

**Department of
Conservation and
Development**

30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553

Phone: 1-855-323-2626

**Contra
Costa
County**



John Kopchik
Director

Jason Crapo
Deputy Director

Deidra Dingman
Deputy Director

Ruben Hernandez
Deputy Director

Gabriel Lemus
Assistant Deputy Director

April 21, 2025

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTENT TO ADOPT A
PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the "Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970" as amended to date, this is to advise you that the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division, has prepared an initial study evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the following project:

- 1. Project Title:** 6621 Johnston Road Second Residence Land Use Permit
- 2. County File Number:** CDLP23-02056
- 3. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
- 4. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Diana Lecca, Project Planner
(925) 655-2869
- 5. Project Location:** 6621 Johnston Road in the San Ramon area of unincorporated Contra Costa County (Assessor's Parcel Number. 204-120-015)
- 6. Applicant / Project Sponsor's Name, Address, and Phone Number:** Louis Miramontes
6621 Johnston Road
Pleasanton, CA 94588
(415)269-0610

7. Description of Project: The applicant requests approval of a land use permit to establish a second single-family residence on a 16.87-acre agricultural lot with an existing single-family residence and walnut orchard. The proposed 2,840 square-foot second residence will have an attached 536 square-foot garage and a new driveway from Johnston Road. The application includes a request for an exception from the collect and convey drainage requirements of Chapter 914-2.004 of the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code.

8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The project site is located in the San Ramon area of unincorporated Contra Costa County on the north side of Johnston Road, approximately 1.4 miles east of the intersection of Camino Tassajara and Johnston Road. Access to the site is from the southern property line off Johnston Road. The site is relatively flat and is bounded on the northwest side by a tributary of Tassajara Creek. The site is currently developed with a single-family residence and a walnut orchard, both of which will remain after the construction of the proposed new residence.

The site is located in a predominantly agricultural area east of Camino Tassajara. Lots in the surrounding area are primarily agricultural in nature. Some lots also include single-family residential development. A commercial equestrian facility is adjacent to the east. To the north, west and south, properties include some private residences and agricultural structures. The San Ramon city limit is located approximately 5 driving miles to the west, and the Alameda County boundary is approximately 4.75 driving miles to the south. This area is also a few miles east of the eastern boundaries of the Town of Danville and the Blackhawk community.

9. Determination: The County has determined that without mitigation the project may result in significant impacts to the environment. Therefore, pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15070, a Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study has been prepared which identifies mitigation measures to be incorporated into the project that will reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. Prior to adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the County will be accepting comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration/initial study during a 20-day public comment period.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study can be viewed online at the following link: [California Environmental Quality Act \(CEQA\) Notifications | Contra Costa County, CA Official Website](https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/ceqa-notifications) or upon request by contacting the project planner. Any documents referenced in the Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study can be provided upon request by contacting the project planner.

Public Comment Period – The period for accepting comments on the adequacy of the environmental document will extend to **5:00 PM, Monday, May 12, 2025**. Any comments should be submitted in writing to the following address:

Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Attn: Diana Lecca
30 Muir Road

Martinez, CA 94553

or via email to: diana.lecca@dcd.cccounty.us

The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and the proposed project will be considered at a meeting of the County Zoning Administrator. The hearing date before the County Zoning Administrator has not yet been scheduled. Hearing notices with instructions on how and/or where to attend the meeting will be sent out prior to the finalized hearing date.

Additional Information – For additional information on the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the proposed project, contact Diana Lecca by telephone at (925) 655-2869, or email at diana.lecca@dcd.cccounty.us

Sincerely,


Diana Lecca

Diana Lecca
Project Planner
Department of Conservation & Development

cc: County Clerk's Office (2 copies)

attachment: Project Vicinity

Vicinity Map



This map is a user generated, static output from an internet mapping application and is intended for reference use only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION. CCMAP is maintained by Contra Costa County Department of Information Technology, County GIS. Data layers contained within the CCMAP application are provided by various Contra Costa County Departments. Please direct all data inquires to the appropriate department.

Spatial Reference
PCS: WGS 1984 Web Mercator Auxiliary Sphere
Datum: WGS 1984

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project Title:** 6621 Johnston Road Second Residence Land Use Permit
County File CDLP23-02056
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Diana Lecca, Project Planner
(925) 655-2869
- 4. Project Location:** 6621 Johnston Road in the San Ramon area of unincorporated Contra Costa County (Assessor's Parcel Number. 204-120-015)
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Louis Miramontes
6621 Johnston Road
Pleasanton, CA 94588
- 6. General Plan Designation:** AL, Agricultural Lands
- 7. Zoning:** A-20, Exclusive Agricultural District
- 8. Description of Project:** The applicant requests approval of a land use permit to establish a second single-family residence on a 16.87-acre agricultural lot with an existing single-family residence and walnut orchard. The proposed 2,840 square-foot second residence will have an attached 536 square-foot garage and a new driveway from Johnston Road. The application includes a request for an exception from the collect and convey drainage requirements of Chapter 914-2.004 of the Contra Costa County Ordinance Code.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located in the San Ramon area of unincorporated Contra Costa County on the north side of Johnston Road, approximately 1.4 miles east of the intersection of Camino Tassajara and Johnston Road. Access to the site is from the southern property line off Johnston Road. The site is relatively flat and is bounded on the northwest side by a tributary of Tassajara Creek. The site is currently developed with a single-family residence and a walnut orchard, both of which will remain after the construction of the proposed new residence.

The site is located in a predominantly agricultural area east of Camino Tassajara. Lots in the surrounding area are primarily agricultural in nature. Some lots also include single-family residential development. A commercial equestrian facility is adjacent to the east. To the north, west and south, properties include some private residences and agricultural structures. The San Ramon city limit is located approximately 5 driving miles to the west, and the Alameda County boundary is approximately 4.75 driving miles to the south. This area is also a few miles east of the eastern boundaries of the Town of Danville and the Blackhawk community.

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement):**
 - Contra Costa County Public Works Department
 - Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
 - San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District
 - Contra Costa County Environmental Health Division
- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

In accordance with Section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, a Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was sent on March 5, 2025, to the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation and the Wilton Rancheria, the California Native American tribes that have requested notification of proposed projects within unincorporated Contra Costa County. Pursuant to section 21080.3.1(d), there is a 30-day time period for the Wilton Rancheria and/or the Villages of Lisjan Nation to either request or decline consultation in writing for this project. The Confederated Villages requested CHRIS records for the project site on March 4, 2025, which staff received on April 1, 2025. The CHRIS records indicated that a previous 1997 study, covering approximately the proposed project area, identified no cultural resources within those portions of the project site affected by the proposed project. Although the general vicinity has sensitivity for archaeological resources, the proposed project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s).

Previously, the Wilton Rancheria had requested consultation in response to a Notice of Opportunity for a different project that led to a meeting between staff and a representative of the Wilton Rancheria. At that meeting, a tentative agreement was reached between staff and the Wilton Rancheria that the Native American tribe will be notified of any discovery of cultural resources or human remains on a project site. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requested that pursuant to State law, the NAHC shall be notified of any discovery of human remains rather than the Native American tribe. Standard Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division (CDD) Conditions of Approval – see Conditions of Approval Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2 in Environmental Checklist Section 5 (Cultural Resources) – provide for notice to the California Native American tribes of any discovery of cultural resources and notice to the NAHC of any discovery of human remains on the site. Any future construction activity on the project site would be subject to CDD Conditions of Approval Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

Without mitigation, the environmental factors checked below would have been potentially affected by this project. Upon incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in the following pages it has been found that the project will not result in any impacts to the environment.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Diana Lecca
Project Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

SUMMARY:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (No Impact)*

Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges & Waterways) of the Contra Costa County General Plan Open Space Element¹ identifies major scenic ridges and waterways within the County. The project site is not in the vicinity of any scenic ridges or waterways. The site is located approximately 0.74 miles to the north of Highland Road, which is designated as a scenic route on Figure 5-4 (Scenic Routes) of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element; however, due to the topography of the surrounding area as well as presence of existing structures and mature foliage, Highland Road is not visible from the site. Thus, the project will have no impact on scenic vistas.

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

¹ Although, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the 2045 General Plan on November 5, 2024, the CDLP23-02056 Land Use Permit application was deemed complete on June 26, 2024. Therefore, the goals, policies, and standards of the former General Plan 2005-2020 apply to the application.

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

Figure 5-4 (Scenic Routes) of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element identifies both State Scenic Highways and County designated Scenic Routes. The project site is not adjacent to any State Scenic Highway or County designated Scenic Route. In addition, there are no historic buildings, rock outcroppings or trees of significant scenic value located on or adjacent to the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not damage any scenic resources.

