the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program adopted on August 3, 1988, the county shall manage growth by allowing new development only when infrastructure and service standards are met for traffic levels of service, water, sanitary sewer, fire protection, public protection, parks and recreation, flood control and drainage and other such services. Land **with a non-urban land use designation** located inside the urban limit line may be considered for changes in designated **to an urban** land uses **designation**, subject to county growth management **consistency with** policies **in the County General Plan** and any other applicable requirements. ~~Location of land~~ **Being located** within the urban limit line shall provide ~~no guarantee that the land may be developed. If land is developed within the urban limit line, a substantial portion of this land shall be retained for open space, parks and recreational uses.~~

(Ords. **2026-01 § 8**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 9. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.014 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example**, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.014 - Agricultural Protection Policies; Minimum Parcel Sizes. The county shall ~~establish~~ **maintain** standards and policies designed to protect the economic viability of agricultural land. These standards and policies shall include a minimum parcel size for prime productive agricultural land located outside the urban limit line ~~to forty~~ **of 40** acres. These standards and policies may also include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, preservation agreements, conservation easements, clustering, establishment of an agricultural soils trust fund, and agricultural mitigation fees.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 9**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 10. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.016 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example**, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.016 - Hillside Protection. Development on open hillsides and significant ridgelines throughout the county shall be restricted and hillsides with a grade of ~~twenty-six~~ **26** percent or greater shall be protected through implementing zoning measures and other appropriate actions.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 10**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 11. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.018 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example**, text in strikeout font ~~example~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.018 - Changes to the Urban Limit Line.

(a) There shall be no change to the urban limit line that **would** violate the 65/35 standard set forth in Section 82-1.006.

(b) Expansions. Except as otherwise provided in this section, as long as there is no violation of the 65/35 standard, the urban limit line can be ~~changed~~ **expanded** by a four-fifths vote of the board of supervisors after holding a public hearing and making one or more of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- (1) A ~~natural or manmade~~ disaster or public emergency has occurred which ~~warrants the~~ **necessitates** provision of housing ~~and/or~~ other community needs within **assets on** land located outside urban limit line;
- (2) An objective study has ~~determined~~ **demonstrated** that the urban limit line is preventing the county from providing **identifying adequate sites to meet** its ~~fair share of affordable housing, or~~ **Regional Housing Needs Allocation**, as required by ~~s~~State law, and the board of supervisors finds that ~~a change to~~ **an expansion** of the urban limit line is necessary and the only feasible means to enable the county to meet these requirements of state law;
- (3) A ~~majority of the cities that~~ **The County and at least one city** are ~~party~~ **parties** to a preservation agreement and the County have approved a ~~change to the ULL affecting all or any portion of the land~~ **that (i) affirms the parties' growth boundaries in the areas** covered by the preservation agreement **and affected by the ULL expansion, and (ii) provides that all parties support the ULL expansion.**

- (4) A minor change to the urban limit line **expansion** will more accurately reflect topographical characteristics or **align with** legal boundaries;.
- (5) A five-year cyclical review of the urban limit line has determined, based on the criteria and factors for establishing the urban limit line set forth in Section 82-1.010 above, that ~~a~~**New** information is **has become** available (from city or county growth management studies or otherwise) or circumstances have changed, warranting a change to **expansion of** the urban limit line;.
- (6) An objective study has determined that a change to the urban limit line is necessary or desirable to further the economic viability of the East Contra Costa County Airport, and either (i) mitigate adverse aviation-related environmental or community impacts attributable to Buchanan Field, or (ii) further the county's aviation related needs; or
- ~~(7)(6)~~ A change **An urban limit line expansion** is required to conform to applicable California **State** or federal law.
- (7) The expansion occurs only within the boundaries of the Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area illustrated on General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, and the Board of Supervisors makes each of the additional following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:**
- (i) The expansion is necessary to further the economic viability of Byron Airport and attain the County's goals related to economic development.**
- (ii) The expanded urban limit line area will accommodate uses directly linked to aeronautics, such as aviation research and development, aircraft manufacturing/assembly, and aeronautical schools/training facilities.**
- (iii) The expanded urban limit line area will not accommodate residential development, logistics/distribution centers, lodging, or any other use not directly linked to aeronautics except for minor ancillary uses necessary to support the airport workforce.**
- (iv) The expansion will not induce sprawl.**
- (c)** Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, any proposed general plan amendment that would expand the urban limit line by more than 30 acres ~~will require~~**s** voter approval of the proposed general plan amendment in addition to and following a four-fifths vote of the board of supervisors ~~approving~~**adopting** the general plan amendment and making one or more of the findings required by subsection ~~(a)(b)~~**(a)** above. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a proposed general plan amendment to expand the urban limit line by more than 30 acres does not require voter approval if, after a public hearing, the board of supervisors by a four-fifths vote makes either of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record: (i) the expansion of the urban limit line is necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of private property; ~~or~~ (ii) the expansion of the urban limit line is necessary to comply with State or federal law; **or (iii) the expansion occurs only within the boundaries of the Byron Airport Potential ULL Expansion Area illustrated on General Plan Land Use Element Figure LU-2, Urban Limit Line, and the Board of Supervisors has made each of the required findings set forth in subsection (b)(7) above.**

