

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** SGI Pacheco LLC, dba Authentic 925, Pacheco
County File #CDRZ20-03254 and CDLP/DP21-02006
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development,
Community Development Division
30 Muir Rd.
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Francisco Avila, Principal Planner, (925) 655-2866
4. **Project Location:** 5753 Pacheco Boulevard
Pacheco, Ca 94553
APN: 125-032-031
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** SGI Pacheco LLC, dba Authentic 925
728 E Commercial St.
Los Angeles, Ca 90012
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within a General Commercial (CO)
General Plan land use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is located within a R-B Retail Business District
(R-B).
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant requests approval of a re-zoning/land use permit/development plan combination to expand the existing Authentic 925 cannabis dispensary to include distribution. The project includes: 1) changing the existing Retail-Business zoning district to C General Commercial District, 2) establishing a distribution component to the existing dispensary activities at the site, 3) new property identification (signage), 4) and façade changes along the Pacheco Boulevard frontage.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject property is a 1.29-acre parcel developed with a 20,235 square-foot retail business building. The site is accessed by Pacheco Boulevard and First Avenue North. Off-street parking is located at the project frontage and rear of the existing building. Existing frontage improvements include fully paved sidewalks, landscaping, and lighting.

The subject site is located within a strip of retail/commercial businesses located along the eastern portion of Pacheco Boulevard, approximately 0.6 miles north of the Pacheco Boulevard and Concord Avenue intersection. Adjacent parcels/uses include similarly sized properties, including several automotive/motorcycle service suppliers. Interstate 680 runs immediately east of the property in a north/south direction and is separated from the subject property by a Caltrans chain-link fence.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement):** Building Inspection Division, Fire Department, Department of Environmental Health, and State of California.

- 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.?**

On March 10, 2021, County staff forwarded an Agency Comment Request package to the Wilton Rancheria with an opportunity to request consultation as part of the subject project. On March 11, 2021, the Wilton Rancheria indicated that they had no concerns regarding this application.

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

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Francisco Avila

Signature

Francisco Avila
Principal Planner

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development

July 16, 2021

Date

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Initial Study Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references, which are available for review either online or at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, 30 Muir Road, Martinez, were consulted:

1. Application received by Contra Costa County on April 2, 2020 (re-zoning) and February 11, 2021 (land use)
2. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020
3. Contra Costa County Code – Title 8 Zoning Ordinance
4. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
5. Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan
6. Clean Water Act
7. Agency Comments
8. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2008* prepared by the California Department of Conservation
9. Public Resources Code section 12220(g)
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District proposed Thresholds of Significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions
11. California Department of Toxic Substances Control website
12. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threat
13. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map
14. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Dam Failure Inundation Areas
15. Contra Costa County Code – Title 4 Health and Safety
16. California Storm Water Resources Control Board – Geo Tracker
17. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

1. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-d) The project includes changing the site’s existing Retail Business zoning to C General Commercial to expand the existing cannabis dispensary to include distribution. The site is located just west of Interstate 680. According to the 2005-2020 County General Plan, this stretch of highway is not designated as a scenic route. The site is not located near a body of water. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are within the project area. Most improvements associated with the project are to the interior of the existing building. There will be alterations to the existing signage, however, site identification will be reduced in overall square footage compared to what currently exists at the site. Therefore, the project represents a less than significant impact compared to what the Retail Business Zoning District conditionally allows (50 feet maximum height for both RB and C zoning districts).

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-e) The project site is listed as being Urban and Built-Up Land by the 2012 San Francisco Bay Area Important Farmland Map. No prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance will be affected due to the project. According to County records, no Williamson Act Contract is applicable to the subject parcel. No forest land or timberland as defined by the California Public Resources code will be affected by the project.

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

SUMMARY:

a-d) Although the project involves changing the site’s zoning designation from RB to C, which will conceivably allow more intense uses at this site, each future application would be required to submit appropriate discretionary applications that would be subject to CEQA review requirements. Given that requirement, it is reasonable to assume that no substantial increase in air emissions would be anticipated beyond those exceeding thresholds of significance and related mitigation measures. As proposed, the distribution facility will add less than 10 vehicle trips and 10 employees to this site. Neither of these figures exceed any conceivable threshold of significance for air quality emissions.

Furthermore, the location in which the distribution facility will be located will only require minor interior improvements. No substantial exterior modifications are included with this application. Therefore, the construction phase of this project will not generate any appreciable air emissions.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-f) The proposal will not affect the migration of wildlife as the site is not within a “Significant Ecological Area and Selected Location of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Area”, as mapped in the 2005-2020 General Plan. No water feature exists on the site or on adjacent properties. Additionally, the entire site has been completely developed for many decades. Given that no expansion to the footprint of the existing building is proposed with this application, the project will not result in an effect on biological resources.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-c) The archaeological sensitivity map of the County’s General Plan (Figure 9-2), identifies the project area as “Largely Urbanized Area”. Discovery of cultural resources is unlikely since the building in which the distribution facility will be located has been established for many decades and no ground disturbance is included in this application. Nevertheless, any future proposal to re-develop the site will be required to go through appropriate discretionary reviews which will include mitigation measures to address the event cultural resources are identified during ground disturbing activities.