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

The project site is located within a rural (non-urbanized) area of the County that is predominantly characterized by agricultural uses such as cattle grazing, livestock production, and crop farming. The terrain surrounding the project site is hilly and adjacent parcels are largely undeveloped aside from some private residences and agricultural structures located along Johnston Road. The parcel itself has already been developed with a single-family residence and walnut orchard. The project includes the construction of a second single-family residence that would be consistent with the development (single-family homes and agricultural buildings) on surrounding parcels. In addition, new development is limited to the relatively flat portion of the subject property, which would reduce the visual impact of new construction from surrounding parcels. Therefore, the project will have less than a significant effect on the established visual character in the area.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The new single-family residence would introduce more light and glare in the area, which may change the existing character of the area. However, daytime views would be similar to views of other residences located on Johnston Road. Although lighting of the new residence, including yard and exterior house lights, may affect nighttime views, this lighting would be similar to that of existing residences along Johnston Road. Therefore, the impact on day or nighttime views would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element*.
- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

As shown on the California Department of Conservation's *Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2020* map, and the California Important Farmland Finder, the parcel is located within a Unique Farmland area. The proposed project to construct a second single-family residence will convert a portion of the current walnut orchard to a non-agricultural use but would keep the remainder of the area as agricultural. The proposed development is allowed with a land use permit and would be compatible with the agricultural land use district and would not substantially alter the land in a manner that would be detrimental to its capacity to sustain agricultural activities.

b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (No Impact)*

The project site is within an agricultural area that is largely non-urbanized. The project proposes a new second residence which is consistent with uses permitted within the A-20 District. Although the

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

property is zoned for agricultural use, the property is not included in a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact arising from a conflict with existing agricultural uses

The project site is in the A-20 Exclusive Agricultural District and is not under a Williamson Act contract. Also, the proposed project does not create any conflicts with existing zoning, because an additional single-family residence is allowed in the A-20 District with a land use permit.

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)? (No Impact)*

The project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g) or timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526. The project site is located within the A-20 Exclusive Agricultural District and the proposed use of the parcel is permitted within this zoning district with a land use permit. Construction at the subject site would not result in the conversion or loss of forest resources.

d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (No Impact)*

The project site is not considered forest land, as discussed above.

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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

Development of this project would not significantly change the existing environment, which due to its location and nature would result in conversion of a small amount of farmland to non-agricultural use. Historically, the parcel has been used as a walnut orchard. However, as mentioned above, a second single-family residence would be compatible with the agricultural land use district and would not substantially alter the land in a manner that would be detrimental to its capacity to sustain agricultural activities. Therefore, development of the project would result in a less than significant impact on the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2025. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2020*.
- [DLRP Important Farmland Finder](#), 2025. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection.
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 8. Zoning Ordinance.

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

SUMMARY:

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

The project site is within the San Francisco Bay Air Basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) pursuant to the *2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan: Spare the Air, Cool the Climate*. The *Clean Air Plan* serves as the regional Air Quality Plan (AQP) for the Air Basin for attaining National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for identifying nonattainment and attainment areas for each criteria pollutant within the Air Basin. The EPA has established NAAQS for six of the most common air pollutants—carbon monoxide, lead, ground level ozone, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide—known as “criteria pollutants”. The Air Basin is designated as nonattainment for State standards for 1-hour and 8-hour ozone, 24-hour respirable particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in diameter (PM₁₀), annual PM₁₀, and annual particulate matter 2.5 micrometers or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}).

The primary goals of the AQP are to protect public health and protect the climate. The AQP identifies a wide range of control measures intended to decrease both criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The BAAQMD does not provide a numerical threshold of significance for project-level consistency analysis with the regional AQP. A measure for determining whether the proposed project supports the primary goals of the AQP is if the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the air quality plans. This measure is determined by comparing project emissions to the significance

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

thresholds identified by the BAAQMD for construction- and operation-related pollutants. These significance thresholds are discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 3.b below. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 3.b, **if emissions control measures are not implemented, fugitive dust could be significant during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement Mitigation Measure Air Quality 1.**

Implementation of the Air Quality 1 and Geology and Soils 1 mitigation measures would reduce the impact of fugitive dust during project construction to a less than significant level.

b) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

This cumulative analysis focuses on whether the proposed project would result in cumulatively considerable emissions. The determination of cumulative air quality impacts for construction and operational emissions is based on whether the project would result in regional emissions that exceed the BAAQMD regional thresholds of significance for construction and operations on a project level. The thresholds of significance represent the allowable amount of emissions each project can generate without generating a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts. Therefore, a project that would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance on the project level also would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to these regional air quality impacts.

The BAAQMD 2024 CEQA Guidelines include screening criteria for purposes of identifying development projects for potentially significant air quality impacts. If a project does not exceed the screening criteria size it is generally expected to result in less than significant impacts relating to criteria air pollutants and precursors, absent exclusionary conditions. The BAAQMD screening criteria for the proposed project are presented in the table below:

TABLE AQ-1: Land Use Screening Criteria		
Land Use Type	Operational Criteria Pollutant Screening Size	Construction-Related Screening Size
Single-Family Residential	421 dwelling units	254 dwelling units

As shown in the table above, the project represents a marginal percentage of the screening threshold. While nature and scale of the project are such that significant air quality impacts are generally not expected based on the BAAQMD screening criteria, the project involves grading during construction which could result in cumulatively significant emissions of fugitive dust.

With respect to the estimated project emissions of fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), the BAAQMD does not recommend a numerical threshold for fugitive dust particulate matter emissions. Instead, the

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

BAAQMD bases the determination of significance for fugitive dust on considering the control measures to be implemented. If all appropriate emissions control measures are implemented for a project as recommended by the BAAQMD, then fugitive dust emissions during construction are not considered significant. However, **if emissions control measures are not implemented, fugitive dust could be significant during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact.** Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

Air Quality 1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Best Management Practices for Construction-Related Fugitive Dust Emissions shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans.

- a. All exposed non-paved surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- g. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
- h. 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.
- i. 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. The Air District's General Air Pollution Complaints number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

Implementation of the **Air Quality 1** mitigation measures would reduce the impact of fugitive dust during project construction to a less than significant level.

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

The BAAQMD defines a sensitive receptor as the following: “Facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples include schools, hospitals, and residential areas.” As specified by the BAAQMD, health risk and hazard impacts should be analyzed for sensitive receptors within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site.

Occupancy of the one new single-family residence would not be expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy long-term air pollutant levels. Construction activities, however, would result in localized emissions of dust and diesel exhaust that could result in temporary impacts at nearby single-family residences. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines state that 85% of the inhalation cancer risk from toxic air contaminants (TACs) is from diesel engine emissions.

Construction and grading activities would produce combustion emissions from various sources, including heavy equipment engines, asphalt paving, and motor vehicles used by the construction workers. Dust would be generated during site clearing, grading, and construction activities, with the most dust occurring during grading activities. The amount of dust generated would be highly variable and would be dependent on the size of the area disturbed, amount of activity, soil conditions, and meteorological conditions. **Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, such activities would generate construction-related emissions that could have a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction.** Consequently, the applicant is required to implement BAAQMD-recommended mitigation measures of **Air Quality 1** to reduce construction dust impacts. In addition, the applicant is required to implement BAAQMD construction Best Management Practices in **Air Quality 2** to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions.

Air Quality 2: The following emissions measures, as recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, shall be included on the construction drawings for the proposed project and implemented during construction:

- a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

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

- b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- c. The applicant shall require construction contractors to reduce construction related fugitive VOC emissions by ensuring that low-VOC coatings having a VOC content of 50 grams per liter or less are used during the coating of the buildings interiors and exterior surfaces.
- d. All construction equipment larger than 50 horsepower used at the site for more than two continuous days or 20 hours total shall utilize diesel engines that are USEPA certified "Tier 4 final" emission standards for particulate matter and be equipped with CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters. Prior to the CDD stamp approval of any construction plans for the issuance of demolition, construction, or grading permits, the construction contractor shall submit the specifications of the equipment to be used during construction to CDD staff.

Implementation of the **Air Quality 1** and **Air Quality 2** mitigation measures would reduce the impact during project construction on sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.

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

As stated in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the populations and is subjective. Objectionable odors are typically associated with agricultural or heavy industrial land uses such as refineries, chemical plants, paper mills, landfills, sewage-treatment plants, etc. There is nothing in the project description that would indicate that the proposal would be a source of objectionable odors beyond that which is ordinarily associated with the grading/paving of a secondary residence. However, the BAAQMD recommends operational screening criteria that are based on the distance between receptors and types of sources known to generate odors. For projects within the screening distances, the BAAQMD has the following threshold for project operations: An odor source with five or more confirmed complaints per year averaged over 3 years is considered to have a significant impact on receptors within the screening distance shown in Table AQ-2 below.

