

## CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Conco Industrial Subdivision  
County Files #SD17-9459 & #LP14-2046
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County  
Department of Conservation and Development  
30 Muir Rd.  
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Sean Tully, Senior Planner / (925) 674-7800  
Department of Conservation and Development  
Community Development Division  
30 Muir Road  
Martinez, CA 94553
4. **Project Location:** Five parcels located along the western boundary of the Walnut Creek Channel, approximately 0.74 miles south of the Waterfront Road bridge/crossing. (APN: 159-250-018, -019, -020, -021, -022)
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Gonsalves and Santucci, Inc.  
5141 Commercial Circle  
Concord, CA 94520
6. **General Plan Designation:** Heavy Industry (HI) and Open Space (OS)
7. **Zoning:** Heavy Industrial (H-I)
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant requests approval of a tentative map to subdivide a 66.57-acre portion of the project site (APN 159-250-018, -019) into six individual industrial lots. Included is a request for approval of a land use permit to allow 1) the establishment of up to five contractor's yard uses (1 immediate, 4 future); 2) roadway and utility improvements impacting three additional parcels (APN 159-250-020, -021, -022); and 3) importation of up to 155,576+/- cubic yards of fill material, some of which is composed of lightweight confoam material. Lastly, the proposed project also consists of the following secondary elements:
  - Request for an exception from collect and convey requirements.
  - Establishment of an office trailer, metal shop, and truck scale in the area of Lot 1.
  - Establishment of a private roadway network consisting of paved roadways up to 24 feet in width with 4-foot gravel shoulders.
  - Establishment of a private sewer facility consisting of grinder/ejector pumps, lift stations, wet wells, and force mains.
  - Extension of existing sanitary sewer lines.
  - Establishment of a 37-foot Private Access & Utility easement.
  - Establishment of a 10-foot Private Sanitary Sewer easement.
  - Establishment of a drainage easement ranging in width between 84 and 162 feet.

- Placement of pre-load fill material along the future alignment of the Walnut Creek levee. Relocation of the Walnut Creek levee will be completed as an element of the forthcoming Lower Walnut Creek Restoration Project, and is not part of this project.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

**Surrounding Area:** The project site is located within an urban and developed area of Martinez, in western Contra Costa County. The surrounding area primarily consists of large industrially-zoned properties ranging in size between approximately 3.5 and 196 acres in area. Existing land uses in the surrounding area include the Martinez Gun Club, the Republic Services Transfer Station, Reliable Trucking truck yard, and various oil and petroleum refining facilities. Pacheco Creek is located immediately west of the site, Walnut Creek and an associated levee are located immediately east of the site, and Suisun Bay is located approximately 1.8 miles to the north.

**Subject Property:** The project site consists of five parcels totaling approximately 95 acres in area. Approximately 72 acres of the project site is vacant and mainly consists of weedy grasslands and embedded wetlands. This area was previously used for solar evaporation of liquid effluent from the nearby Vine Hill Complex, which was used as a Class I hazardous waste treatment storage and disposal facility until 1989. The remaining 23 acres is the current site of a concrete pumping contractor's yard also owned by the applicant. The majority of the project site is less than 10 feet above sea level, and as a result, the entire project site is located within a FEMA 100-year floodplain.

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

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- County Flood Control District
- Contra Costa Water District
- Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**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.?**

A "Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation" was forwarded to the Wilton Rancheria on January 28, 2019. As of the completion of this study, the County had not received a response nor a request for consultation.

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics              | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils           | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      |
| <input checked="" 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

Sean Tully  
Senior 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
<b>1. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The project site is located in a low-lying area of Martinez, just south of Suisun Bay. Aside from nearby Vine Hill, the majority of the area surrounding the project site is relatively flat. The combination of the region’s flat topography, existing structural development, and mature trees significantly reduce the number of locations where long-range views of Suisun Bay or Mt. Diablo are available. Currently, grade elevation at the site ranges between approximately 4 and 6 feet above sea level. The 155,500 cubic yards of fill proposed for deposit at the site will be spread across an approximately 35-acre portion of the site, and as a result, will result in lot grade elevations of no more than approximately 11 feet above sea level. This relatively small increase in grade elevation at the site has very little potential for impacting scenic vistas of Suisun Bay or Mt. Diablo that may exist from adjacent properties.

Lot-1 is proposed for immediate development as a contractor’s yard, and will be improved with structures such as an office trailer and metal shop. There is no maximum structure height in Heavy Industrial (H-I) zoning districts, and the design of these proposed structures have not yet been finalized. However, the flat topography of the surrounding area and distance of these proposed structures from adjacent properties will limit any potential for impacting scenic vistas to a less than significant level.

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

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

There are no scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or buildings located on the project site. In addition, the portions Interstate 680 (north of State Route 24) and State Route 4 (west of State Route 160) in the vicinity of the project site are not Caltrans Officially Designated Scenic Highways. Based on the above, the potential for the proposed project substantially damaging scenic resources within a state scenic highway is less than significant.

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

As defined in Section 21071 of the Public Resources Code, the subject property is located within an urbanized area of Contra Costa County. There is no specific plan, overlay zoning district, or zoning standard related to scenic quality that is applicable to the subject property or proposed project. The Open Space Element of the County General Plan does consist of various policies, goals, and implementation measures focused on scenic quality and resources. Although there are many scenic resources within the County, the policies, goals, and implementation measures of the Open Space Element generally focus on resources such as hilltops, ridges, rock outcroppings, mature stands of trees, and bodies of water/watercourses. There are no hilltops ridges, rock outcroppings, or trees located on the subject property, and the adjacent Walnut and Pacheco Creeks will not be impacted as part of the project. Therefore, the potential for the project conflicting with any policy of the Open Space Element intended for the governing of scenic quality is less than significant.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Only one of the proposed lots (Lot-1) is proposed for immediate development. However, when fully developed, the project site would be able to accommodate up to five contractor’s yards. The final design and lighting needs of each contractor’s yard have not yet been determined, and will require additional review prior to establishment. However, it is assumed that each facility will require some lighting for safe access around buildings, parking lots, and equipment storage areas of each lot, which may result in significant light levels during nighttime hours. In addition, it is anticipated that the outdoor storage of materials may take place at one or more of the contractor’s yards. Depending on the quantity and reflectivity of these stored materials, there is also potential for significant levels of glare during daytime hours.

Potential Impacts

Due to the contractor’s yard nature of the uses that will be established on each lot, there is a likelihood that exterior lighting will be utilized for safe access and the outdoor storage of

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

materials. Depending on the scale of development on each lot, there is a potential for the creation of a new substantial sources of light or glare that can adversely affect views in the area.

Mitigation Measures

AES-1: All outdoor light fixtures shall be strategically located, and shall be deflected downward to focus illumination on the lot in which they are located, and not to adjacent properties.

AES-2: The use of highly reflective building materials, such as glass with reflectivity over 25 percent or unfinished metals, shall be prohibited. All exterior materials and other components of structures proposed shall be finished with paints or other materials with a reflectivity less than 55 percent.

AES-3: If the outdoor storage of highly reflective materials or equipment is proposed, the storage area shall be enclosed with solid fencing, or similar barrier, that is of a height that will significantly screen the highly reflective materials from adjacent properties.

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

<b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

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

Pursuant to the 2016 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map maintained by the California Natural Resources Agency, the subject property has been categorized as “Urban and Built-Up” land. Therefore, there is no potential for converting farmland to a non-agricultural use.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

The project site is located within one of the County’s Heavy Industrial (H-I) zoning districts. Due to the industrial nature of the zoning district, there is no potential for the proposed project conflicting with existing zoning for agricultural uses or with a Williamson Act contract.

- c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g) or conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?*

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

The project site is located within an urban area of the County where forest land or timberland does not naturally occur. Additionally, the project site is located within an H-I zoning district, which would not allow for the management of forest resources or the growing or harvesting of timber. Lastly, there is no element of the proposed project that consists of a request for, or that will result in, a zoning change of the project site. Based on the above, there is no potential for the proposed project conflicting with or causing the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland –zoned Timberland Production.

- d) *Would the project involve or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The project site is located within an urban area of the County where forest land does not naturally occur. In addition, due to the frequency of drought-type conditions of Contra Costa County, the project site would not be capable of supporting 10 percent native tree cover without irrigation improvements. Therefore, pursuant to the definitions stated in Section 12220(g) of the Public Resources Code, the subject property would not be considered as forest land.

- e) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

Although vacant, the project site is considered as “Urban and Built-Up” land by the California Natural Resources Agency partly due to the prior use of the property and the urban nature of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposed project will be industrial in nature, and will have no potential for impacting any agricultural properties or uses that exist within the County. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project resulting in the conversion of existing farmland to a non-agricultural use.



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

<b>3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The County’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) is designed to reduce local greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while improving community health. As an implementation measure, the CAP includes a GHG reduction strategy that is consistent with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) guidance for preparation of a GHG reduction strategy. The CAP’s 2020 GHG reduction target is also consistent with State Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and the associated scoping plan, which seek to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Since the approval of AB 32 in 2006, post-2020 GHG reduction goals have been identified in various Executive Orders signed by the Governor. The most recent reduction goal amendment being that of Executive order B-30-15 approved in April of 2015, which set a GHG emissions target for 2030 at 40 percent below 1990 levels. The County is now in the process of updating the CAP to comply with these new standards and goals

As an implementation measure, the CAP consists of a GHG reduction strategy designed to be consistent with BAAQMD strategies. To assist planning staff with implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy from a project level, the CAP includes a development checklist (Appendix-E) which, when completed, identifies a project’s consistency with the CAP. Appendix-E lists the following standards for identification of a development project’s consistency with the CAP.

- Installation of high-efficiency appliances and insulation to prepare for the statewide transition to zero net energy.
- New nonresidential development will install high-efficiency appliances and insulation.
- New residential and nonresidential development will meet the standards to be solar ready as defined by the California Building Standards Code.
- New single-family houses and multi-family units with private attached garages or carports will provide prewiring for EV charging stations inside the garage or carport.

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

- New multi-family (greater than five units) and nonresidential (greater than 10,000 square feet) developments will provide EV charging stations in designated parking spots.
- New residential and nonresidential development will be located within one half-mile of a BART or Amtrak station, or within one quarter-mile of a bus station.