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

SUMMARY:

a-b) The project includes a re-zoning of the subject site from Retail Business to C General Commercial for the purposes of adding a distribution component to an existing cannabis dispensary. It is anticipated that the distribution aspect of the business will require two additional van trips per day. No distribution activities will be conducted on the weekends. Therefore, given that the proposal does not include cultivation which would significantly increase the amount of energy used, the project reflects a minimal increase in energy consumption.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-f) The site is not within an Alquist-Priolo zone. No ground disturbance is anticipated with this rezoning application. Tenant improvements are expected in order to establish the distribution portion of the cannabis business, however, the building in which the operation is located does not to increase in square-footage. Therefore, no geotechnical reviews are triggered by the proposal.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-b) Greenhouse gases are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere and contribute to global climate change. Vehicle emissions and energy consumption all increase greenhouse gases; however, rezonings are legislative acts which do not cause greenhouse gas emissions. The distribution portion of the project will add two vehicular trips to the site which does not exceed any bright-line threshold. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any plan aimed at reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-g) The project location is not within an airport land use plan area or wildland interface zone. Additionally, the establishment of a distribution component to an already entitled cannabis facility will not emit hazardous materials or place people at risk of exposure. Re-zoning proposals do not include any physical alterations within themselves, however, if approved, this project will result in the site being within a C General Commercial zoning district designation. This zoning designation allows for a broader more intense range of uses compared to the existing retail-business zoning district for the site. Nevertheless, in the event, the site is re-developed in the future, each proposal will be required to submit the necessary discretionary applications which would be subject to their own environmental review. Therefore, this application has no potential to increase risks with respect to hazardous materials.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-e) As stated throughout this document, the project does not include any expansion of the subject building or increase of impervious surfaces. Modifications to the existing floor plan and signage are the extent of physical improvements associated with this project. Given that the subject site has been completely developed, the re-zoning of the project will not likely result in any proposals that would increase impervious surfaces.

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

SUMMARY:

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

The subject property and surroundings have been developed for many decades. No separation of established communities will occur as a result of this rezoning application. Surrounding zoning districts include C General Commercial (established businesses) and public (roadways). Below is a comparison of development standards for each district. As reflected in the table, the proposed C General Commercial zoning district retains many, if not more stringent, development standards as the current Retail Business zoning district. Therefore, the project will not result in any land use plan conflicts.

	Retail Business	Commercial
Minimum Lot Size:	3,500	7,500
Maximum Height:	50	50
Setback:	10	10

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

SUMMARY:

a-b) Known mineral resource areas in the County are shown on Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the General Plan Conservation Element. No known mineral resources have been identified in the project vicinity, and therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource. The project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

13. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-c) Activities at the project site are not expected to expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of the Community Noise Exposure Levels shown on Figure 11-6 of the General Plan Noise Element. Types and levels of noise generated from the uses associated with the proposed distribution facility would be similar to noise levels from the existing cannabis dispensary. Thus, project noise impacts to the existing surrounding land uses would be de minimis.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-b) The proposed project would result in the addition of a distribution facility to an existing cannabis operation. According to the applicant, the combined (dispensary and distribution) operation would have approximately 20 employees. The distribution facility will comprise between 5 and 10 employees. Conceptually, if all 10 new employees lived outside of the County and had to relocate, this number of new residents would reflect a less than significant impact. Therefore, no new housing would need to be constructed, nor would existing residents be displaced.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a) Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Fire protection to the project site would be provided by the fire station located at 209 Center Avenue (approximately two miles driving distance to the site). Using an average travel speed of 35 miles per hour, an engine responding from Station 9 would take less than five minutes to reach the project site. This response time is typical for areas in the project vicinity. In addition, as detailed in the comment letter for the proposed project from the Fire District, the project is required to comply with the applicable provisions of the California Fire Code and applicable Contra Costa County Ordinances that pertain to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. Prior to the issuance of building, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the fire district. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project relating to fire protection would be non-consequential.

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

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the Pacheco area. The addition of one new commercial

use in the project area would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the area. Furthermore, the project applicant has a robust security plan which will reduce likelihood of any need for police services. Therefore, the impact of the project will be of no measurable effect.

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

Indirectly, as described in Section 14. above, the project could result in a maximum increase of 10 new employees and their families to the area. Conservatively, an estimated 10 of these persons (1 in 3 per household) may be children between the ages of 5 to 19. The potential 10 school-age children would have an indirect impact on the schools. The project is within Mount Diablo Unified School District. The increase of ten students (less than 0.1 percent) would not significantly impact the district.

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

As discussed in Section 14. the proposed project would include a distribution facility with up to 10 new employees. The project employees and their families could increase population in the project area. As a result, there could be an increase in use of parks in the surrounding area. These parks provide recreational facilities such as playgrounds, picnic and barbecue areas, and youth and adult recreational programs. Given the number of parks in the area, and the project's relatively small indirect addition to the population, the impacts of the proposed project on parks would be less than significant and require construction of additional facilities.