Proposed expansions of 30 acres or less do not require voter approval.

(d) Contractions. The urban limit line can be contracted by a four-fifths vote of the board of supervisors after holding a public hearing and making one or more of the following findings based on substantial evidence in the record:

- (1) The contraction will more accurately reflect topographical characteristics, areas at high risk from natural hazards, or an area's conservation status.**
- (2) The contraction will more accurately align with legal or regulatory boundaries.**
- (3) The contraction is necessary to implement the terms of a preservation agreement to which the county is a party.**
- (4) The contraction will limit urban sprawl or protect natural resources.**
- (5) The contraction is necessary to comply with applicable State or federal law.**
- (6) New information has become available or circumstances have changed, warranting a contraction of the urban limit line.**

The board of supervisors may adopt a General Plan amendment contracting the urban limit line by any acreage through the process described above.

- ~~(c)~~ The board of supervisors may conduct a cyclical review of the urban limit line every five years.
- ~~(d)~~ **(e)** The board of supervisors will review the boundary of the urban limit line in the year 2016 **concurrently with each State-mandated General Plan Housing Element update cycle.** The purpose of the year 2016 **these** reviews is to determine whether a change to **expanding** the boundary of the county's urban limit line map is warranted, based on facts and circumstances resulting from the county's participation with the cities in a comprehensive review of the availability of land in Contra Costa County sufficient to meet housing and jobs needs for 20 years **is necessary to allow the County to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation.** This **These** reviews of the urban limit line **are** in addition to any other urban limit line reviews of the urban limit line **that** the board of supervisors may conduct **deem necessary.**
- ~~(e)~~ **(f)** Any change to the urban limit line proposed as a result of any review authorized by this section will not be effective unless it is approved pursuant to the procedures set forth in this section.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 11,** 2006-06 § 4, 91-1 §2, 90-66 §4.)

Section 12. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.020 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **[example]** while text in strikeout font ~~[example]~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.020 - Annexations and Incorporations. The local agency formation commission ("LAFCO") shall be advised to (1) respect and support the county's 65/35 land preservation standard, **and** urban limit line ~~and growth management standards~~

when considering requests for incorporation or annexation to cities or service districts, (2) apply the ~~stricter of the~~ growth management standards of ~~either the county, the incorporating city or the annexing city or service district~~ when considering requests for incorporation or annexations of land to cities or service districts, and (3) require unincorporated land located within the urban limit line that is included in the incorporation of a new city or annexed to a city to provide a fair share of affordable housing when and if such land is developed.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 12**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 13. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.022 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example** while text in strikeout font [example] is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.022 - Housing. As required by the State Planning Act **Law**, the county general plan shall **be reviewed and updated** periodically ~~review and update the new~~ general plan to conform to **comply with** state housing requirements and to ensure it's **the county maintains** capacity to accommodate a variety of housing types and prices **affordability levels** throughout the county. In accordance with the provisions of Section 82-1.018, the board of supervisors may make findings of necessity that the urban limit line should be changed to allow the county to ~~meet~~ **provide** its fair share of affordable housing and **meet** other state housing requirements.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 13**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4)

Section 14. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.024 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example** while text in strikeout font [example] is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.024 - Cooperation with Cities **on Preservation**. To the extent feasible, the county shall enter into preservation agreements with cities in the county designed to preserve certain land in the county for agriculture, ~~and~~ open space, wetlands, ~~or~~ **and** parks.