Staff will recommend that the entitlement for the proposed development be conditioned to require that staff of the County Building Inspection and Community Development Division verify the project’s compliance with the CAP’s Appendix E standards (where possible) prior to approval of building permits for the proposed project. By ensuring compliance with the development checklist, the potential for the project conflicting with or obstructing the implementation of the County CAP is reduced 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?*

The BAAQMD CEQA guidelines is a guidance document that provides lead agencies, consultants, and project proponents with uniform procedures for assessing air quality impacts. The document recommends quantification thresholds for use in determining whether construction and operational activities associated with development projects will have significant adverse environmental impacts, identifies methodologies for predicting project emissions, and identifies measures that can be used to avoid or mitigate identified air quality impacts. The BAAQMD is in the process of updating their CEQA guidelines to reflect revised CEQA Guidelines, recent court decisions, methodologies, and mitigations intended to ensure the Bay Area maintains its ability to meet GHG reduction pursuant to current 2030 and 2050 goals. As these updates have not yet been adopted, the County continues to utilize the most recent guidelines for air quality analysis, which were published in May of 2017.

The development’s projected operational emissions levels will be well below the BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as shown in the chart below.

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance for Project Operations		
Emissions Type	Significant missions rate (tons/yr.)	Project Emissions (tons/yr.) <sup>1</sup>
ROG	10	0.3928
NO <sub>x</sub>	10	0.0732
PM <sub>10</sub>	15	0.0566
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	10	0.0157
GHGs	10,000 MT/yr	244 MT/yr <sup>2</sup>

The proposed project also has potential for exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations as a result of emissions from the use of heavy equipment and other activities related to the construction phase of the project. As shown in the chart below, the anticipated 55lbs/day Nitrogen Oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions levels exceed the significance threshold.

BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance for Project Construction Activities			
Emissions Type	Significant missions rate (lbs/day)	Project Emissions (lbs/day) <sup>3</sup>	Mitigated Project Emissions (lbs/day) <sup>4</sup>
ROG	54	5	5
NO <sub>x</sub>	54	55	50
PM <sub>10</sub> (exhaust)	82	1	1
PM <sub>2.5</sub> (exhaust)	54	1	1
GHGs	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Potential Impact

The equipment needed for the construction and grading phases of the project would result in NO<sub>x</sub> levels that exceed BAAQMD thresholds of significance. With the implementation of the BAAQMD’s “Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects” as well as project-specific mitigations to specify the tier of off-road diesel engines permitted for use during the construction phase, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions will be reduced to a less than significant level.

<sup>1</sup> Project emissions quantities calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2

<sup>2</sup> GHGs considered for annual project emissions include CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CO<sub>2e</sub>

<sup>3</sup> Project emissions quantities calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2

<sup>4</sup> Project emissions quantities calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2

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

Mitigations

AIR-1: To reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and Particulate Matter (PM) emissions during construction phase activities, all off-road diesel engine equipment used for construction-related activities shall be equipped with Tier-3 grade or better diesel engines.

AIR-2: The following BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures shall be implemented throughout the construction phases for all lots within the subdivision.

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose materials off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15mph.
- 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.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxins control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specification. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- The property owner or general construction contractor shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Please refer to the analysis and discussion in Subsection-b above.

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

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

The contractor’s yard proposed for establishment on Lot-1 of the subdivision will be that of a building contractor, which is not a use type that is typically associated with or expected to generate objectionable odors during operations. The future tenants for Lot-2 through Lot-5 have not been identified at this time, and thus the potential odors from those uses cannot be assumed. However, it should be noted that the subdivision will be conditioned to require approval of a County land use permit prior to establishment of each future contractors yard, which will allow for additional environmental review for potential odor emissions from those uses.

Construction activities at the project site will require diesel-powered vehicles and equipment, which may result in localized odors. However, these odors would be temporary and would dissipate in the outdoor construction environment. In addition, the diesel engine idling time restrictions of mitigation measure AIR-2 will help to reduce odor impacts from diesel fuel combustion. Lastly, the project site is over 2,000 feet east of the nearest residence and is surrounded by existing odor producing industrial sources (e.g., transfer station, Acme Landfill, Tesoro Refinery) that are currently in operation.

Based on the nature of the proposed use, the project site’s location away from sensitive receptors, and location adjacent to existing odor sources, the potential for the proposed project resulting in odor emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people is less than significant.

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

<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?*

Between March of 2015 and July of 2017, biologists of Salix Consulting administered six field assessments of the project site. These assessments revealed that aside from wetlands, the project site is one primary habitat type classified as ruderal annual grasslands. These grasslands provide foraging habitat for a variety of resident and migratory birds, nesting habitat for several avian species, and habitat for various mammals.

There are eleven special-status plant species that have been documented as occurring within five miles of the project site. Of those eleven species, Bolander’s waterhemlock, Congdon’s tarplant, Suisun marsh aster, San Joaquin spearscale, Saline clover, Soft bird’s-beak, and Marin knotweed

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

are the seven species that have the potential for occurring at the site due to the availability of suitable habitat. Although suitable habitat for these species has been identified at the site, none were observed by Salix Consulting biologists during their assessments.

There are thirteen special status animal species that have been documented as occurring within five miles of the subject project site. Of those thirteen species, Western pond turtle, Northern harrier, Burrowing owl, Short-eared owl, and Saltmarsh harvest mouse are the five species that have the potential for occurring at the site due to the availability of suitable habitat. Although suitable habitat for these species has been identified at the site, none were observed by Salix Consulting biologists during their assessments.

Potential Impact

Review of historical assessment databases for the surrounding area and biological assessments of the project site indicate that seven special-status plant species and five special-status animal species have potential for being present at the project site. These special-status species have the potential for being impacted by activities that may occur during the construction phase of the proposed project. Incorporation of the following mitigations will reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Special-Status Plant Species

BIO-1: Prior to building or grading permit issuance, and prior to any vegetative clearing, brush clearing, or other ground disturbing activity including paving associated with construction or development of the lots, a pre-construction survey shall be administered and a report shall be prepared by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of the seven special-status plant species listed in the September 2017 report of Salix Consulting as potentially occurring at the site. The rare plant survey shall be conducted during the optimal time to identify the target species (spring and summer), and shall include appropriate mitigations as necessary to avoid significant impacts. The survey report shall be submitted to the CDD for review and approval.

BIO-2: Should federally- and state-listed Soft bird's-beak be found to be located at the project site, consultation may need to occur with USFWS and or CDFW. Should any plants species with California Native Plant Society (CNPS) rank be located within the assessment area, appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed in coordination with the CDD.

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

Western Pond Turtle

BIO-3: Preconstruction Survey: Prior to any ground disturbance that occurs between April 1 and October 31, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for Western pond turtle and their nests. This shall include a search for nests in uplands on the landside of the levees.

BIO4: Avoidance and Minimization: If nest sites are located, the applicant shall notify the CDFW and a 50-foot buffer area around the nest shall be staked. Work shall be delayed until hatching is complete and the young have left the site.

Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds

BIO-5: Preconstruction Survey: Prior to any ground disturbance during the nesting/breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey no more than 15 days prior to initiation of the proposed ground disturbance activities. This survey shall include the use of standard protocols for burrowing owl surveys, as outlined by the CDFW *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012)*. If active nests are found on or immediately adjacent to the, CDFW shall be contacted to determine the appropriate avoidance measures. If no nesting is found to occur, ground disturbance may proceed.

Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse

BIO-6: The upland grassland areas adjacent to the wetland pickleweed habitats may be used by the Salt Marsh harvest mouse on occasion. To eliminate the potential for take of Salt Marsh harvest mouse outside of the wetland buffer area and to minimize the potential for impacts to potential habitat, the following measures are recommended:

- Prior to the initiation of ground disturbance in the upland grassland areas adjacent to pickleweed habitat, a qualified biologist shall conduct an environmental training session for all contractors and construction personnel. At a minimum, the training shall include a description of the Salt Marsh harvest mouse and its habitats; the specific avoidance measures being implemented for this species; and the boundaries within which work may be conducted.
- Prior to the initiation of ground disturbance in the upland grassland areas adjacent to pickleweed habitat, an exclusion fence shall be established outside of all wetlands on the construction side(s). This fence shall serve the purpose of a barrier to keep Salt Marsh harvest mice from entering the construction site, and will act as a barrier



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

to keep construction personnel and equipment out of the wetlands and Salt Marsh harvest mouse habitat. The fence shall be trenched into the ground and backfilled to prevent mice from moving underneath the fence. The final design and proposed location of the fencing shall be reviewed and approved by regulatory agencies prior to being installed. No construction activities or personnel will be allowed in habitats inside of the exclusion fencing. The qualified biologist shall monitor the fence periodically to ensure that it remains an effective barrier to Salt Marsh harvest mice. The fence will be maintained as needed and remain in place until the completion of ground disturbance in the upland grassland areas adjacent to pickleweed habitat.

- The Salt Marsh harvest mouse exclusion fencing shall be installed with an opening into the habitat areas. After this installation, all remnant habitat (pickleweed patches) within the ground disturbance area shall be cleared only by hand and / or hand tools (e.g., trowel, hoe, rake, shovel). Any mice located within the remnant habitat patches should passively relocate through the opening and into the adjacent habitat. No motorized equipment, including weed whips, shall be used to remove pickleweed within the ground disturbance area. A qualified biologist shall monitor the pickleweed removal within the ground disturbance areas. Once the pickleweed is removed, the fence shall be closed to encompass the habitat and exclude mice from reentering the ground disturbance area.

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?*

Pursuant to Figure 8-1 (Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas) of the County General Plan, the subject property is not located within one of the County’s identified significant ecological areas. Additionally, the subject property is not located in or adjacent to an identified refuge, wildlife area, or ecological reserve area of either the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The East Bay Municipal Utility District maintained Waterbird Regional Preserve is located approximately 3,000 feet west of the project site, and there is no element of the proposed project that will directly impact that regional preserve. Lastly, portions of Pacheco and Walnut Creek abut the project site along its northern, western, and eastern boundaries. No element of the proposed project consists of encroachment, realignment, or any other physical changes to either creek. Based on the above, the potential for the project having a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is less than significant.

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?*

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

A wetland delineation map of the project site was prepared by Wood Biological Consulting in 2003. A revised map was then submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“Corps”), who conducted a field verification on September 14, 2015. In a preliminary jurisdictional determination dated February 17, 2016, the Corps provided a map indicating that 5.43 acres of wetlands and 4.48 acres of other waters (mostly unvegetated salt flats) are present at the project site. The Corps’ direction was to categorize any waters that have less than 5% vegetation cover as “Other Waters”, but it should be noted that there is only a subtle difference between wetlands and “Other Waters” as they are essentially biologically identical.

Using the available wetland delineation maps, the applicant has been able to design the project in a manner that will avoid physical encroachment upon all wetlands areas at the site. However, because the nature and design of the future contractor’s yards to be located on Lot-2 through Lot-5 have not yet been identified, there is potential that future development on those lots could result in the removal of existing wetland areas.