Two circumstances have the potential to cause odor impacts:

1. A source of odors is proposed to be located near existing or planned sensitive receptors, or
2. A sensitive receptor land use is proposed near an existing or planned source of odor.

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

Projects that would site an odor source or a receptor farther than the applicable screening distance, shown in Table AQ-4 below, would not likely result in a significant odor impact.

TABLE AQ-2: Odor Screening Distances	
<i>Land Use/Type of Operation</i>	<i>Project Screening Distance</i>
Wastewater Treatment Plant	2 miles
Wastewater Pumping Facilities	1 mile
Sanitary Landfill	2 miles
Transfer Station	1 mile
Composting Facility	1 mile
Petroleum Refinery	2 miles
Asphalt Batch Plant	2 miles
Chemical Manufacturing	2 miles
Fiberglass Manufacturing	1 mile
Painting/Coating Operations	1 mile
Rendering Plant	2 miles
Coffee Roaster	1 mile
Food Processing Facility	1 mile
Confined Animal Facility/Feed Lot/Dairy	1 mile
Green Waste and Recycling Operations	1 mile
Metal Smelting Plans	2 miles

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District., 2022. *CEQA Guidelines*.

Project Operation

Land uses typically associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste disposal facilities, agricultural operations, or other operations listed in Table AQ-2. The proposed second residence project is not within the odor screening distances for a sewage treatment plant, refinery, or other odor producing sources. Therefore, there would be no impact regarding odors associated with the location of the proposed project.

Project Construction

During construction and grading, diesel powered vehicles and equipment used on the site could create localized odors. These odors would be temporary; however, **there could be a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction due to the creation of objectionable odors. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures Air Quality 1 and Air Quality 2 above.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from the creation of objectionable odors to a less than significant level.

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

Sources of Information

- [attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf \(baaqmd.gov\)](attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf (baaqmd.gov)), 2025. *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate, Final 2017 Clean Air Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- [CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update \(baaqmd.gov\)](CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov)), 2025. *CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update, 2022 CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Public Access Lands map, the project site is not located in or adjacent to an area identified as a wildlife or ecological reserve.

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

According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the General Plan Conservation Element, this area does not have any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The location of the second single-family residence is within the existing walnut orchard on the project site. The new residence would not alter the use or significantly change any level of activity on site. Construction of the new residence would create approximately 3,400 square feet of new impervious surface area. Due to the limited area of onsite disturbance, it is unlikely that there would be any plant or animal species of concern that would be affected by future construction of a residence..

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Less Than Significant Impact)

A tributary of Tassajara Creek is adjacent to the northwest of the project site; however, the area of proposed construction activity on the site would be approximately 550 feet east of the tributary and within the existing walnut orchard. All project activities would be limited to the site, with construction access from Johnston Road east of the site. Given the distance between the tributary and the construction location on the project site, the project would have a less than significant impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act uses the Army Corps of Engineers definition of wetlands, which are defined as, “areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.” There are no isolated wetlands on the project site. Therefore, no substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands are expected.

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

The project site is bounded to the northwest by a tributary of Tassajara Creek; however most of the site is an existing walnut orchard and the area of proposed construction activity would be within the walnut orchard approximately 550 feet east of the tributary. As discussed in Environmental Checklist

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

Section 4.a, the project site does not support a special-status or unique wildlife population. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.

The walnut orchard on the project site has been in long-term active use, and is regularly maintained as a working orchard. Therefore, it is not likely the orchard would provide nesting and foraging habitat.

e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (No Impact)*

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 816-6 of the County Ordinance Code) provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal while allowing for reasonable development of private property. The project site contains a walnut orchard which will remain after the construction of the proposed new residence. This orchard qualifies under County Code Section 816-5.1002(4), Permit Exceptions, whereby a tree permit is not required for tree removal or alteration within the orchard. Therefore, the proposed project would not be in conflict with the Ordinance.

f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (No Impact)*

There is one adopted habitat conservation plan in Contra Costa County, the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP). The plan was approved in May 2007 by the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy, comprised of the cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, and Pittsburg, and Contra Costa County. The HCP/NCCP establishes a coordinated process for permitting and mitigating the incidental take of endangered species in East Contra Costa County. The plan lists Covered activities that fall into three distinct categories: (1) all activities and projects associated with urban growth within the urban development area (UDA); (2) activities and projects that occur inside the HCP/NCCP preserves; and (3) specific projects and activities outside the UDA. As the project does not fall into any of these categories, the project is not covered by, or in conflict with the adopted HCP/NCCP.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Conservation Element*.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2025. *Public Access Lands Map. October 17, 2024*.
- [East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy, CA | Official Website \(cocohcp.org\)](http://cocohcp.org), 2025. *East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy*.

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

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

Historical resources are defined in the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5 as a resource that fits any of the following definitions:

- Is listed in the California Register of Historic Places and has been determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historic Resources Commission;
- Is included in a local register of historic resources, and identified as significant in a historical resource survey that has been or will be included in the State Historic Resources Inventory; or
- Has been determined to be historically or culturally significant by a lead agency.

The project site has an existing 4,325-square-foot single-family residence with garage constructed in the 1990; and solar equipment. Neither the residence nor the site are on the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory or in the California Register of Historic Places. Thus, construction of a second single-family residence site would not affect any known historical or culturally significant resource.

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

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

The archaeological sensitivity map (Figure 9-2) of the County's General Plan Open Space Element identifies this area as having medium sensitivity in terms of potential for significant archeological resources. The project will involve minor grading to construct a second residence and therefore will require ground disturbing activities. Although the area of construction activity has been in long-term active agricultural use, construction could result in **a possibility that buried archaeological resources could be present and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact on archaeological resources**. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

Cultural Resources 1: The following Mitigation Measures shall be implemented during project construction.

- a. A program of onsite education to instruct all construction personnel in the identification of archaeological deposits shall be conducted by a certified archaeologist prior to the start of any grading or construction activities.
- b. If archaeological materials are uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite excavation, all work within 30 yards of these materials shall be stopped until a professional archaeologist who is certified by the Society for California Archaeology (SCA) and/or the Society of Professional Archaeology (SOPA), and the Native American tribe(s) that has requested consultation and/or demonstrated interest in the project site, have had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation(s) if deemed necessary.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact on archeological resources during project construction to a less than significant level.

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

No human remains or cemeteries are known to exist within or near the project site; however, there is a possibility that human remains could be present, and accidental discovery could occur during project construction. Consequently, **construction activities on the project site could result in a potentially significant impact due to disturbance of human remains**. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure.

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

Cultural Resources 2: Should human remains be uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite excavation(s), earthwork within 30 yards of these materials shall be stopped until the County coroner has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the human remains and determine the proper treatment and disposition of the remains. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if the coroner determines the remains may those of a Native American, the coroner is responsible for contacting the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by telephone within 24 hours. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, the NAHC will then determine a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) tribe and contact them. The MLD tribe has 48 hours from the time they are given access to the site to make recommendations to the landowner for treatment and disposition of the ancestor's remains. The landowner shall follow the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 for the remains.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact on human remains during project construction to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes.*
- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element.*

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

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project entails the construction of one new single family residence. During the operation of the new residence, energy would be consumed as part of the use of the residence, which would involve energy consumption for the various household appliances and equipment, along with outdoor lighting. The future residence would be designed and constructed in accordance with the California Buildings Codes, which includes specific requirements for residential construction to reduce the amount of energy required for lighting and heating, as well as to promote energy conservation.

During construction of the residence, there would be energy consumption through the combustion of fossil fuels in construction vehicles, worker commute vehicles, and construction equipment. Fossil fuels to power construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during grading, paving, and building construction. The types of equipment could include gasoline- and diesel-powered construction and transportation equipment. If the proposed project is approved, the applicant will be required to implement the Department's standard construction restrictions that include, but are not limited to, limiting all construction activities and use of large trucks and heavy equipment to daylight, non-holiday weekday hours. However, during working hours, **inefficient or unnecessary energy use due to operation and idling of vehicles and equipment and operating improperly maintained equipment could result in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures in Air Quality 2 above.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy to a less than significant level.

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

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

The State of California has routinely adopted legislation to address climate change and clean energy production that has resulted in efforts to increase the efficiency of vehicles, buildings, and appliances and to provide energy from renewable sources. Locally, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update on November 5, 2024. The 2024 Update includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County.