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

Libraries:

The Contra Costa Library operates 28 facilities in Contra Costa County. The Contra Costa Library system is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. A portion of the property taxes from the project site would go to the Contra Costa Library system. Accordingly, the impact would be less than significant.

Health Facilities:

The Contra Costa County Health Services Department (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 11 health centers and clinics in the County. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes, including a portion of the taxes on the project site. Thus, the impact of the use of public health facilities by project employees and their families who live in or move to the area, would be less than significant.

16. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 Contra Costa County General Plan bases the need of parks and other recreational facilities on the needs and changes in the number of people living in the County. As stated throughout this study, the project involves operation of a cannabis business. Therefore, no new residential neighborhoods will be constructed or required as part of this development. Additionally, the proposed project does not consist of eliminating or altering any existing recreational facilities within the County. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact the number of parks and other recreational facilities that would be required within the subject area and County as a whole.

- 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?*

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

17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The project proposes to add a distribution component to an existing cannabis retail business. Access to the site has been established for many decades and does not need modification in order to execute the proposal. Furthermore, rezoning the site to General Commercial will not necessitate site modification. In the event, an application for a more intense use is submitted for review, any modifications to the site will be considered at that time. Therefore, given that the distribution facility will add less than 10 vehicular trips per day, a full Traffic Impact Analysis is not required as projects generating less than 100 peak hour trips generally will not create or exacerbate a significant circulation impact.

Thus, the project will no conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed project would not alter the local infrastructure in a way that could hinder future establishment of public transportation. The project does not propose a design that would prevent the use of bicycles or other alternative modes of transportation, thus there would be no impact.

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

The project proponent has successfully operated similar businesses in other Bay Area cities. Locating the proposed business at this in-fill location is encouraged as it will reduce potential vehicles miles traveled. Nevertheless, with a maximum of 10 employees visiting the site per day, the proposal will not exceed any vehicle miles traveled (VMT) threshold. Additionally, existing public transportation infrastructure is located within 1/3 of a mile, which will further reduce VMT for the project. Therefore, the project represents a less than significant impact with regards to vehicles mile traveled.

- c-d) *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)?*

There are no increased hazards due to a design feature such as curves or intersections. The project's ingress/egress has been established for decades and no modifications are necessary for the project. Contra Costa Fire Protection District has reviewed the project for conformance with the Fire District standards, which include emergency access, and no comments of concern were received. Therefore, the project will have a no impact with regards to the geometric design of the project.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

a-b) According to the County's Archaeological Sensitivities map, Figure 9-2, of the County General Plan, the subject site is located in an area that is considered "largely urbanized," and is generally not considered to be a location with significant archaeological resources. Additionally, the site is completely covered with either with parking lots and/or building structures. Lastly, no ground disturbance is required to establish the distribution facility within the existing building. At most, a tenant improvement building permit will be issued which will not include any footprint expansion. Given all these factors, there is no potential for the project to impact undiscovered cultural resources on the site.

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

SUMMARY:

a-e) The project site is considered an in-fill location within the unincorporated Pacheco area of the County. As such, wastewater, electric, gas, and telecommunication facilities are available to the property. All utility providers have returned agency comments indicating that sufficient capacity exists in the network to serve the proposal. Future distribution activities would incrementally add to the waste headed to a landfill in the form of packaging; however, the impact of the project-related incremental increase would be considered less than significant as the vast majority of material generated will be recyclable. Thus, no significant environmental effects are expected from the construction or operational components of the project.

20. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

As discussed in section 9.g above, the project site is in a developed area of Contra Costa County, which is designated as an “urban unzoned” area by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and therefore, would not have a significant risk of wildland fire. Additionally, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection’s Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map characterizes this area as a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone area. Thus, no impact is expected.

- a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
N/A

- 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?*
N/A

- 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??*
NA/

- 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?*
N/A

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 combination of type and location of the proposed project creates a scenario where there is minimal potential for adverse impacts to plant/animal communities, examples of California history, or environment in general. Additionally, the construction phase of the project does not require any ground disturbance that may have impacts on unforeseen cultural resources yet to be discovered. Therefore, no mitigations are required to execute the rezoning or tenant improvements necessary for the project. The proposed project will not place significant demand on utilities for operation and will not produce significant amounts of hazardous waste as the primary function of the site is to distribute cannabis related products to the general area.

- 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.)*

Construction of the proposed project includes tenant improvements to an existing building. No expansion of the existing building or parking area is necessary to establish the project. The proposed distribution facility will add less than 10 daily vehicular trips to the site and area in general. This amount of new traffic is not expected to negatively impact the area’s traffic circulation system.

Nevertheless, staff is not aware of any new development in the general area that when cumulatively combined with this project will have a negative effect on the environment or general

welfare of the community. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant cumulative effect on the environment.

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

The proposed re-zoning and distribution facility will have a detrimental effect on the environment. No processing or manufacturing of hazardous materials is included as part of this project. The associated air quality impacts are considered negligible due to the low number of anticipated trips (up to 10 per day). As of the date of this initial study, staff is unaware of any studies or other reports that have been issued that indicate the project will result in a direct or indirect hazard to humans.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map

2. Site Plan