Potential Impact

Future improvements proposed as part of the project may result in direct removal or other substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands located at the site. However, incorporation of the wetlands mitigation listed below will reduce that potential to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

BIO-7: In the event that any construction (currently proposed or future) at the project site will result in unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional wetlands, regulatory permits shall be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404 Clean Water Act) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401 Clean Water Act). The amount and type of mitigation for wetland habitat loss shall be determined during the permitting process by the regulatory agencies, but shall be no less than a 1:1 ratio (replacement to impacts) for in-kind wetlands on a functions and values basis. Mitigation shall be provided through purchase of wetlands credits from an approved wetlands mitigation bank. If this option is not available or feasible, then proponent-sponsored mitigation or in-lieu fee payment may be used if available and feasible, and is approved by the regulatory agencies.

- 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?*

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

Pacheco Creek and Walnut Creek abut the project site along its northern, eastern, and western boundaries. However, there is no element of the proposed project that requires the direct removal, fill, or relocation of any portion of those watercourses. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project impacting migratory fish that may utilize those watercourses, is less than significant. The biological assessment completed for the project indicates that ground areas within the project site could serve as nesting habitat for migratory birds, which could be disturbed by future construction activities at the site. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5, the potential for impacts to migratory birds will be reduced to a less than significant level. Lastly, there are no wildlife nursery sites located anywhere on the subject property.

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

There are no mature trees located at the project site, and thus there is no potential for the project conflicting with the County’s Tree Preservation and Protection ordinance.

The Conservation Element of the County General Plan consists of goals and policies that focus on natural resources within the County. Of those natural resources, three that are discussed in detail are vegetation, wildlife, and water resources. Generally speaking, the goals and policies are intended to identify, preserve, and manage the valuable natural resources of the County. Some of the policies that are directly applicable to the project are listed as follows:

Vegetation and Wildlife Policies

- **8-6:** Significant trees, natural vegetation, and wildlife populations generally shall be preserved.
- **8-10:** Any development located or proposed within significant ecological resource areas shall ensure that the resource is protected.
- **8-17:** The ecological value of wetland areas, especially the salt marshes and tidelands of the bay and delta, shall be recognized. Existing wetlands in the County shall be identified and regulated. Restoration of degraded wetland areas shall be encouraged and supported whenever possible.
- **8-27:** Seasonal wetlands in grassland areas of the County shall be identified and protected.

Vegetation and Wildlife Implementation Measures

- **8-j:** setback from the edge of any wetland area may be required for any new structure. The breadth of any such setback shall be determined by the County after environmental review examining (a) the size and habitat value of the potentially affected wetland, and (b) potential impacts on the wetland, and adjacent uplands, arising out of the development and operation of the new structure. Unless environmental review indicates that greater or lesser protection

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

is necessary or adequate, setbacks generally will be between 50 and 100 feet in breadth. Expansions or other modifications of non-habitable agriculturally-related structures existing as of 1990 shall be exempt from this setback requirement. Parcels which would be rendered un-buildable by application of this standard shall also be exempt.

- **8-1:** The County shall require avoidance, minimization and/or compensatory mitigation techniques to be employed with respect to specific development projects having a potential to affect a wetland. In evaluating the level of compensation to be required with respect to any given project, (a) on-site mitigation shall be preferred to offsite and in-kind mitigation shall be preferred to out-of-kind, (b) functional replacement ratios may vary to the extent necessary to incorporate a margin of safety reflecting the expected degree of success associated with the mitigation plan, and acreage replacement ratios may vary depending on the relative functions and values of those wetlands being lost and those being supplied. To the extent permitted by law, the County may require 3:1 compensatory mitigation of any project affecting a "Significant Wetland".

Water Resource Policies

- **8-78:** Where feasible, existing natural waterways shall be protected and preserved in their natural state, and channels which already are modified shall be restored. A natural waterway is defined as a waterway which can support its own environment of vegetation, fowl, fish and reptiles, and which appears natural.
- **8-79:** Creeks and streams determined to be important and irreplaceable natural resources shall be retained in their natural state whenever possible to maintain water quality, wildlife diversity, aesthetic values, and recreation opportunities.
- **8-89:** Setback areas shall be provided along natural creeks and streams in areas planned for urbanization. The setback areas shall be of a width adequate to allow maintenance and to prevent damage to adjacent structures, the natural channel and associated riparian vegetation. The setback area shall be a minimum of 100 feet; 50 feet on each side of the centerline of the creek.
- **8-93:** Particular care shall be exercised by development proposals to preserve and enhance riparian corridors along creeks which connect to the freshwater marsh segments of coastal areas in the North Central and East County areas.

The biological assessments of the project site identified special-status plants and animals that may be present, identified sensitive habitat, and confirmed the existence of previously delineated wetlands areas. The construction-phase mitigations detailed in Subsections a & c above, will ensure that impacts to the project site's sensitive species and habitats are reduced or even completely eliminated. This is substantially consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan Conservation Element.

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

- 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?*

The County has adopted the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides a framework to protect natural resources in eastern Contra Costa County. This plan covers areas within the Cities of Brentwood, Clayton, Oakley, Pittsburg, as well as unincorporated areas of Eastern Contra Costa County. The proposed project has no potential for conflicting with the provisions of the East Contra Costa County HCP/NCCP because the project site is located in Martinez, which is not one of the areas of the County that is covered by the plan.

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

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
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?*

The project site was previously utilized for solar evaporation of liquid effluent from a nearby waste treatment storage and disposal facility, but has remained unused since that land use ceased in 1989. There are no buildings, structures, or other improvements at the site that have the potential for being deemed as a historical resource. Therefore, the potential for the project causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is less than significant.

- 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?*

The proposed project consists of importing a substantial amount of soil and the development of five of the proposed lots for contractor’s yard uses. The drainage infrastructure, roadway design, and structural improvements (i.e., metal shop, truck scale, office trailer) for Lot-1 have been identified; however, the scope of work and design details for future development of the remaining lots is unknown at this time and will require separate review by County staff.

**Potential Impact**

Since significant grading will be required for construction of the proposed structural improvements, roadways, and drainage improvements, there is potential for disturbance of underground archaeological resources that may not have been identified to date. Therefore, the following mitigations will be incorporated as part of the project to ensure that the proper action is taken in the event that cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbance.

**Mitigations Measures**

CUL-1: If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during ground disturbance activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery should be redirected. The CDD shall be notified and a qualified archaeologist contacted to

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

evaluate the finds and make recommendations. It is recommended that such deposits be avoided by further ground disturbance activities. If such deposits cannot be avoided, they should be evaluated for their significance in accordance with the California Register of Historical resources.

CUL-2: If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, they will need to be avoided by impacts, or such impacts must be mitigated. Upon completion of the archaeological assessment, a report shall be prepared which documents the methods, results, and recommendations of that assessment. The report shall be submitted to the Northwest Information Center and appropriate Contra Costa County agencies.

Prehistoric materials can include flakes-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, choppers) or obsidian, chert, or quartzite tool-making debris; culturally darkened soil (i.e., midden soil often containing heat-affected rock, ash and charcoal, shellfish remains, and cultural materials); and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historical materials can include wood, stone, concrete, or adobe footings, walls and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

**Potential Impact**

Since significant grading will be required for construction of the proposed structural improvements, roadways, and drainage improvements, there is potential for disturbance of underground human remains that may not have been identified to date. Therefore, the following mitigations will be incorporated as part of the project to ensure that the proper action is taken in the event that human remains are discovered during ground disturbance.

CUL-3: If human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected. The CDD and County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, an archaeologist should be contacted to assess the situation. If the human remains are of a Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendation for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

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



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

<b>6. ENERGY – Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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??*

Lot-1 through Lot-5 will be used as a contractor’s yard for industrial land uses. The grading, drainage infrastructure installment, and building establishment elements of the construction phase can all be implemented with the use of typical construction equipment and practices. Lot-1 will be utilized as a contractor’s yard for the property owner, and will be used for those minor fabrication and equipment storage activities typically associated with a building construction firm. There is no element of the proposed use for Lot-1 or scope of construction activities needed to establish all six resultant lots at the project site that would knowingly result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Lot-2 through Lot-5 will be leased to separate parties at a later time, and thus the exact nature of the uses and improvements proposed for those lots is not available at this time. However, it should be noted that approval of a separate discretionary land use permit will be required to establish each contractor’s yards on Lot-2 through Lot-5, which will allow for future assessment, and mitigation if necessary, of the potential energy impacts for each future use.

- b) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

As part of the County’s adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP), Energy Efficiency and Conservation is a topic that has been analyzed as part of the County’s effort to reduce local GHG emissions. To assist planning staff with the implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy, the CAP includes a development checklist (Appendix-E) that is utilized at the project-level to determine a project’s consistency with the CAP. For development projects such as that which is the subject of this study, the County can condition the entitlement to require that compliance with the standards of Appendix-E be verified prior to approval of building or grading permits. Since the applicant proposes to immediately construct buildings in the area of Lot-1, compliance with Appendix-E of the County CAP will be required as a condition of approval should the requested entitlements be granted. Requiring compliance prior to development at the site will ensure that both immediate and future development at the site does not conflict with the County’s local plan pertaining to renewable energy or energy efficiency.

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
----------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:**

The project site encompasses portions of the former Baker site, which was part of the Vine Hill Complex facility that was used for management of used oils, oil reprocessing, and the treatment of chemical waste until the facility was closed in 1989. The Baker site was primarily used for the solar evaporation of liquid wastes by way of using surface impoundment ponds that were separated by dikes. The majority of the project site lies within the footprint of former Ponds A and B. The current topography of the project site was created when the Baker Site was closed by removing dikes between the former ponds and placing fill to raise the site to its existing grade. The fill placed at the site ranges between 7.5 and 12.5 feet in thickness, and is a mixture of various soil materials including sandy lean clay, clayey sand, fat clay, abundant gravel, occasional debris, and concrete. Bay mud lies below the fill, stiff clay and silty sand underlie the bay mud, and sedimentary rock is below these materials over most of the site. Under the proposed project, approximately 155,500 cubic yards of fill will be imported to the site to raise grade of the resultant lots.

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

- a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:*
- i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

The majority of Lot-5 and a portion of Lot-3 are located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ) where recently active traces of the Concord-Green Valley fault are located. As such, the proposed project is subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and a fault investigation would be required for any structure intended for human occupancy (i.e., 2,000 or more person hours/year) that would be constructed in the identified EFZ. The applicant has identified building pads for each resultant lot, and has located the pads for Lot-3 and Lot-5 entirely outside of the identified EFZ.