The construction and operation of the new single-family residence would be subject to the measures in the 2024 Update. Thus, the second residence would be consistent with the strategies of the adopted Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update, and would not impede any State or local initiatives for increasing renewable energy or efficiency.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes.*
- *Contra Costa County, Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update. 2024.*

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

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

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

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Marsh Creek Fault, which is mapped approximately three miles east of the project site. Given that the site is not within an official Earthquake Fault Zone, the risk of fault rupture is generally regarded as very low. Thus, the risk of fault rupture can be considered to be less than significant.

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

The U.S. Geological Survey (2016) indicates that there is a 72 percent chance of at least one magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake striking the San Francisco Bay region between 2014 and 2043. Thus, the General Plan Safety Element identifies areas that are more or less susceptible to seismic damage as shown in Figure 10-4, Estimated Seismic Ground Response. According to Figure 10-4, the project site is located in an area of Hard Bedrock which is noted to have a lowest damage susceptibility. The risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the Building Code and the County Grading Ordinance. The Building Code requires use of seismic parameters which allow the structural engineer to design buildings to be based on soil profile types and proximity of faults deemed capable of generating strong/violent earthquake shaking. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. Thus, the environmental impact from seismic ground shaking would be considered to be less than significant.

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

Figure 10-5, Estimated Liquefaction Potential, of the General Plan Safety Element divides land in the County into three liquefaction potential categories: “generally high,” “generally moderate to low,” and “generally low”. It is used as a “screening criteria” during the processing of land development applications, on a project-by-project basis. The project site is in an area that is in the “generally low” category. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. The construction of the new residence is subject to the building code regulations, therefore the environmental impact from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be expected to be less than significant.

iv) *Landslides? (No Impact)*

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

In 1975 the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) issued photointerpretive maps of Contra Costa County showing the distribution of landslide and other surficial deposits. The USGS mapping is presented on Figure 10-6 (Geologic (Landslide) Hazards) of the General Plan Safety Element. According to this map, which was prepared by an experienced USGS geologist, landsliding is not a potential hazard for this site.

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

According to the US Web Soil Survey, the soil series that occur on the project site is primarily Conejo Clay loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), and clay substratum (0 to 2 percent slopes). The Conejo Clay series is described as consisting of very deep, well-drained, and forms in alluvium from basic igneous or sedimentary rocks. The hazard of erosion of Conejo clay loam is none to slight where soil is tilled and exposed. As a result, there would be a less than significant adverse environmental impact related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 7.a.iii and 7.a.iv above, the project site is not within a liquefaction or a landslide area. Thus, the risk of unstable soil would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 7.b, the soil series mapped on the site is Conejo clay loam. With regard to its engineering properties, the underlying clayey soil is moderately expansive and moderately corrosive. The expansion and contraction of soils could cause cracking, tilting, and eventual collapse of structures. The risks of damage associated with these adverse engineering properties of the soils can be avoided or minimized by proper site preparation work, in combination with foundation and drainage design that is sensitive to the prevailing soils conditions.

The geotechnical study prepared for the existing single-family residence on the project site (*Geotechnical Study for Single Family Residence, Johnston Road, Contra Costa, California*. Henry Justiniano & Associates, July 25, 1989) confirmed the expansion potential of the soil. The geotechnical study included recommendations for grading, foundation design, drainage, utility trenches, and pavements. Subsequently a geotechnical update report (*Geotechnical Update, Proposed Single Family Residence 6621 Johnston Rd. Pleasanton, California*. Henry Justiniano & Associates, May 30, 2023) was prepared for the proposed second single-family residence. Recommendations in

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

the geotechnical update include applying the construction recommendations of the 1989 geotechnical study with revised recommendations for slab-on-grade design.

Thus, there is a potentially significant impact due to expansive soil for the second single-family residence if the recommendations of the geotechnical study and geotechnical update report are not implemented. Consequently, the project sponsor is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

Geology 1: The applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the geotechnical study (*Geotechnical Study for Single Family Residence, Johnston Road, Contra Costa, California*. Henry Justiniano & Associates, July 25, 1989) as modified by the geotechnical update report (*Geotechnical Update, Proposed Single Family Residence 6621 Johnston Rd. Pleasanton, California*. Henry Justiniano & Associates, May 30, 2023) in the construction documents submitted for the grading and building permit applications for the second single-family residence.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impacts of expansive soils to less than significant levels.

e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

The project site is currently not served by a municipal sewer system but has well water and a septic system that is permitted by the Contra Costa Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division. Any future work and increase of use will have to be approved by the Environmental Health Division.

As described in Environmental Checklist Section 7.b above, the soil series that occurs on the project site are the Conejo Clay loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), and clay substratum (0 to 2 percent slopes). The permeability of these soils is moderately slow. Based on the soil properties, the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County concludes that these soils have severe limitation for use as a filter field for septic system. Thus, **there would be a potentially significant impact on septic systems due to soil conditions on the project site.** Consequently, The applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure.

Geology 2: The applicant shall be responsible for documenting the adequacy of the existing leach field or identify a potential leach field site of adequate size that complies with regulations administered by the Environmental Health Division of the County Health Services Department. If a suitable site is not identified on the site, the project sponsor will need to request that the Environment Health Division consider a specialized design.

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

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact of soil conditions on septic systems to a less than significant level.

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

Although there are no known unique paleontological resources or geologic features on the project site, **there is a possibility that buried fossils and other paleontological resources or hidden geologic features could be present and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact on paleontological resources. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the Cultural Resources 1 mitigation measures.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact on archeological resources during project construction to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Safety Element*.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1977. *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California*.
- [Web Soil Survey - Home \(usda.gov\)](https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/), 2025. *USDA Web Soil Survey*.
- Henry Justiniano & Associates, Geotechnical Engineering, May 30, 2023. *Geotechnical Update Proposed Single Family Residence 6621 Johnston Rd. Pleasanton, California*.
- Henry Justiniano & Associates, Geotechnical Engineering, July 25, 1989. *Geotechnical Study for Single Family Residence, Johnston Road, Contra Costa, California*.

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

Construction and operation of the second single-family residence on the project site will generate some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. The 2022 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines state that for a project to have a less-than-significant impact related to operational GHG emissions, it must include, at a minimum, no natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing in the residences, and no wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 6 above, the new single-family residence would be operated and constructed in accordance with the California Buildings Codes, which includes specific requirements for residential construction to reduce the amount of energy required for lighting and heating, as well as to promote energy conservation. As a result, the project would result in the generation of less than significant amounts of GHG emissions.

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

At a regional scale, the BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan that addresses GHG emissions as well as various criteria air pollutants. The BAAQMD Plan included a number of pollutant reduction strategies for the San Francisco Bay air basin. Within Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County Climate Action and

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

Adaptation Plan 2024 Update on November 5, 2024, which includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County. All building/grading activities associated with the project are subject to compliance with these measures. Thus, the proposed project would generate some GHG emissions, but not at levels that would result in a conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Sources of Information

- [attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf \(baaqmd.gov\)](attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf (baaqmd.gov)), 2025. *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate, Final 2017 Clean Air Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- [CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update \(baaqmd.gov\)](CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov)), 2025. *CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update, 2022 CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- Contra Costa County, *Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update*. 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

There would be associated use of fuels and lubricants, and other construction materials during the construction period for the second single-family residence. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (Cal/OSHA)

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

requirements. With compliance with existing regulations, the project would have a less than significant impact from construction.

Operation of the new residence would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in very small quantities as they relate to household use. Contra Costa County regulates household hazard disposal, and the home's occupants would be responsible for proper handling and disposal of household materials. For example, household hazardous substances can be dropped off for free at the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility, located approximately 18.7 miles north of the project site at 4797 Imhoff Place in Martinez. Because any hazardous materials used for household operations would be in small quantities, long-term impacts associated with handling, storing, and dispensing of hazardous materials from project operation would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project to construct a second residence on the project site would not involve handling, use, or storage of substances that are acutely hazardous. The site has historically been in agricultural use with an existing single-family residence located within the walnut orchard south of the proposed location of the second residence. Thus, substantial concentrations of asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, or other hazardous materials would not be present on the site, and the risk of release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (No Impact)

There are no schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The closest schools are more than two miles from the site, including Creekside Elementary School at 6011 Massara Street approximately 2.28 miles to the west, and Tassajara Hills Elementary at 4675 Camino Tassajara approximately 2.25 miles to the west-northwest. Due to the distance between the project site and the schools, the proposed project would not have an impact on the schools related to hazardous substances.