(Ords. **2026-01 § 14**, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 15. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.026 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example** while text in strikeout font [example] is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.026 **RESERVED** ~~Application to Projects Prior to Adoption of New General Plan. From the effective date of Ordinance 90-66 to the adoption of the new general plan, prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion, or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the general plan, the county shall adopt findings as to whether or not the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the policies established in this chapter. (Ords. 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).~~

Section 16. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.028 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline **example** while text in strikeout font [example] is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.028 - Duration.

The provisions of this chapter shall be in effect until December 31, 2026 2051, to the extent permitted by law.

(Ords. 2026-01 § 16, 2006-06 § 5, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 17. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.030 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline [example] while text in strikeout font ~~[example]~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.030 - No Violation of Law by this Chapter.

- (a) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed or interpreted in such a manner as to operate to deprive any landowner of substantially all of the market value of the landowner's property or otherwise constitute an unconstitutional taking without compensation. If application of any of the provisions of this chapter to any specific project or landowner would create an unconstitutional taking, then the board of supervisors may allow additional land uses, otherwise adjust permit requirements or take such other actions to the extent necessary to avoid what otherwise might be construed to be a taking. Any such additional land uses or other adjustments shall be designed to carry out the goals and provisions of this chapter to the maximum extent feasible.
- (b) Nothing contained in this chapter shall constitute an amendment of the existing general plan. ~~Upon approval of this chapter by the voters, the county shall take all necessary and appropriate steps to reflect the policies of the 65/35 land preservation plan in the new general plan for the county, consistent with the requirements of CEQA and the State Planning Law.~~ Nothing contained herein shall prevent the county from complying with applicable requirements of state law relating to the adoption and amendment of general plans.

(Ord. No. 2026-01 § 17; 2024-23, § III (Exh. A), 12-3-24; Ords. 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

Section 18. Ordinance Code Section 82-1.032 is amended to read as follows (new text to be inserted is shown in bold italics and underline [example] while text in strikeout font ~~[example]~~ is deleted from the existing text and text in ordinary font is unchanged by this measure):

82-1.032 - Definitions.

- (a) As used in this chapter, the phrase "land within the county" shall mean all of the ~~acreage~~ territory within the boundaries of Contra Costa County, including water area, except the saltwater area of the county west of Stake Point.
- (b) As used in this chapter, the term "non-urban uses" shall mean ~~rural residential and agricultural structures allowed by applicable zoning and facilities for public purposes, whether privately or publicly funded or operated, which are necessary or desirable for the public health, safety or welfare or by state or federal law~~ uses allowed in the land use designations categorized as "non-urban" in the Land Use Element of the County General Plan.

(Ords. 2026-01 § 18, 91-1 § 2, 90-66 § 4).

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This measure shall become effective immediately upon approval by the voters. Upon the effective date,

Section 4.A.1 CHANGES TO GENERAL PLAN URBAN LIMIT LINE MAP and Section 4.A.2 CHANGES TO GENERAL PLAN TEXT of this measure are hereby inserted into the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, as one of the four consolidated General Plan amendments for calendar year 2026 allowed under State law. Upon the effective date, Ordinance No. 2026-01 is hereby enacted as a County ordinance, amending the County Ordinance Code.

SECTION 6. SEVERABILITY

If any portion of this measure is hereafter determined to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all remaining portions of this measure shall remain in full force and effect. Each section, subsection, sentence, phrase, part or portion of this measure would have been adopted and passed regardless of whether any one or more section, subsections, sentences, phrases, parts or portions was declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 7. AMENDMENT OR REPEAL

Except as otherwise provided herein, this measure may be amended or repealed only by the voters of Contra Costa County at a countywide election.