Potential Impact

Portions of the project site are located within an identified Alquist-Priolo EFZ. Placement of habitable structures in this area may directly expose people and structures to significant adverse effects as a result of the rupture of the Concord-Green Valley fault. Mitigations as discussed below are required to reduce the potential for substantial adverse impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

- GEO-1: Prior to recordation of the Final Map, the applicant shall record a deed notification which runs with the property and alerts future property owners and lessees of the fact that portions of the project site are located within the official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone delineated by the State of California.
- GEO-2: No structures intended for human occupancy, as defined by the State Mining and Geology Board, shall be constructed within any portions of the subject property that are within the identified Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.
- GEO-3: Improvements within the identified Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone areas of the project site shall be limited to roads, surface parking, water quality/drainage improvements, and outdoor storage. Any proposal to allow uses not expressly listed above shall be subject to the review of the County Peer Review Geologist, and review and approval of the CDD.

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

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Portions of the project site are located within and adjacent to mapped portions of an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and thus are within a seismically-active area. As a result, the project site may be exposed to strong ground shaking depending on earthquake magnitude, distance to seismic sources, and other factors.

Potential Impacts

Future development at the site may expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects as a result of strong seismic ground shaking along the adjacent Concord-Green Valley fault. Mitigations as discussed below are required to reduce the potential for substantial adverse impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-4: Prior to the recordation of the Final Map, the project proponent shall submit a Geotechnical Update Report for review by the County Peer Review Geologist, and review and approval of the CDD. The report shall provide recommendations for future geotechnical investigation at the site, including recommendations for subdivision improvements, as well as recommendations that would address the need for geotechnical investigations that pertain to the future development of Lot-1 through Lot-5. The required geotechnical report(s) can address the entire site or be segmented to address parcel-by-parcel improvements. The scope of the geotechnical investigation shall address the following: (i) expansive soils, (ii) corrosive soils), (iii) liquefaction potential, (iv) settlement and monitoring settlement, (v) design of drainage facilities and their effect on planned improvements, (vi) provide seismic parameters based on the adopted California Building Code, and (vii) provide a point-by-point response to all of the geologic and soils hazards that are listed for discussion in in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

With regard to liquefaction potential, the Safety Element of the County General Plan includes a map that divides Contra Costa County into three categories: “generally high,” “generally moderate to low,” and “generally low.” This map was prepared for the County by a geotechnical engineering firm that considered available data on soil types, elevation of the water table, and limited review of borehole logs for land development projects within the County. This map is used as a “screening criteria” by Contra Costa County during the processing of land development applications, on a project-by-project basis. Since the map

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

was included in the General Plan (1990), the County has consistently required rigorous evaluation of liquefaction potential in areas of “high potential,” and less comprehensive investigations are demanded in the “moderate to low” category. The map attempts to be conservative on the side of safety, and where geologically recent fluvial or esturine deposits are shown on soils maps of the County, the Liquefaction Potential Map places such areas in the “generally high” category. Site specific investigations are needed to determine if liquefiable sands are present and to provide stabilization measures where liquefiable sands are confirmed.

According to this map, the project site is in the “generally high” category. As mentioned above, project sites with this classification only require a rigorous evaluation of the liquefaction potential. On a site where the rate of sedimentation is high, borings would be needed within the “footprint” of each planned structure for human occupancy. Borings typically would be 50 feet deep, but due to the fact that the project site is bounded by two creek channels, deeper borings may be appropriate. In the experience of the County Peer Review Geologist, only 1 acre of every 100 acres of land in the “generally high” category have the unique conditions required for liquefaction of sands to be a hazard, and geotechnical measures are available to avoid/control the risk of damage should liquefiable soils be present.

Potential Impact

The project site is located in an area of the County that has been identified by the County General Plan as having soils that have a “generally high” liquefaction potential. In addition the project includes a proposal to place approximately 155,500 cubic yards of fill at the site to raise the elevation of grade for each lot. Depending on its composition, the imported fill could pose a liquefaction hazard. Incorporation of the mitigations below will reduce the potential for substantial adverse impacts as a result of liquefaction, to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-4 and:

GEO-5: Engineered Fill: Fill placed at the site shall be a soil or soil/rock mixture free of deleterious matter and contain no rocks or hard fragments larger than 4-inches in maximum dimension with less than 15 percent larger than 1-inch maximum dimension.

GEO-6: Compaction: Surfaces in areas to be filled should be scarified to a depth of at least 8-inches. The scarified soil shall be moisture conditioned to at least 3

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

percent over optimum moisture content and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) test D-1557 shall be used to establish the reference values for computing optimum moisture content and relative compaction. If soft or yielding soils are present during subgrade preparation or fill compaction, they should be scarified, moisture conditioned, and compacted or removed by excavating to expose firm soil.

Fill shall be placed in lifts 8 inches or less in loose thickness and moisture conditioned to at least optimum moisture content. Moisture conditioning should be performed before compaction. Each lift should be methodically compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. A sheepsfoot compactor or equivalent shall be used for compacting clay soils. Material that fails to meet the moisture or compaction criteria should be loosened by ripping or scarifying, moisture conditioned, and then recompacted. After compaction, fills shall not be allowed to dry out. This may require periodic sprinkling or covering with an impermeable barrier.

iv) *Landslides?*

The project site is relatively flat with elevations at the site ranging between 4 feet and 8 feet above sea level. Even after the imported fill has been placed and compacted, the site will remain free of any significant topographic changes. Due to very small elevation range and lack of steep slopes at the site, the potential for landslides occurring at the property is less than significant.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

The Soil Survey of Contra Costa County has mapped the soil of the project site as Omni silty clay (Qb). This soil type is very cohesive and naturally drains very slow. Therefore, any portions of the project site that will not be covered by imported fill will have a less than significant potential for resulting in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measures GEO-5 and GEO-6, the fill imported to the site will be of a composition and level of compaction that is also resistant to erosion. As a result, the potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as a result of the project is less than significant.

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?*

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

In its's current condition the project site consists of undocumented fill that is a mix of various soils, bay mud, stiff clay and silty sand, and sedimentary rock.

Potential Impact:

Based on the identified soil and geologic units, soils at the site may be expansive, subject to liquefaction, and subject to settlement.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-6

- 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?*

The project site consists of a relatively thick layer of bay mud that can be found below the majority of the site.

Potential Impact

The project site consists of a thick layer of bay mud which is known to be highly expansive. Expansive soils expand with the addition of water and shrink when they dry out. This continuous change in soil volume can cause structures and other improvements to move unevenly and crack over time.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-6

- 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?*

The Environmental Health Division of the County Health Services Department has reviewed the proposed project, and has advised that fill material is not suitable for a septic system. However, Lot-1 through Lot-5 will be outfitted with a grinder pump and wet well private sewage system. Wastewater will be pumped from each lot to a private master sewage lift station wet well at the southerly end of Lot-1. Sewage flows will then be pumped from the master sewage lift station and discharged to an existing private lift station located at an adjacent Conco Concrete Yard also owned by the project proponent, which has a direct connection to existing public sewer services and infrastructure of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District.



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

- f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

County staff is unaware of any sight assessments or record research that indicates the presence of a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature at the site. However, the project site consists of bay mud from the Holocene Epoch and sedimentary rock, which Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources, 2010) indicate are rock units that have some potential for containing significant paleontological resources.

Potential Impact

The combination of the project site’s geologic properties and the need for substantial ground disturbance activities as part of the project creates the potential for disturbance of underground paleontological resources that may not have been identified to date. Therefore, to be conservative, the following mitigations will be incorporated as part of the project to ensure that the proper action is taken in the event that paleontological resources are discovered during ground disturbance activities.

Mitigations Measures

GEO-7: In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during grading or other construction activities at the site, all construction, excavation, or grading activities within 100 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted until the CDD has been notified and a qualified paleontologist has had the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and provide proper management recommendations.

GEO-8: If the site is found to contain significant paleontological resources (as determined by CEQA Guidelines), funding shall be provided by the applicant to identify, record, report, evaluate, and recover the resources as necessary. Construction in the area of the find shall not recommence until impacts to the paleontological resource is mitigated.

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

<b>8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</b>				
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?*

The BAAQMD’s Thresholds of Significance includes an analysis and screening criteria for determining if the projected Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions for a project would contribute to a significant impact to the environment. As is done with regulated air pollutants, if the project would generate GHG emissions above the identified threshold, the proposed project would be seen as having the potential for having a significant impact. Table 2-1 (Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance) of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project with “Operational-Related” GHG emissions (stationary source) that exceeds 10,000 MT/yr. will have a significant impact on the environment.

CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed in collaboration with the air districts of California to provide a uniform platform for quantifying potential criteria pollutants and GHG emissions associated with construction and operational activities of land use projects. Based on project specific data, and default data of the CalEEMod computer model, the proposed development would result in GHG emissions levels as shown in the table below.

<b>Operational-Related GHGs Emissions Levels (Stationary Sources)</b>	
Emissions Type	Project Emissions (MT/yr.)*
Total CO <sub>2</sub> (Bio-CO <sub>2</sub> & NBio-CO <sub>2</sub> )	113.96
CH <sub>4</sub>	0.5779
N <sub>2</sub> O	5.8900 e-003
CO <sub>2</sub> e	130.17
<b>Projected Project Total</b>	<b>244.71</b>

\*Project emission quantities based on 30,500 ft<sup>2</sup> of proposed pad area and 7.12 acres of proposed paved surfaces (roadway), and was calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2

Based on the projected emissions levels shown above, future development at the site will result in less than 10,000 MT/yr. of GHG emissions, and thus the potential for the project having a significant impact on the environment is less than significant.

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

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

The County has adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) which includes a GHG reduction strategy. The goal of the strategy is to reduce community-wide emissions to 15% below 2005 levels by the year 2020. To assist planning staff with implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy, the CAP includes a development checklist (Appendix-E) which verifies a project’s consistency with the CAP. By conditioning the proposed project to require that staff of the Building Inspection and Community Development Divisions verify the project’s compliance with Appendix-E of the County CAP prior to issuance of any building or grading permits, the potential for the proposed project conflicting with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases is reduced to a less than significant level.

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

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?*

The project consists of approval of a tentative map for the creation of six lots, five of which will be used for contractor's yard land uses. The contractor's yard for Lot-1 will be immediately developed and used by the property owner. The property owner is a building contractor, and will be utilizing Lot-1 for the storage of materials and equipment used at various construction sites. Based on the nature of the proposed use for Lot-1, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that a hazard will be created as a result of transporting, using, or disposing hazardous materials.

Lots-2 through -5 will be leased to alternate parties who will establish separate contractor's yard uses and associated improvements as needed. Those lessees have not yet been identified, and thus the details or the manner in which the contractor's yards on Lots-2 through -5 will be administered is not yet known. However, this project will be conditioned to require that the establishment of each future contractor's yard be allowed only after the granting of a land use permit entitlement

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

from the County. This County review will allow for a subsequent project-specific environmental review in the event that hazardous materials will be used as part of any of the future land uses.