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

The property is currently in residential and agricultural uses. A review of regulatory databases maintained by County, State, and federal agencies found no documentation of hazardous materials violations or discharge on the project site. The project site is not listed on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites (Cortese) List. that is maintained pursuant to California Government Code section 65962.5. The nearest site that has been investigated by the California

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

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is the Creekside Elementary School site. The school site was determined not to have any potential hazards and the DTSC issued a No Action determination on December 11, 2007. Thus, there would be no impact.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)*

The project is not located within two miles of an airport. The nearest public use airport is the Byron Airport, located 11.71 miles to the east-northeast. The airport influence area is delineated in the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The site is not within the Byron Airport influence area. Thus, the proposed project is not considered to be located within an area where airport operations present a potential hazard.

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

The second residence would access the property from a new driveway intersection with Johnston Road, which would be independent of the existing driveway for the existing residence. The driveway would access the publicly-maintained section of Johnston Road until it reaches Camino Tassajara approximately 1.4 miles to the west. Camino Tassajara is a designated County arterial as shown on Figure 5-2 (Roadway Network Plan) of the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element that would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local neighborhood. If the project is approved, the Public Works Department will require a Code-compliant curb and driveway to Johnston Road. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on emergency response and emergency evacuation plans.

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

The project site and vicinity are in a high fire hazard severity zone in a state responsibility area. Consequently, the new single-family residence would be required to conform to the provisions of the California Building Code and California Fire Code related to construction in wildland urban interface fire areas. The second residence would be required to conform to California Building Code Chapter 7A (Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure), California Fire Code Chapter 49 (Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas), and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Building Standards). Construction drawings for the building permit would be required to receive approval from the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. As a result, fire-related risks for the new residence would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

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

- [EnviroStor \(ca.gov\)](https://EnviroStor.ca.gov), 2025. *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2025. Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese)*.
- Contra Costa County, 2000. *Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department, June 25, 2024. *Land Use Permit LP23-2056 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval*.
- [FHSZ_Contra_Costa_County_SRA_11x17_09292023.pdf | Powered by Box](https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10238/FHSZ_Contra_Costa_County_SRA_11x17_09292023.pdf), 2025. *Office of the State Fire Marshal, State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, Contra Costa County, updated March 27, 2024*.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The proposed project must comply with applicable Contra Costa County C.3 requirements. Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and 16 incorporated cities in the county have formed the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. In October

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

2009, the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) adopted the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Regional Permit for the Program, which regulates discharges from municipal storm drains. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control storm water runoff. The County has the authority to enforce compliance with its Municipal Regional Permit authority in its adopted C.3 requirements. The C.3 requirements stipulate that projects that create or replace 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface must incorporate specific measures to reduce runoff, such as dispersion of runoff to vegetated areas, use of pervious pavement, installation of cisterns, and installation of bioretention facilities or planter boxes. If 10,000 square feet of impervious surface is created, the project sponsor will need to prepare a storm water control plan. The proposed project would add approximately 3,400 square feet of impervious surface. Therefore, the Public Works Department states that a stormwater control plan is not required for the project. The Public Works Department has reviewed the project plans minor subdivision plans and is requiring all storm drainage facilities to be in compliance with the County Ordinance Code and Public Works design standards. With compliance of the project with these requirements, the project would have a less than significant impact on water quality..

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The 16.87-acre project site is currently served by a well at a central location on the property. . At the time of application for a building permit for the second single-family residence, the applicant will be required to submit water supply plans to the Department of Environmental Health, Environmental Health Division. The Division would review the plans with respect to applicable well standards, including setbacks, sustained yield, water quality, and construction. . Thus, the project is not expected to significantly impact groundwater resources in the area.

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

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

The applicant proposes to maintain the existing drainage pattern on the project site, whereby runoff flows west towards the tributary of Tassajara Creek. The applicant has requested an exception to the collect and convey requirements of Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code. Public Works staff have reviewed the exception request and states that it is not opposed to the granting of the exception, and thereby finds that continuing the existing drainage pattern would not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property owners. With the granting of the exception and given the relatively low-density of the area, the addition of a new

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

residence would not have a significant impact on the existing drainage pattern, and therefore, would not 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 off-site? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed above in Environmental Checklist Section 10.c.i, storm runoff would follow the existing patterns of the site with the granting of the exception. Public Works staff has indicated that the current patterns of drainage to a natural adequate watercourse would suffice and would not result in a substantial increase that would create flooding. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact on the existing drainage system and would not result in on or off-site flooding.

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

As mentioned above, Public Works staff has reviewed the conditions of the site and indicated that the proposed home site is in a low-density part of Johnston Road, and the existing drainage pattern on the project site will be adequate for the new residence. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the operation of existing and planned stormwater drainage systems..

iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows? (No Impact)*

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is located FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) Flood Map 06013C0500F. As shown on the FEMA Flood Map, land in the project vicinity is classified as being in Zone X, which is considered to be an area of minimal flood hazard. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on flood flows.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.c.iv above, the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is also not in an area that would be susceptible to inundation by seiche or tsunami. The California Geological Survey (2009) has projected and mapped the tsunami hazard posed by a tidal wave that passes through the Golden Gate and into San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay and Carquinez Strait. As mapped, the tsunami hazard in Contra Costa County is limited to the lowland areas immediately adjacent to these waterways. A seiche is a water wave in a standing body of water such as a large lake or reservoir that is caused by an earthquake, a major landslide, or

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

strong winds. This hazard does not exist within the project vicinity as there are no large lakes or reservoirs in the area.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.a above, the applicant is not required to prepare a stormwater control plan since it does not exceed the threshold for such requirement. Additionally, Public Works staff has reviewed and has found that the current drainage system is adequate to support a secondary residence. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan and would have a less than significant impact.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 10, Division 1014. *Stormwater Management and Discharge Control*.
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department, June 25, 2024. *Land Use Permit LP23-2056 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval*.
- [FEMA Flood Map Service Center | Search By Address](#), 2025. *FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency), Flood Map 06013C0500F, effective 06/16/2009*.
- California Emergency Management Agency, 2009. *Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning: Richmond Quadrangle/San Quentin Quadrangle, Mare Island Quadrangle, Benicia Quadrangle*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Safety Element*.

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

SUMMARY:

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

The 16.87-acre project site is located on the north side of Johnston Road in the A-20 Exclusive Agricultural District, wherein an additional single-family residence is allowed with a land use permit. The second residence on the site would be located north of the existing residence within the walnut orchard. As described in Section 9 (Surrounding Land Uses and Setting), other agricultural parcels to the north, west and south include some private residences and agricultural structures. Therefore the property will remain consistent with the uses allowed in the A-20 District after development of the second residence and would not physically divide an established community.

b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (No Impact)*

There are currently no applicable specific area policies for this unincorporated San Ramon Area adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, nor are there any specific to this land use type. The project involves the establishment an additional single-family residence on a property in the A-20 District, which is allowed with a land use permit. Development of the second residence with the granting of the exception would be in compliance with County Ordinance Code regulations. Also, the removal of walnut trees to accommodate the second residence is exempt from the regulations of the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance. Thus, the project would not be in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation.

Sources of Information

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

Contra Costa County Code, Title 8. Zoning Ordinance.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

Known mineral resource areas in the County are shown on Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the General Plan Conservation Element. No known mineral resources have been identified in the project vicinity, and therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

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

The project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

Sources of Information

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

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE – Would the project:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The use of the property would not substantially change with the second single-family residence. Accordingly, activities at the project site are not expected to expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of the Community Noise Exposure Levels shown on Figure 11-6 of the General Plan Noise Element. Parcels previously developed with single-family residences, and other agricultural uses adjoin the project site to the north and east. Figure 11-6 shows that levels of 75 dB or less are normally acceptable and noise levels up to 80 dB are conditionally acceptable in agricultural areas. The types and levels of noise generated from the second residence would be similar to noise levels from existing residential development on the site and in the area.

During project construction, there may be periods of time when there would be loud noise from construction equipment, vehicles, and tools. The maximum projected noise level of construction equipment operating on the project site could be up to 88 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. **Although the construction activities would be temporary, the activities could have a potentially significant impact during project construction on adjacent residences.** Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following noise mitigation measures.

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

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

- a. The applicant shall make a good faith effort to minimize project-related disruptions to adjacent properties, and to uses on the site. This shall be communicated to all project-related contractors.
- b. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.
- c. A publicly visible sign shall be posted on the property with the telephone number and person to contact regarding construction-related complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours. The CDD phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- d. Unless specifically approved otherwise via prior authorization from the Zoning Administrator, all construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:

New Year's Day (State and Federal)

Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)

Washington's Birthday (Federal)

Lincoln's Birthday (State)

President's Day (State)

Cesar Chavez Day (State)

Memorial Day (State and Federal)

Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)

Independence Day (State and Federal)

Labor Day (State and Federal)

Columbus Day (Federal)

Veterans Day (State and Federal)

Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)

Day after Thanksgiving (State)

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

Christmas Day (State and Federal)

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

Federal Holidays: [Federal Holidays \(opm.gov\)](http://Federal Holidays (opm.gov))

California Holidays: [State Holidays \(ca.gov\)](http://State Holidays (ca.gov))

e. Large trucks and heavy equipment are subject to the same restrictions that are imposed on construction activities, except that the hours are limited to 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce construction period noise impacts to a less than significant level.

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

Residential use of the project site would not generate significant ground borne vibration. Also, the project does not include any components (e.g., pile driving) that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels during construction activities.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No Impact)*

There is no currently operating private airstrip in the vicinity of the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people to airstrip-related noise.

The nearest public use airport is the Byron Airport, which is located 11.71 miles to the east-northeast of the project site. Accordingly, the project site would not be located within an area where there would be excessive airport-related noise.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020, *Noise Element*.
- Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, 1971. *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*. U.S.E.P.A. Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Contract 68-04-0047.

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

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (**Less Than Significant Impact**)*

A second single-family residence on the project site would directly increase the San Ramon area population by an estimated three persons, based on the Census 2020 estimate of 2.88 people per household for the 94583 zip code area (San Ramon, California). The Census 2020 estimate for the population in the 94583 zip code area in 2023 is 84,929 persons, and therefore, the impact of adding three persons to the zip code area would be less than significant.

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

The project site currently includes one single-family residence and a walnut orchard that will remain with construction of the second single-family residence. Also, there is no evidence of homeless persons residing on the site. Thus, the proposed project would not displace any person or existing housing and would have no housing displacement impact.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- [U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States](#), 2023. *Census 2020, QuickFacts, Contra Costa County, CA*.

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

SUMMARY:

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Fire protection and emergency medical response services in the project vicinity are provided by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District (SRVFPD). Fire protection at the project site would be provided by Fire Station 36 located at 2001 Lusitano Street, approximately 2.9 mile driving distance to the northwest. Prior to construction of the second residence, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project on fire protection services would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the San Ramon neighborhood. In addition to regular patrol service, backup police protection services would be provided by the Valley Station of the Sheriff's Office, located at 150 Alamo Plaza #C, approximately 14 miles driving distance to the northwest of the project site. The addition of the second residence on the project site would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the neighborhood.

c) Schools? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The San Ramon Valley Unified School District (SRVUSD) provides public education services from kindergarten to 12th grade to the San Ramon neighborhood. Students in this neighborhood would

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

attend the Tassajara Hills Elementary School located at 4675 Camino Tassajara, approximately 3 miles driving distance west-northwest of the project site, Diablo Vista Middle School located at 4100 Camino Tassajara, approximately 3.9 miles driving distance to the west, and Dougherty Valley High School located at 10550 Albion Road, approximately 7.8 miles driving distance to the southwest. Tassajara Hills Elementary School has a current enrollment of 447 from kindergarten to 5th grade. Diablo Vista Middle School has a current enrollment of 837 students from 6th to 8th grade. Dougherty Valley High School has a current enrollment of 3,340 students from 9th to 12th grade.

Based on Census 2020 data, 26.9% of the population of the 94583 zip code area would be under 18 years old and 5.1% of the population would be under 5 years old. Therefore, of the projected three persons living in the secondary single-family residence, at most one person would be under 18 years old. Using a conservative estimate of one person attending schools in the San Ramon Valley Unified School District, the project-related increase in enrollment at any school would be less than one percent. Also, the project applicant for the second single-family residence would be required to pay the state-mandated school impact fee for the new dwelling unit. Accordingly, school impacts would be less than significant.

d) Parks? (No Impact)

The closest public parks to the project site include the Morgan Territory Regional Preserve 2.93 miles to the northeast (to the Morgan Territory Road Stating Area), Diablo Vista Park 4.49 miles to the west, Rancho San Ramon Community Park 5.27 miles to the southwest, and Mount Diablo State Park 6.93 mile to the east (to the Summit Trailhead). The 5,321-acre Morgan Territory Regional Preserve is maintained by the East Bay Regional Park District and is an undeveloped wilderness area with trail connections into the almost 20,000-acre Mount Diablo State Park. Diablo Vista Park is a 20-acre community park maintained by the Town of Danville. Rancho San Ramon Community Park is a 22.89-acre community park maintained by the City of San Ramon. Given the Census 2020 estimate of 2.88 people per household for the 94583 zip code area, occupancy of the new residence would contribute to a negligible increase in use of the parks. The amount of available park space and the project's small addition to the San Ramon area population would minimize project impacts on recreational facilities. As such, the project would have no impact.

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

Libraries: The Contra Costa Library operates 26 facilities in Contra Costa County, including the Dougherty Station Library, located at 17017 Bollinger Canyon Road Front Street, approximately 7.1 miles driving distance to the southwest of the project site. Based on the Census 2020 estimate of the occupancy of the second residence, the new residence on the project site would not substantially increase the number of library patrons and would have a less than significant impact on library facilities.

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

Health Facilities: The Contra Costa County Health Services District operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 15 health centers and clinics in the county. There is no public health facility in the Diablo area. The closest public health facilities to the project site are the Concord Public Health Clinic, located at 2355 Stanwell Circle, and the Concord Health Center, located at 3052 Willow Pass Road. Both facilities are approximately 24.1 miles driving distance to the northwest. Based on an average household size of 2.88 people for the 94583 zip code area, development of the second residence would not result in a substantial increase in population and thus would not substantially impact the use of public health facilities. The project would have a less than significant impact.

Sources of Information

- [Stations & Facilities | San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District](#), 2025. *San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, Fire Stations*.
- [Valley Station | Contra Costa Sheriff, CA \(cocosheriff.org\)](#), 2025. *Contra Costa County office of the Sheriff, Valley Station*.
- [San Ramon Valley Unified School District - Home](#), 2025. *San Ramon Valley Unified School District*.
- [School/District Profile Search Results \(CA Dept of Education\)](#), 2025. *California Department of Education, 2024-2025 Enrollment by Grade, San Ramon Valley Unified School District*.
- [Diablo Vista Park | Danville, CA](#), 2025. *Town of Danville, Community Parks, Diablo Vista Park*.
- [Rancho San Ramon Community Park - City of San Ramon](#), 2025. *City of San Ramon, Rancho San Ramon Community Park*.
- [Morgan Territory Regional Preserve | East Bay Parks](#), 2025. *East Bay Regional Park District, Morgan Territory Regional Preserve*.
- [Mount Diablo State Park](#), 2025. *California Department of Parks and Recreation, Mount Diablo State Park*.
- <http://ccclib.org/>, 2025. *Contra Costa County Library*.
- <https://cchealth.org/#Centers>, 2025. *Health Centers & Clinics, Contra Costa Health Services*.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
16. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (No Impact)*

As discussed in Section Environmental Checklist Section 15.d, the closest parks to the project site include the 5,321-acre Morgan Territory Regional Preserve 2.93 miles to the northeast, the 20-acre Diablo Vista Park 4.49 miles to the west, the 22.89-acre Rancho San Ramon Community Park 5.27 miles to the southwest, and the almost 20,000-acre Mount Diablo State Park 6.93 mile to the east (to the Summit Trailhead). The second residence on the project site may incrementally increase use of these parks; however, given the amount of available park space and the project's small addition to local area population, the project would have no impact on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks.

b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (No Impact)*

The proposed project would not include a recreational facility on the project site. Given the location of the nearby neighborhood and regional parks, the residents of the second residence would likely use these existing parks. The incremental increase in the use of these park facilities would not be expected to result in the need to construct or expand recreational facilities.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- [Diablo Vista Park | Danville, CA](#), 2025. *Town of Danville, Community Parks, Diablo Vista Park*.
- [Rancho San Ramon Community Park - City of San Ramon](#), 2025. *City of San Ramon, Rancho San Ramon Community Park*.
- [Morgan Territory Regional Preserve | East Bay Parks](#), 2025. *East Bay Regional Park District, Morgan Territory Regional Preserve*.

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

- [Mount Diablo State Park](#), 2025. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Mount Diablo State Park.