- 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?*

The subject property is located on a portion of the former Vine Hill Complex hazardous waste facility, which was owned and operated by the IT Corporation. The Vine Hill Complex was comprised of the Vine Hill and Baker sites, and was used for the treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste until it was closed in 1989. The subject site is located in the area of the former Baker Site, which consisted of various surface impoundments used for the storage and solar evaporation of hazardous wastes.

After the closure of the Vine Hill Complex in 1989, hazardous wastes remaining in the Baker Site impoundments were solidified and consolidated into a closure cell/landfill (“Baker Landfill”) located on a parcel (APN: 159-250-014) that is southwest of and immediately adjacent to the properties that comprise the project site. In addition, groundwater control systems and associated infrastructure were installed below the Baker landfill to recover groundwater and leachate for conveyance off the site. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) granted the closure of the Baker Site in 1999, and noted that the property had been remediated to levels that allow unrestricted future land use. The applicant has been in contact with IT Environmental Liquidating Trust (ITELT), who is the party currently monitoring and maintaining the Baker Landfill. In addition to including the approximate location on the project plans, the applicant has requested a complete inventory and location map of all infrastructure currently serving the Baker Landfill, and will be working with ITELT and DTSC to field locate that infrastructure prior to any construction activities at the project site. This coordinated effort will ensure that the exact alignment of the groundwater control system infrastructure is determined, and that the proposed confoam fill material can be placed as necessary to significantly lessen the potential for damage from the imported fill and roadway improvements.

The applicant has considered the importance of ITELT and the DTSC’s continued access to the Baker Landfill. As a result, the applicant has designed the project to ensure that access points will be made available during construction activities, and from the paved private street serving the proposed industrial lots. In addition, an easement over the proposed private access will be granted to ITELT and their authorized representatives for continued access and maintenance of their facilities.

Since the Baker Site as a whole was cleaned and closed to DTSC standards, the fact that the proposed project will not disturb or otherwise impact the Baker Landfill, and continued access to the landfill for monitoring and maintenance will be provided; , the potential for the proposed

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

project creating a significant hazard through the likely release of hazardous materials is 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?*

There are no existing schools or schools proposed for location with one-quarter mile of the project site.

- 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?*

The subject property is a portion of IT Corporation’s former Vine Hill Complex hazardous waste disposal site, which utilized large surface impoundments for the storage and solar evaporation of hazardous waste. However, the hazardous waste that remained in the surface impoundments that formerly covered the area of the project site were solidified and consolidated into a landfill under permit from the DTSC. Although the former Vine Hill Complex appears on DTSC’s list of hazardous materials sites, the project site is located in that area of the former Vine Hill Complex that has been cleaned and certified for closure by the DTSC. As discussed in Subsection-b above, the adjacent Baker Landfill has been considered in the project design, and will in no way be impacted as part of the project. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment is less than significant.

- 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?*

The subject property is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Buchanan Field Airport. This means that the subject property is in an area of the County that is routinely affected by aircraft operations, and that certain land use actions are subject to Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review. Section 1.5 (Types of Actions Reviewed) of the County’s Airport Land Use Compatibility plan identifies the types of actions that require, or are subject to, ALUC review. The actions include, but are not limited to, amendments to a General or Specific Plan, adoption of certain zoning ordinances or building regulations, modification of an airport or its master plan, and major land use actions within the noise contour or Safety Zones of either of the County’s two public airports.

The project consists of subdividing the subject property for the establishment of five separate contractor’s yards. The proposed project does not propose modifications to the County General Plan, a specific plan, the County Zoning Code, or the County Building Code. Furthermore, the

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

subject property is not located within the existing or projected noise contours or any of the delineated Safety Zones for the Buchanan Field Airport. Lastly, the proposed project does not meet the criteria of a major land use action that would require ALUC review pursuant to Section 1.5.3(a)(1) of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Based on the nature and scope of the proposed project, location of the project site outside of applicable safety zones and noise contours, and the criteria of projects that require review by the ALUC, the potential for the proposed project resulting in a safety hazard or excessive noise exposure for people residing or working in the project area is less than significant.

- f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Aside from required utility extensions and roadway improvements, all structural improvements will take place within the boundaries of the two existing parcels that will be subdivided for the creation of the industrial lots. All proposed utility extensions will be located underground, and thus will not impede traffic flows on any surrounding roadways and waterways that may provide access to the site or that may be part of an existing emergency response or evacuation plan. In addition, the proposed project will not impact any existing power poles, telecommunication towers, or other mediums for communication which may be part of an existing emergency response or evacuation plan. Based on the above, the potential for the project impairing implementation or physically interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is less than significant.

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

The project site is located within an urbanized area of the County, and is surrounded by commercial and industrial uses such as a trucking yard, oil refineries, a gun club, and a landfill. In addition, the project site and surrounding properties (aside from the oil refineries located along the eastern boundary of Walnut Creek) are all located within the service district of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (“CCCFPD”). CCCFPD has reviewed the plans for the proposed project, and there has been no indication that the proposed project poses a significant wildfire risk. In the event the proposed project is approved, the CCCFPD has notified the County and applicant of standards that must be incorporated in the project design such as fire hydrant installation, access roadway design, and fire sprinkler/suppression systems. Based on the subject property’s location within an urban environment and the CCCFPD’s service area, and the project’s requirement for compliance with CCCFPD standards, the potential for the proposed project exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires is less than significant.

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

<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?*

If the proposed project is approved, the resultant lots will serve as locations for building contractor’s yards, or other similar contractor land uses. Lot-1 will be occupied and operated by the property owner, who is a building contractor. Lot-1 will be primarily utilized for the outdoor storage of trucks and equipment, a metal shop for minor fabrication and equipment maintenance, and a small office trailer. There are no elements or activities associated with the operation of the proposed use on Lot-1 that pose a significant potential for violating water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The lessees for Lot-2 through Lot-5 have not yet been identified, and thus the details of future land uses for those lots is unknown. However, the project will be conditioned to require that the lessees obtain approval of a County-issued land use permit prior to development or establishment of a use on each lot, which will allow for subsequent environmental review. Lastly, it should be noted that the subject property is within the service area of and will be connected to public sewer services of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD).



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

Based on the nature of the proposed use and the future connection to CCCSD public sanitary sewer infrastructure, the potential for the project violating water quality standards, violating waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrading water quality is less than significant.

- 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?*

The subject property is located within the service area of the Contra Costa Water District. The resultant lots will connect to existing CCWD potable water infrastructure via new 12-inch underground water pipeline extensions within the proposed private access roadways, and thus will not need to draw water from existing groundwater supplies. CCWD will have access to this infrastructure via 37- and 33-foot private access and utility easements over the proposed private roadways.

As part of the post-closure monitoring for the Baker Site, groundwater monitoring wells were installed along the perimeter of the Baker Landfill (closure cell). Ground water from these wells is tested to detect any migration of contaminated water from the landfill, and is pumped to a groundwater treatment plant at the nearby Vine Hill Site via underground pipelines. The groundwater pipeline runs from the northwestern corner of Baker Landfill, and along the western boundary of the project site within an existing 10-foot utility easement. The project includes a proposal to remove the top two feet of native soil over this existing pipeline, and ensure that imported fill placed above those pipelines is comprised of lightweight confoam material. Use of this lightweight fill limits the weight and/or stress levels on or near the pipeline infrastructure.

Since the proposed project will have access to CCWD water and the existing groundwater conveyance pipelines will be protected by using lightweight fill material, the potential for the proposed project substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or substantially interfering with groundwater recharge is less than significant.

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

- i) *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

There is no element of the proposed project that will alter the course of Pacheco Creek or Walnut Creek.

The project consists of constructing more than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface due to the proposed paved roadways, and thus triggers the requirement for completion and

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

submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP). The applicant has submitted a preliminary SWCP which has been reviewed and deemed as adequate for the proposed project. The plan identifies self-treating areas, proposed retaining detention basins, and underground drainage infrastructure that will assist in the collection and treatment of stormwater generated at the site. In the event the proposed project is approved, the project will be conditioned to require that a Final SWCP be submitted for review, approved, and implemented at the site prior to the recordation of the Final Map. Implementation of the approved SWCP will ensure that drainage patterns at the site meet standards of the County’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Implementation of the SWCP and compliance with the County’s applicable drainage standards will ensure that the potential for the project resulting in substantial erosion or siltation, flooding, exceeding the capacity of existing drainage systems, or impeding/redirecting flood flows is less than significant.

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

Due to the project site’s location within a flood zone, the project includes a proposal to import fill to raise the grade level for each resultant lot. This imported fill will in-turn reduce the amount of stormwater that can be contained at the site prior to draining to adjacent properties or the two adjacent creeks. In consultation with County Flood Control District staff, a hydraulic analysis was administered to determine the maximum amount of fill that could be imported to the site without significantly increasing the water surface elevation (WSEL) in Pacheco and Walnut Creeks. The analysis determined that a WSEL change of 0.10 feet or less would be negligible. Furthermore, to remain within this threshold, the study found that fill imported to the site shall not exceed the 11-foot elevation (North American Vertical Datum of 1988, NAVD 88).

Potential Impact

The amount of fill imported to the site directly reduces the amount of stormwater that can be contained at the site. Too great a reduction in the project site’s storage capacity has the potential to significantly increase the WSEL of Pacheco and Walnut Creeks, which can subsequently increase flooding and other hazards to properties downstream. By incorporating the following mitigation to limit the amount of fill imported to the site, the potential for impacts as a result of an increased WSEL of Pacheco and Walnut Creeks would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

Mitigation Measure

HYD-1: Increases in the WSEL of Walnut and Pacheco Creeks as a result of stage storage changes from imported fill at the project site shall not exceed 0.10 feet. To stay below this threshold, fill imported to the site shall not exceed the 11-foot elevation (NAVD 88) or a total volume of 155,576 cubic yards.

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?*

Please refer to the analysis and discussion in Subsection-i above.

iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

Please refer to the analysis and discussion in Subsection-i and ii above.

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

The subject property is located within a 100-year flood hazard area as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project consists of importing approximately 155,500 cubic yards of fill, which will raise finished grade of Lots-1 through -5 within five feet of the flood elevation for all portions of the site. However, 155,576 cubic yards of fill is the maximum the project site can accommodate while only causing a negligible hydraulic increase (0.10 feet or less) to the water surface elevation (WSE) of Pacheco and Walnut Creek.