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

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County Transportation Analysis Guidelines in June 2020. The Transportation Analysis Guidelines require a transportation impact analysis of any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers peak period trip generation rate of 0.74 AM peak hour trip and 0.99 PM peak hour trip per dwelling unit for single-family residences, the existing single-family residence on the project site generates a total of 2 (1 AM and 1 PM) peak hour trips. The second single-family residence would similarly generate a total of 2 (1 AM and 1 PM) peak hour trips. Accordingly, a project-specific traffic impact analysis is not required. Since the project would yield less than 100 AM or PM peak hour trips, the proposed project would not conflict with circulation along Johnston Road and Camino Tassajara.

There is no transit service, bicycle facilities or pedestrian facilities on Johnston Road. On Camino Tassajara in the vicinity of Johnston Road, there is a Class II bicycle facility, but no transit service or pedestrian facilities. The closest bus stop is at the Camino Tassajara / Charbray Street intersection located 3.2 driving miles to the west. Because of the distance to transit stops and the rural character of Johnston Road and Camino Tassajara in the vicinity of Johnston Road, significant demand for transit service is not expected, and the proposed project would not impede any existing transit service.

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

Due to the rural character of this area, pedestrian activity along any roadway is largely non-existent. The location and characteristics of the project site make it unlikely that anyone would travel by foot. Thus, the absence of pedestrian facilities would not constitute a significant impact.

With respect to bicycle facilities, there are no plans to add any bicycle facility to Johnston Road. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 17.a, the second single-family residence on the project site would generate a total of 2 (1 AM and 1 PM) peak hour trips. This increase in traffic would have a less than significant effect on the bicycle facility along Camino Tassajara.

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

The June 2020 Contra Costa County Transportation Analysis Guidelines include the following screening criteria. If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, the project would be expected to have a less than significant impact and would not require VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) analysis.

- i. Projects that:
 - a. Generate or attract fewer than 110 daily vehicle trips; or,
 - b. Projects of 10,000 square feet or less of non-residential space or 20 residential units or less, or otherwise generating less than 836 VMT per day.
- ii. Residential, retail, office projects, or mixed-use projects proposed within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor.
- iii. Residential projects (home-based VMT) at 15% or below the baseline County-wide home-based average VMT per capita, or employment projects (employee VMT) at 15% or below the baseline Bay Area average commute VMT per employee in areas with low VMT that incorporate similar VMT reducing features (i.e., density, mix of uses, transit accessibility).
- iv. Public facilities (e.g. emergency services, passive parks (low-intensity recreation, open space), libraries, community centers, public utilities) and government buildings.

Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers daily trip generation rate of 9.44 daily trips per dwelling unit for single-family residences, the existing single-family residence on the project site generates a total of 9 daily trips. Thus, the current use of the project site is below the thresholds of 110 daily vehicle trips and 20 residential units. Similarly, the second single-family residence would generate a total of 9 daily trips. Thus, with the second residence, use of the site will remain below the thresholds. Therefore, a VMT analysis is not required. Accordingly, the proposed project would have a less than significant transportation impact and would be consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 9.f, the second residence would access the property from a new driveway intersection with Johnston Road, which would be independent of the existing driveway for the existing residence. If the project is approved, the Public Works Department will require a Code-compliant curb and driveway to Johnston Road. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features and it would have a less than significant impact.

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

As described above in Environmental Checklist Section 17.c, access to the second residence would be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Department. Access would also be subject to review and approval by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development and the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Growth Management Element*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element*.
- Contra Costa County, 2020. Contra Costa County Transportation Analysis Guidelines.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017. *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*.
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department, June 25, 2024. *Land Use Permit LP23-2056 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval*.
- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes.

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

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 5.a above, there is an existing residence on the project site, a 4,325-square-foot single-family residence built in the 1990. Neither the residence nor the site are on the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory or in the California Register of Historic Places. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on any known historical or culturally significant and visible tribal cultural resources.

b) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 5.b and 5.c above, grading and other earthwork associated with construction of the second residence could encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources and human remains. **Damage or destruction of archaeological resources and disturbance of human remains during project construction would be potentially significant impacts. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the mitigation measures of Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2.**

Regarding paleontological resources, as discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 7.f, there is a possibility that buried fossils and other paleontological resources or hidden geologic features could be present and encountered during grading and other earthwork. **Damage or destruction of**

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

paleontological resources during project construction would be a potentially significant impact. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the mitigation measures of Cultural Resources 1

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the adverse environmental impact on archaeological resources, human remains, buried fossils and other paleontological resources, or hidden geologic features to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.

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

SUMMARY:

a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (No Impact)*

The project site is in an agricultural area that is not served by any municipal water or wastewater system, and therefore, the project would have no effect on water or wastewater treatment facilities. Similar to other land uses in the vicinity, the proposed project would use an on-site groundwater wells for potable water and an on-site septic system for wastewater disposal. The wells and septic system would be subject to review and approval by the Environmental Health Division. Environmental Health has reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that the septic system for the project must comply with current standards. Environmental Health's approval will be required prior to the issuance of building permits.

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

The project site includes existing improvements for electric power, natural gas, and other common utilities. The new second single-family residence would connect to existing improvements, and therefore, construction of new or relocated facilities would not be necessary.

The potential impacts of the project on water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities would be less than significant.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? (No Impact)

The project site currently has a fresh water well. The County Environmental Health Department has reviewed the project proposal and has indicated that the water supply well will be subject to review for compliance with current standards for water quality and sustained yield prior to the issuance of permits. The addition of one single-family residence within a walnut orchard on the project site would not significantly deplete groundwater supplies. Thus, the demand for water resources to serve future development on the project site would have a less than significant impact on existing water resources.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (No Impact)

The project site is in an agricultural area that is not served by any municipal wastewater system, and therefore, the project would have no effect on wastewater treatment facilities.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (No Impact)

Construction of the second single-family residence would generate construction solid waste. Construction on the project site would be subject to the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), which requires that at least 65% by weight of job site debris generated by most types of building project types be recycled, reused, or otherwise diverted from landfill disposal. This requirement applies to demolition projects and most new construction, as well as the majority of building additions or alterations. CalGreen is administered in the County through the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, and verifiable post-project documentation is required to be submitted to demonstrate that at least 65% of the nonhazardous construction and demolition (C&D) debris generated on the job site are salvaged for reuse, recycled or otherwise diverted. The Debris Recovery Program would reduce the construction debris headed to a landfill by diverting materials that can be recycled to appropriate recycling facilities. Nondiverted C&D debris is required to be transported to an approved Construction and Demolition Processing Facility. Accordingly, the environmental impact of construction waste would be less than significant.

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

With respect to residential waste, Contra Costa County contracts with franchise haulers for solid waste, recycling, and organics collection service for about one half of the unincorporated County. The Department of Conservation and Development, Solid Waste and Recycling Section administers four franchise agreements with Allied Waste Systems, Crockett Sanitary Service, Garaventa Enterprises, and Richmond Sanitary Service. Republic Services collects residential waste under the Allied Waste, Crockett Sanitary, and Richmond Sanitary agreements. Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery collects residential waste under the Garaventa Enterprises agreement. In the other half of unincorporated County, collection service is managed by three different sanitary districts, the Kensington Community Services District, the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority (RecycleSmart, a joint powers authority), and the City of San Ramon, where unincorporated areas of San Ramon are served under the city's collection franchise. California Public Resource Code (PRC) Division 30, and Title 14, Natural Resources, of the California Code of Regulations require solid waste facilities to have a 15-year capacity. The capacity of Keller Canyon is approximately 40 years if the maximum daily capacity was brought to the landfill. As is the case with construction debris, a portion of the residential waste is expected to be recycled and would thereby reduce the residential waste headed to a landfill by a franchise hauler. Thus, residential waste from the second single-family residence on the project site would incrementally add to the operational waste handled by a franchise hauler; however, the impact of the project-related residential waste is considered to be less than significant.

e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (No Impact)*

The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste. Development of a second single-family residence would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that would conflict with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. Thus, the project would have no impact.

Sources of Information

- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4746/CalGreen-Construction-Demolition-Debris>, 2025. *Contra Costa County, Conservation and Development Department, CalGreen / Construction & Demolition (C&D) Debris Recovery Program*.
- <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/44986/Approved-CD-Processing-Facilities?bidId>, 2025. *Contra Costa County, Approved Construction & Demolition (C&D) Processing Facilities*.
- <https://cccrecycle.org/235/Franchise-Agreements>, 2025. *Contra Costa County, Franchise Agreements*.
- <https://cocogis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2c5e6c6b1f7d419eac7005c84a76de90>, 2025. *Contra Costa County, Waste Hauler Area Map*.