In the event of a 100-year storm, there is a likelihood that the project site will be inundated beyond the capacity of the proposed drainage system. Lot-1 is proposed for use as a building contractor's yard, and thus it is expected that building materials and construction equipment will be stored at the site. There is no evidence to suggest that hazardous materials, solid waste, or other byproducts will be stored at the site in quantities that will pose a risk for significant pollutant release as a result of inundation. The details of the future lessees and associated land uses for Lot-2 through Lot-5 have not yet been identified, and thus the risk from those uses cannot be assessed. However, subsequent environmental reviews will be conducted for each of the future contractor's yards as the project will be conditioned to require discretionary land use permit approval prior to the development of Lot-2 through Lot-5. Based on the nature of the proposed building contractor's yard identified for Lot-1 and the requirement for environmental reviews prior to the development of each of the remaining lots, the potential for the proposed project resulting in significant pollution as a result of inundation is less than significant.

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

- e) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The resultant lots will be connected to public sanitary sewer infrastructure of the CCCSD via an underground infrastructure connection to an existing private lift station located on the adjacent property under common ownership. In addition, County staff has reviewed drainage plans and a SWCP completed for the project, and have determined that they meet standards of the County’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Lastly, the applicant has proposed the use of lightweight confoam fill material to reduce the potential for adversely impacting the groundwater collection system for the adjacent Baker Landfill property. Based on the above, the potential for the project conflicting with or obstructing implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan is less than significant.

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

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The subject property is located within an urbanized portion of the County, and is surrounded by vacant properties, landfills, contractor’s yards, and oil refineries. The project site is already physically divided from surrounding properties to the north, east, and west by Pacheco and Walnut Creek. Aside from the adjacent Baker Landfill site, the subject site is separated from properties to the south by an existing railroad. Lastly, the subject property is vacant, and thus there are no established communities currently located at the project site that would be physically divided by the proposed access roads or lot configuration. Based on the above, there is no potential for the proposed project physically dividing 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?*

The majority of the project site is located within a Heavy Industry General Plan Land Use designation. A small portion at the northern extent of the site is located within an Open Space designation. However, this area of the property has been identified as the location for wetland habitat, and thus no improvements will take place in this area. The Heavy Industry designation allows for land uses that require large areas of land with convenient truck and rail access, such as metalworking, chemical or petroleum processing and refining, and heavy equipment operation. The proposed subdivision will result in six lots, five of which have been designated for contractor’s yard uses; which will be compatible with the landfill, refinery, and other industrial land uses that surround the site. The compatibility of the proposed land use with those around it results in a less than significant potential for the people, improvements, and overall environment surrounding the project site being exposed to new conditions that may have an adverse impact due to their incompatibility.

The Land Use Element of the County General Plan provides policies for specific geographical areas of the unincorporated County. These specific area policies focus on providing additional policies associated with the unique characteristics and needs of each area. Pursuant to Figure 3-2 of the County General Plan, the project site is immediately adjacent to the Vine Hill/Pacheco Boulevard specific policy area. The three policies for this area focus on protecting the scenic assets and slopes of Vine Hill Ridge (Policy 3-104), buffering the neighborhood east of I-680 from

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

industrial/landfill-related uses (Policy 3-105), and encouraging the continued operation of the Viano Family vineyard and winery. The proposed subdivision and contractor’s yard establishment has no potential for conflicting with any of these plans or policies.

The Conservation Element of the County General Plan provides policies to protect natural resources and their uses. To do so the Conservation Element contains various policies aimed at protecting ecological resources, conserving natural resources through the control of urban growth, and achieving a balance of uses of the County’s natural and developed resources. Biological mitigation measures (BIO-1 through BIO-7) have been incorporated as part of the project to protect the wetlands, sensitive species, and other ecological resources on or around the project site. There is no proposal for a rezoning, General Plan amendment, or Urban Limit Line adjustment that could impact urban growth in the County. Lastly, there is no element of the project that would offset the balance of the use of the County’s natural and developed resources. Based on the above, the potential for the project conflicting with the policies of the Conservation Element geared toward avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts is less than significant.

In addition to that which is discussed above, the proposed project will be subject to review and/or standards of the DTSC, County Public Works Department, and County Health Services Department. By requiring that the project sponsor adhere to the review and permitting protocol enforced by these agencies, the potential for the project causing an environmental impact as a result of a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation geared toward avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts is reduced to a less than significant level.

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

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**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?*

Pursuant to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located within any of the County’s known significant mineral resource areas. Additionally, review of findings reports from prior borings administered at the site at the request of the prior landowner indicate that Bay Mud extends down to elevations of -54 feet, sediment stiff clay and silty sands underneath the Bay Mud, and that bedrock underlies the sediment. There is no information in the record this far to indicate that any valuable mineral resources are located at the project site. As such, the potential for the project resulting in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource is less than significant.

- 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?*

There are no general plan, specific plan, or other land use plans within the County that delineate the existence of a resource recovery site on the subject property.

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

<b>13. NOISE – Would the project result in:</b>				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?*

The Noise Element of the County General Plan indicates that Community Noise Exposure Levels at or below 75 dB (decibels) L<sub>dn</sub> (Day-Night Average Level) are categorized as “Normally Acceptable” for industrial land uses. The subject property is surrounded by active industrial uses such as the Tesoro Oil Refinery, Acme Landfill, Central Concrete Supply Company, and the Republic Services Contra Costa Transfer Station; as well as other noise generating land uses such as the Martinez Gun Club and the adjacent railroad line. Based on the building contractor’s yard nature of the use proposed for Lot-1, any increase in ambient noise levels generated by the project would be negligible beyond those created by the existing surrounding land uses. The nature of the future contractor’s yards to be located on Lot-2 through Lot-5 is unknown at this point, and thus the noise generated from those future uses cannot be assessed. However, approval of a discretionary land use permit will be required prior to the establishment of the contractor’s yards on those lots, which will allow for subsequent project-specific environmental assessments for potential noise impacts.

- b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?*

The daily operation activities of the building contractor’s yard proposed for Lot-1 will primarily consist of large truck and construction equipment storage, construction material storage, and some minor equipment fabrication activities. None of these activities are typically associated with the generation of excessive ground borne vibration. Lessees for the four remaining contractor’s yards have not yet been identified, and thus the potential for the generation of ground borne vibration



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

or noise from those uses cannot be analyzed at this time. However, the subdivision will be conditioned to require County approval of a land use permit prior to the establishment of each future contractor’s yard, which will allow for a subsequent environmental assessment specific to the nature of each lot’s development.

The construction phase of the project also has the potential for generating ground borne vibration and noise. This is due to the large-scale trucks and construction equipment needed to import and place the proposed fill, required soil compaction activities, and the construction of the paved access roads. However, the subject property is surrounded on three sides by Pacheco and Walnut Creek, and the Baker Landfill on the other, which will help in buffering the levels of ground borne vibration and noise impacting the surrounding properties. In addition, land use types such as a building contractor’s yard, Acme Landfill, Republic Services Transfer Station, and Tesoro Refinery surround the project site, some of which also generate ground borne vibration and noise that area characteristically similar to that of the construction phase for the project. Due to the temporary nature of the ground borne noise and vibration generated by the construction phase of the proposed project and the existing vibration and noise generated by the industrial uses in the area, the potential for the construction phase of the project generating excessive ground borne vibration and noise beyond what already exists today is less than significant.

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

Exhibits 5D through 5G of the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan illustrate the noise contours associated with Buchanan Field Airport activity in 1999, as well as projected noise contours for future activity anticipated at the airport. The exhibits detail the surrounding properties that will be impacted by noise levels of 50dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or more. The subject property does not fall within any of the noise contours for either the current (as of 1999) or projected Buchanan Field airport activities. Since studies indicate that the subject property will not be subject to airport noise levels of 50dBCNEL or greater, the potential for the project exposing people residing or working within the project area to excessive airport noise is less than significant.

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

<b>14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</b>				
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)?*

The proposed project does not include the construction of any residential housing, and once fully developed and operational, will support no more than five contractor’s yards. This lack of a residential component and inclusion of a relatively small increase in business opportunities will result in a negligible population increase in the County, if any.

The project includes the construction of three private roads (Roads “A”, “B”, and “C”) that will provide access to the six resultant lots. These private access roads will provide access through to the Imhoff Drive public right-of-way via a series of private access easements over adjacent Conco and Central Contra Costa Sanitary District properties. These new private roads and easements would only provide access to development within the project site because the project site is surrounded by Walnut Creek and Pacheco Creek, and no bridges across those watercourses are proposed as part of the project. Furthermore, the primary utility extensions (i.e., water, sanitary sewer) proposed as part of the project will be minor lateral extensions that are only sufficient enough to support the proposed development.

Based on the lack of a residential element, relatively small increase in business opportunities, and the relatively small-scale utility and roadway improvements proposed, the potential for the project inducing a substantial unplanned population growth in the area is less than significant.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project site is vacant and does not consist of any existing housing or substantial numbers of people who otherwise occupy the property. Therefore, there is no potential for displacing substantial numbers of existing people or housing as a result of the proposed project.

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

<b>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:</b>				
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?*

The project site is located within the service area of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD), who has had an opportunity to review and comment on the project. In their comment letter of March 15, 2017, the CCCYPD provided a list of standards that will apply to the project. The listed standards include, but are not limited to, all-weather driving surface design standards, access gate standards, hydrant and water supply standards, and square footage thresholds for fire sprinklers. There has been no indication from the CCCYPD that altered or new fire protection facilities will be necessary to accommodate the proposed project.

b) *Police Protection?*

The subject project is located within the service area of the Contra Costa County Sheriff. As discussed throughout this report, the proposed project does not include a residential element that will result in a substantial population increase within the County. In addition, based on the size of the resultant parcels, the five contractor’s yards to be established at the site will not be of a scale that would create significant quantities of new business opportunities within the County. Based on the above, the proposed project will not pose a substantial risk to the County’s ability to maintain the General Plan standard of having 155 square feet of Sheriff station area and support facilities for every 1,000 members of the population. Therefore, the potential for the project resulting in substantial adverse impacts as a result of expanded police protection facilities is less than significant.

c) *Schools?*

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

The project site is located within an area that does not fall under the jurisdiction of any of the County’s eighteen school districts, and thus there was no school district from which project comments could be provided. In addition the proposed project will not induce a significant population increase within the County, which could result in a significant increase in the number of students within the County. Based on the above, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that the project would increase the demand for educational services that could not be accommodated by existing schools within the County. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the expansion of existing or construction of new schools is less than significant.

d) *Parks?*

The proposed project will not induce a significant population increase within the County. Therefore, the proposed project will not pose a significant risk for the County being unable to maintain the General Plan standard of having three acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 members of the population. In addition, the potential overall scale and industrial nature of the future contractor’s yards will not generate a quantity of new employees within the County that would significantly increase the use of the County’s existing parks and recreational areas in a manner that would require expansion of existing or the construction of new facilities. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the expansion of existing or construction of new parks is less than significant.

e) *Other public facilities?*

During staff’s initial review of the proposed development and prior to deeming the project complete, project-specific comments were solicited from various local agencies and other interested parties (other than those discussed above in this section) in order to alert County staff and the applicant to any additional permitting, improvements, or other actions that may be required for full permitting and implementation of the project. Among the groups solicited for the project were the County Health Services Department, Public Works Department, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, and the Contra Costa Water District. No indication of a need for new or expanded facilities was received from any of these agencies.

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

<b>16. RECREATION</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The proposed project does not include a residential element that would directly induce a population increase within the County. In addition, the proposed land uses will not be of a type or scale that would create a substantial quantity of new employment opportunities within the County. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project resulting in substantial physical deterioration of parks or other recreational facilities as a result of increased use is less than significant.

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

The proposed industrial subdivision does not include a recreational facilities element. Due to its industrial nature, the County's Park Dedication Ordinance is not applicable to the proposed project (Section 920-4.006 Exemptions and proviso) and thus there is no requirement for the dedication of park land or payment of an in lieu fee. Based on the above, the project will not require or result in the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities.

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

<b>17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:</b>				
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?*

Policy 4-c of the County General Plan’s Growth Management Element and the County’s Transportation Demand Ordinance (Chapter 82-32) require that a traffic impact analysis be administered for any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (8<sup>th</sup> edition) and the 30,500 total square feet of office/metal shop space anticipated for the site, the anticipated total daily trips to be generated by the project is 109<sup>5</sup>. Since the total daily trip amount is only slightly over 100 trips, it is clear that neither the AM or PM peak-hour trip amounts would exceed the 100 trip thresholds, and thus would not be significant enough to require a traffic impact analysis.

The purpose of the Transportation and Circulation Element of the County General Plan is to establish goals, policies, and implementation measures to assure that the transportation system of the County will have adequate capacity to serve planned growth within the County through 2020. Generally speaking, the policies and implementation measures of the Transportation and Circulation Element focus on achieving goals such as safe and efficient multimodal transportation systems, maintaining or improving traffic service standards/levels, reducing greenhouse gases, encouraging bicycling and walking, and appropriate street design. Most of the policies and implementation measures are enforced on a regional or plan level, and thus would not be applicable to the proposed project. However, there are certain policies and implementation measures, including, but not limited to, those pertaining to roadway design and traffic standards, would apply on a project level. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department, which is the County agency that maintains and enforces standards pertaining to public roads. They have reviewed the proposed project, and have determined that the private roadway design would exceed applicable design and safety standards of the County General Plan and Division 98 (Streets) of the County Ordinance. The applicant has considered the levee

<sup>5</sup> Daily trip generation calculated using land use description/ITE code Warehousing (150)

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

relocation element of the future Lower Walnut Creek Channel Project, and has incorporated roadway design elements that will ensure continued access for any future vehicle, pedestrian, or trail access that will occur along that new levee alignment. The project site is located within an industrial region of the County away from high-density residential or commercial development, and thus many policies pertaining to public and or multimodal transportation systems do not apply. The resultant lots will be accessed via private roads that cross adjacent private property, and are void of any existing bike lanes or trails that would require extensions through the project site.

Based on the project’s anticipated vehicle trip generation, location within an industrial region of the County, and the County Public Works Department’s review of the proposed project; the potential for the project conflicting with any applicable programs, plans, ordinances, or policies is less than significant.

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

As of the date this Initial Study was published, Contra Costa County has not developed and adopted its own thresholds of significance for analyzing transportation impacts in terms of a project’s anticipated vehicle miles traveled (VMT). However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c) allows lead agencies to consider thresholds previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or experts, provided the decision to adopt those thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.

Pursuant to the “Technical Advisory *On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*” (December 2018) by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy or General Plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day can be assumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. In summary, this threshold is based on OPR’s analysis of CEQA categorical exemptions for existing facilities, and the linear increase of trip generation in relation to building footprint. Based on the project’s anticipated daily trip count of 109, the proposed project is assumed to have a less than significant potential for causing a significant transportation impact.

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)?*

The project site consists of constructing three new private roads that will provide access to each of the resultant lots. The design of these roads have been reviewed by the County Public Works Department, and have been deemed as meeting or exceeding minimum County private road standards. There has been no requirement from the County Public Works Department nor a proposal from the applicant to alter the design or configuration of any existing off-site roadway (i.e., Imhoff Drive, access road over CCCSD property) that provides access to the site.

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

Furthermore, contractor’s yards will be established on the resultant lots, which will result in the use of passenger vehicles, dump trucks, and other large trucks for equipment transportation on the access roads. These vehicles will be substantially similar to those used by surrounding industrial land uses such as the adjacent contractor’s yard and the CCCSD properties. The lack of modifications to existing roadways, Public Works Department approval of the proposed private roadway design, and similarity of vehicles/equipment to be used at the site, limits the potential for an increase in hazards due to a geometric feature or incompatible use, to a less than significant level.

d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

The project design is subject to the access roadway requirements and standards of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD). Since the proposed private roadways will be less than 28 feet in width, the applicant will be required (via fire district plan approval and on-site inspection) to post “No Parking – Fire Lane” signs at the site. Furthermore, design features such as all-weather roadway surfaces, “turn arounds” for Fire District apparatus, and fire hydrants will also be incorporated in the design as required by the CCCYPD. The incorporation of these design features combined with CCCYPD’s required plan review and inspection prior to final inspection or use of any buildings or roadway at the site, will reduce the potential for the proposed project resulting in inadequate emergency access to a less than significant level.



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

<b>18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>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:</i></b>				
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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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)?*

The County is unaware of any assessments being administered at the site to determine the existence of tribal cultural resources. However, between the 1940s and 1989, the project site was utilized as a hazardous waste solar evaporation site for the IT Corporation. The nature, scale, and activities required to establish the surface impoundments associated with that use would have likely caused substantial changes to any tribal cultural resources that may have existed at the site. In addition, the filling of the surface impoundments and other physical changes made to the property after the closing of the IT Corporation facility would have likely caused further substantial changes in the significance of any tribal cultural resources that may have existed at the site. Lastly, a “Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation” was forwarded to Wilton Rancheria on January 28, 2019. Neither a request for consultation nor a denial was received in response to this correspondence. Based on the nature of the grading and chemicals used for the operation and clean-up of the prior use, the potential for any tribal cultural resources existing at the site is extremely low. In addition, there has been no indication from representatives (Wilton Rancheria) of the native tribes known to have historically occupied the area, that the project site is a tribal resource. Therefore, the potential for the proposed project causing a substantial adverse change to a significant tribal cultural resource is less than significant.

- b) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?*

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

Please refer to the analysis and discussion in subsection-a above.

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

<b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – <i>Would the project:</i></b>				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The proposed project consists of private sewer facilities, water infrastructure, drainage improvements, and improvements for other common utilities that will be established at the site. All of these utility improvements will require connections to existing infrastructure and facilities, but there will be no need for the construction of new or relocated facilities. Therefore, the potential for the project resulting in significant environmental impacts as a result of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities is 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?*

The resultant lots will receive public water services from the CCWD via an existing main located in the area. The CCWD has worked closely with the applicant on the project design due to their infrastructure and easements that encroach upon the boundaries of the project site. Throughout their communication with the applicant and County staff, there has never been any indication from

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

the CCWD that the water demand of the proposed project would exceed their capacity. In an email dated September 14, 2018, the CCWD advised that they had received an updated project submittal package addressing their prior comments, and that they had no further comments to provide on the project. Therefore, there is no information in the record or from the water service provider to indicate that water demand of the project would exceed their capacity.

- 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?*

The project will be served by a grinder pump and wet well private sewer facility. This on-site private system will pump sewage flows to an existing private lift station located on the adjoining Conco concrete contractor’s yard located at 5050 Imhoff Drive (APN: 159-250-021). The private lift station located on the adjacent Conco property is directly connected to public sanitary sewer infrastructure of the CCCSD. The CCCSD has reviewed the proposed on-site private system, and there has been no indication that the proposed project will exceed their capacity. Furthermore, that applicant will be required to obtain a construction plan stamp-approval from the CCCSD prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.

- 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?*

The proposed project would generate solid waste during both the construction and operational phases. Construction at the site would be subject to the County CalGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, which require that 65 percent (by weight) of the material and waste from project job sites be reused, recycled, or otherwise diverted from landfill disposal. Furthermore, the subject property is within the service area of Republic Services, who will provide solid waste removal and recycling services. The primary activity of the proposed contractor’s yards will be that of storing vehicles and equipment required for operation, rather than manufacturing or processing activities that tend to produce higher quantities of waste. Lastly, Keller Canyon Landfill and Acme Landfill are the two active and permitted landfills within the County that would accept waste from the project site. As of the capacity assessment completed in November of 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had approximately 84 percent of its maximum capacity remaining to accept waste, and had an estimated closure date of December 31, 2030 based on that capacity. As of the capacity assessment completed in March of 2012, the Acme Landfill had approximately 8 percent of its maximum capacity remaining to accept waste, and had an estimated closure date of July 1, 2021 based on that capacity. Based on the relatively low anticipated solid waste generation of the proposed use, the remaining capacity of the County’s two active landfills, and CalRecycle’s management of the state’s waste management programs in cooperation with service providers such as Republic Services, the potential for the proposed

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

project generating solid waste in excess of State or local standards or conflicting within Federal, State or local regulations is less than significant.

- e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Please refer to the analysis and discussion in Subsection-d above.

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

<b>20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>				
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?*

The proposed project includes paved access roadways that will allow for unimpeded access to and from the site. In addition, the project has been reviewed by the CCCFPD, who has provided a list of standards and regulations that are applicable to the project design. Lastly, no element of the proposed project will adversely impact any regional-scale communication systems within the County that may be used as part of an emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, the potential for the project substantially impairing an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan is 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?*

The subject property is located within a relatively flat area of the County, and lacks any substantial sloping topography within its boundaries. In addition, the project site is located within a developed industrial area of the County, which significantly reduces the potential for a wildfire occurring in the vicinity of the project site. Lastly, the project site is within the service area of the CCCFPD, who has required that the applicant incorporate fire hydrants within the project design. Based on the nature of the surrounding environment, design of the proposed development, and location

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

within the CCCFPD service area. The potential for the proposed project exacerbating wildfire risks is 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?*

The CCCFPD has reviewed the proposed project, and has provided a list of fire protection improvements that must be incorporated as part of the project. The list includes, but is not limited to, fire hydrants, emergency apparatus turnarounds, Knox Company operated gate switches, and building fire sprinkler systems. All of the required improvements would reduce the fire hazard at the site, and are common fire safety improvements that can be easily incorporated into the proposed elements of the project. Therefore, the potential for the project increasing fire risk or impacting the environment as a result of the installation or maintenance of fire protection infrastructure is less than significant.