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

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Less Than Significant			
20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near the state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 9.g, the project site and vicinity are in a high fire hazard severity zone in a state responsibility area. Consequently, the new single-family residence would be required to conform to the provisions of the California Building Code and California Fire Code related to construction in wildland urban interface fire areas. The second residence would be required to conform to California Building Code Chapter 7A (Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure), California Fire Code Chapter 49 (Requirements for Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas), and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Building Standards). Construction drawings for the building permit would be required to receive approval from These requirements would reduce the risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 15.a, fire protection and emergency medical response services in the project vicinity are provided by the SRVFPD. Fire protection at the project site would be provided by Fire Station 36 located at 2001 Lusitano Street, approximately 2.9 mile driving distance to the northwest. Prior to construction of the second residence, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Compliance with SRVFPD requirements would ensure that project impacts in emergency response and evacuation would be less than significant.

b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The lot is relatively flat and contains numerous trees due to its nature as a walnut orchard; however, construction drawings for the building permit for the existing single-family residence within the walnut orchard was reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Similarly, the construction drawings for the second single-family residence would be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD. Accordingly, based on this SRVFPD review and approval, access to and from the residence would not be substantially encumbered due to a wildfire and persons on the project site would be able to readily evacuate if necessary. Therefore, wildfire risk to the occupants of single-family residences on the project site would be less than significant.

c) *Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (Less than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 20.b above, construction plans for the second residence would be reviewed and approved by the SRVFPD, and compliance with all Fire Protection District requirements would ensure that temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment due to wildfires would be less than significant.

d) *Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (Less than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 7.a.iv and 7.c, the project is not within a landslide area and the risk of unstable soil would be less than significant. Thus, expose of people or structures to significant risk of fire-related slope instability due to the proposed project would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- [FHSZ Contra Costa County SRA 11x17 09292023.pdf | Powered by Box](https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/Portals/0/State%20Fire%20Marshal%20-%20State%20Responsibility%20Area%20Fire%20Hazard%20Severity%20Zone%20Maps%20-%20Contra%20Costa%20County%20-%20March%2027%202024.pdf), 2025. *Office of the State Fire Marshal, State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, Contra Costa County, updated March 27, 2024.*

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

- [Stations & Facilities | San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District](#), 2025. *San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, Fire Stations*.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 3 (Air Quality), 5 (Cultural Resources), 6 (Energy), 7 (Geology and Soils), and 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have potentially significant construction impacts on air quality, and due to the accidental discovery of buried archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. Mitigation measures, including Air Quality 1, Air Quality 2, Cultural Resources 1, and Cultural Resources 2 are proposed that address these potentially significant impacts. If the proposed project is approved, the mitigation measures will be conditions of approval of the proposed project and the applicant will be responsible

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

for implementation of the measures. With implementation of the mitigation measures, project impacts will be less than significant.

*b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (**Less Than Significant Impact**)*

There are no improvements proposed that will significantly alter the existing environmental conditions of the site. Nevertheless, the proposed project and construction implications have been analyzed as part of this study and were found to have a less than significant impact on the environment. The incremental impacts of this project are negligible and the risk of cumulatively considerable impacts (when considering past, current or probable future projects) is less than significant given the land use limitations for properties outside of the Urban Limit Line.

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

This Environmental Checklist has disclosed impacts that would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. If the project is approved, all identified mitigation measures will be included as conditions of approval for the project, and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures. As a result, there would not be any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES


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

- Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, 1971. *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances. U.S.E.P.A. Office of Noise Abatement and Control*, Contract 68-04-0047.
- California Department of Conservation. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2020*.
- California Emergency Management Agency, 2009. *Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning: Richmond Quadrangle/San Quentin Quadrangle, Mare Island Quadrangle, Benicia Quadrangle*.
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department, June 25, 2024. *Land Use Permit LP23-2056 Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval*.
- Henry Justiniano & Associates, Geotechnical Engineering, May 30, 2023. *Geotechnical Update Proposed Single Family Residence 6621 Johnston Rd. Pleasanton, California*.
- Henry Justiniano & Associates, Geotechnical Engineering, July 25, 1989. *Geotechnical Study for Single Family Residence, Johnston Road, Contra Costa, California*.
- SHAER-K Engineering, 2023. *New Miramonte Residence, Site Plan, Front Elevation, Details and Notes*.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil conservation Service, 1977. *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California*

ATTACHMENTS


- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Project Plans**

Vicinity Map



This map is a user generated, static output from an internet mapping application and is intended for reference use only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION. CCMAP is maintained by Contra Costa County Department of Information Technology, County GIS. Data layers contained within the CCMAP application are provided by various Contra Costa County Departments. Please direct all data inquires to the appropriate department.

Spatial Reference
PCS: WGS 1984 Web Mercator Auxiliary Sphere
Datum: WGS 1984



NEW MIRAMONTE RESIDENCE

TBD JOHNSTON ROAD

PLEASANTON, CA

BUILDING CODE CRITERIA

2022 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (2021 IBC WITH STATE AMENDMENTS)
 2022 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE (2021 UMC WITH STATE AMENDMENTS)
 2022 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE (2021 UPC WITH STATE AMENDMENTS)
 2022 CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC CODE (2021 NEC WITH STATE AMENDMENTS)
 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE, 2022
 COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA CONSTRUCTION ORDINANCES

CONSTRUCTION TYPE: V-B
 OCCUPANCY TYPE: R-3

APN: 204-120-015-1 ZONED R-L

TOTAL LIVING AREA 2194 sf

COVER'D PORCHES 364 sf
 282 sf
 646 sf

GARAGE 536 sf
 TOTAL AREA 3376 sf



MIRAMONTE RESIDENCE
 TBD JOHNSTON ROAD
 PLEASANTON, CA


DATE: JUNE 2023
 SCALE: AS SHOWN
 DRAWN BY: K.S.WRIGHT
 DWG FILE: 23.09
 DRAWING NO. A1
 SHT 1 OF 6

SHOVER-K ENGINEERING
 ARCHITECTURAL ENGINEERING DESIGN
 980 MANN CREEK ROAD
 WEISER, ID 83672
 FOR Plan's App'd 7.23
 PH (208) 549-2156
 kseke@yahoo.com



REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

FRAMING NOTES:

- A. Provide min. R-30 insulation in all attic spaces U.O.N. Provide R-15 insulation in all under floor areas.
- B. Exterior walls shall be 2x 6 studs @ 16" o.c. U.O.N. Use 2x 4 studs @ 16" o.c for interior walls, U.O.N.
- C. All exterior walls and walls common to the house & garage shall have R-13 insulation.
- D. Provide metal gutters & downspouts.
- E. Provide attic venting per venting calculations.
- F. Provide 2x wood fascia at all eaves.
- G. New walls and ceilings common to house & garage shall be of fire resistive constr. sheathed w/ $\frac{5}{8}$ " Type X sheetrock on the garage side from the fdn. to the underside of roof sheathing. Include all posts, beams, ceilings and walls of garage adjacent to and supporting residence.
- H. Door(s) common to garage and house shall be 20 min. labeled, tight fitting w/ weather stripping. Door(s) shall be self-closing and self-latching.
- I. Provide min. 22" x 30" attic access w/ weather stripping having min. clr. ht. of 30" in location shown on flr. plan. Provide switch lighting w/in reach of access door.



LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

WINDOW & GLAZING NOTES:

- A. Minimum window area shall be 8% of the floor area of any habitable space with 4% of the area operable. CRC Section R303.1.
- B. Bedroom windows shall comply with CRC R310.1 for egress. Windows shall have a minimum net clear openable area of 5.7 sf w/ a minimum net clear openable height of 24". The minimum net clear openable width dimension shall be 20". Egress windows shall have a maximum finished sill height of not more than 44" above the floor.
- C. Glazing in individual fixed or operable panels adjacent to a door where the nearest vertical edge is within a 24" arc of either vertical edge of the door in a closed position and where the bottom edge of the glazing is less than 60" above the walking surface shall be safety glazing. CRC Section R308.4.
- D. Provide safety glazing where windows are within 18" of the floor and/or when adjacent to all stairways and landings.
- E. Safety glazing is required for all doors and enclosures for all bathtubs, showers, hot tubs, whirlpools, saunas, steam rooms. Hinged shower doors shall open outward.
- F. All new door and window returns shall be minimum 3" (2 studs) wide, U.O.N.
- G. Windows shall be dual pane, insulated. All windows shall be Milgard Tuscan Series with vinyl frames. Title 24 calcs to match.
- H. All windows shall be labeled in accordance with T-24 requirements. All windows and glass doors have U-Factor = 0.35 and SHGC = 0.35.
- I. All exterior doors and windows shall have a head ht. of 7'-0" U.O.N. on the plans.