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

As discussed above, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the proposed project will increase wildfire risks or hazards within the County. Therefore, the potential for the project increasing risks to people or structures as a result of increased post-fire runoff, slope instability, or drainage changes is less than significant. There is a potential for downstream flooding as a result of the imported fill, which has been analyzed and mitigated as discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this study.

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

<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?*

The site’s location adjacent to Pacheco and Walnut Creeks and the proposal for significant fill importation have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment as a result of increased water surface elevations. As a result, a mitigation has been incorporated as part of the project to limit the amount of imported fill, which reduces the resultant change in the water surface elevation, potential for downstream flooding, and stormwater runoff to adjacent properties.

A biological assessment of the project site found that wetlands and other land cover types known to serve as possible habitat for sensitive wildlife and plant species exist at the site. Based on the proposed land uses and activities associated with the improvement of the site, the project has the potential for degrading the quality of those resources. As a result, biological mitigations have been incorporated as part of the project to avoid or lessen those impacts, or to even replace those resources that have been destroyed or removed.

With the incorporation of the grading and biological mitigation discussed above, the project has a less than significant potential for substantially degrading the environment, reducing habitat of a



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

fish or wildlife species, reducing wildlife populations, or eliminating examples of California history or pre-history.

- 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.)*

Staff is aware of four additional substantial development projects in the vicinity of the proposed project that are under review or have been recently approved by the County. These project are as follows:

1. Chevron Avon Connectivity Project (County File #LP18-2027): The project consists of installing approximately 1.5 miles of lateral pipeline to transport gasoline and diesel fuel from an existing Chevron Avon Terminal to an existing Kinder Morgan Concord Terminal. The project also consists of installing two new 200,000-barrel storage tanks at the Avon Terminal. The majority of the proposed pipeline will be installed underground within the Solano Way right-of-way. The application is still under review by County planning staff. The application was deemed complete in February of 2019, and the environmental review process has now been initiated.
2. Martinez to Shell/Chevron Pipeline Connectivity Project (County File #LP16-2011): The project consists of installing approximately 8,082 feet of new 16-inch bidirectional pipeline between an existing TransMontaigne Terminal in Martinez, and existing tie-in points for Shell San Pablo Bay and Chevron KLM pipelines in the Martinez area. Portions of the pipeline will be installed both aboveground and underground within pipe casings, the majority of which will be within the Waterbird Road right-of-way. The application has been deemed complete, and is currently in the environmental review phase.
3. Bay View Residential Project (County Files #GP04-0007, #RZ04-3148, #DP04-3080, #SD04-8809): The proposed project consists of a request for approval of a tentative map to subdivide a 78-acre parcel (APN: 380-030-046) into 144 single-family residential lots, 11 acres of parkland, and 37 acres of open space. The project also consists of proposals to amend the General Plan to change existing industrial Land Use designations to that of Single-Family Residential Medium Density (SM), Open Space (OS), and Parks and Recreation (PR); amend the General Plan to update text pertaining to the Vine Hill/Pacheco Boulevard area; and rezone the project site from an industrial district to a project-specific Planned Unit (P-1) district. The project has been deemed complete and is currently in the environmental review phase.
4. Lower Walnut Creek Restoration Project: This Contra Costa County Flood Control District led project consists of restoring and enhancing approximately 252 acres of tidal

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

marsh, 52 acres of adjacent lowland terrestrial grasslands and wetlands, and 50 acres of uplands. The project also consists of breaching and lowering levees and berms, construction of new setback levees for flood protection, and grade filled areas to create new tidal wetland areas. The project will impact areas along the southern shore of Suisun Bay, and from Suisun Bay upstream along the Walnut Creek and its tributary Pacheco Creek. As of the completion of this study, the project had not yet been fully permitted as the environmental impact report for the project is still pending completion and publishing.

The proposed project and all other land use or zoning projects within the County jurisdiction are subject to environmental review under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), unless deemed exempt pursuant to Articles 18 (Statutory Exemptions) and 19 (Categorical Exemptions) of the CEQA Guidelines. By applying CEQA, any project that has potential for impacting the environment will be analyzed to determine the significance of those impacts. Once they are identified, CEQA establishes a duty for public agencies to avoid or minimize those impacts where feasible (Section 15021).

Although they are not all enforced by the Department of Conservation and Development or any other branch of the County, there are policies, standards, and laws of other agencies and governmental bodies that are intended to promote environmental preservation and or safety within the County. The County’s consultation with third party agencies to identify these overlapping jurisdictions and assist in implementation of their respective standards and policies, helps to further reduce or eliminate environmental impacts of proposed projects beyond that which may be identified with the County’s analysis and enforcement alone.

The requirement for environmental review under CEQA and applicability of outside agency laws and policies applies at both the project and plan (e.g., general plan, community plan, specific plan, regional plan) levels of zoning and development within the County. This overlap of regulation has allowed the County to anticipate cumulative environmental impacts throughout the County, and to adopt various General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures that significantly reduce the cumulatively considerable impacts of individual projects. In the case of the proposed project, there are no cumulatively considerable impacts due to the project-specific mitigations and the policies and regulations of overlapping jurisdictions listed for each impact below.

Aesthetics: Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-3; General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements.

Agricultural and Forest Resources: The project will have no individual impacts on agricultural and forest resources.

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

Air Quality: Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; National (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS); County Climate Action Plan (CAP);

Biological Resources: Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-7; US Fish & Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Native Plant Society; U.S. Army Corp of Engineers; Clean Water Act; Regional Water Quality Control Board

Cultural Resources: Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3; Northwest Information Center; County Coroner; Native American Heritage Commission; Wilton Rancheria

Energy: CAP; California Title 24

Geology and Soils: Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-8; American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) test D-1557; General Plan Safety Element; California Building Code

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; National (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS); County Climate Action Plan (CAP);

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: County General Plan Safety Element; California Department of Toxic Substance Control; County Health Department – Environmental Health Division; Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

Hydrology and Water Quality: Mitigation Measure HYD-1; Clean Water Act; Regional Water Quality Control Board; National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES); State Water Resources Control Board; Porter-Cologne Water Control Act; San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan

Land Use Planning: County General Plan Land Use Element; County Ordinance – Title 8; California Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan;

Mineral Resources: County General Plan Conservation Element

Noise: County General Plan Noise Element; Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; Noise Control Act

Population and Housing: Contra Costa County General Plan Growth management Element

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

Public Services: Contra Costa County General Plan Growth management Element; Contra Costa County Fire Protection District; California Fire Code; California Building Code; Central Contra Costa Sanitary District; County Sheriff

Recreation: Contra Costa County General Plan Growth Management Element; County Park Dedication Ordinance; Quimby Act;

Transportation: County General Plan Transportation and Growth Management Elements; County Transportation Demand Ordinance; Contra Costa Transportation Authority; County Measure-C / Measure J

Tribal Cultural Resources: Mitigation Measure CUL-1 through CUL-3; Article 2 of the Public Resources Code

Utilities and Service Systems: Contra Costa County Growth Management Element; Contra Costa Water District; Central Contra Costa Sanitary District; California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle); California Public Utilities Commission; Pacific Gas and Electric Company; County Ordinance Section 418-10 (Recycling Requirements for Landfill Disposal) and Section 418-14

Wildfire: County General Plan Growth Management and Safety Elements; Contra Costa County Fire Protection District; California Fire Code

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

The project consists of subdividing the project site into individual industrial lots for the establishment of contractor’s yard uses. As mentioned throughout this study, the project site is located within a developed and industrially-zoned portion of the County, which significantly limits the number of human beings in the surrounding area. In addition, the analysis discussed within this study evaluated the potential impacts of the project from various viewpoints, and has incorporated project-specific mitigations where necessary to reduce all potential impacts to a less than significant level. Based on the overall nature of the proposed project, location of the subject property, and project mitigations, the potential for the proposed project having substantial adverse impacts on human beings is less than significant.

## REFERENCES

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

- 1) Project Application and Plans
- 2) United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Website
- 3) Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory (12/2010)
- 4) County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Data Layers
- 5) Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title-8)
- 6) Contra Costa County General Plan (2005 – 2025)
- 7) Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan (12/2015)
- 8) 2016 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map Act (webpage)  
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/con16.pdf>
- 9) Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (12/13/2000)
- 10) California Public Resources Code (Webpage)  
<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesTOCSelected.xhtml?tocCode=PRC&tocTitle=+Public+Resources+Code+-+PRC>
- 11) California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
- 12) Federal Clean Air Act (Webpage)  
<http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title42/chapter85&edition=prelim>
- 13) California Clean Air Act (Webpage)
- 14) Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines (5/2017) (Webpage)  
[http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa\\_guidelines\\_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en)
- 15) CalEEMod Land Use Emissions Model Version 2016.3.2
- 16) California Department of Fish and Wildlife Website  
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/>
- 17) U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Website  
<https://www.fws.gov/>
- 18) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Website  
<https://www.epa.gov/>

- 19) East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP)
- 20) Federal Clean Water Act (Webpage)  
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-08/documents/federal-water-pollution-control-act-508full.pdf>
- 21) Department of Toxic Substance Control Envirostar Data Management System (Webpage)  
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
- 22) Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (8<sup>th</sup> Edition)
- 23) OPR “Technical Advisory *On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*” (12/2008)
- 24) *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* of AEI Consultants (2/19/2014)
- 25) *Response to Comments* Correspondence of Hultgren-Tillis Engineers (3/19/19)
- 26) Geologic Peer Review Letters of Darwin Meyers Associates (9/28/2018, 8/4/2017)
- 27) Biological Resources Assessment of Salix Consulting (9/2017)
- 28) Stormwater Control Plan of Milani & Associates (10/2018)
- 29) Geotechnical Investigation Report of Hultgren – Tillis Engineers (4/26/2017)
- 30) Project Comments of DTSC (6/6/2019)
- 31) Project Comments Memo of County Public Works Dept. (4/25/19)
- 32) Project Comments of PG&E (4/9/2019)
- 33) Project Comments Memo of County Flood Control District (12/26/2018)
- 34) Email of Contra Costa Water District (9/24/2018, 6/15/2017)
- 35) Project Comments of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (8/23/2017)
- 36) Project Comments of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (8/10/2017)
- 37) Project Comments of the Health Services Department (7/31/2017)
- 38) Project Comments Email of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (3/2/2017)

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Site Plan**