

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project Title:** 300 King Drive Tree Permit
County File CDTP22-00004
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation and Development,
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Diana Lecca, (925) 655-2869
Diana.Lecca@dcd.cccounty.us
- 4. Project Location:** 300 King Drive in the Walnut Creek area of unincorporated Contra Costa County (Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 186-011-035, 238-012-025)
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Izzat Nashashibi
Humann Company
1021 Brown Avenue
Lafayette, CA 94549
- 6. General Plan Designation:** SM Single-Family Residential – Medium Density, MM Multiple-Family Residential – Medium Density, OS Open Space
- 7. Zoning:** R-10 Single-Family Residential District
- 8. Description of Project:** The applicant requests approval of a Tree Permit to allow the removal of four (4) code-protected trees and authorize work under the drip lines of 12 code-protected trees for the construction and grading of a second driveway to an existing single-family residence that traverses a northwest-facing hillside. Trees to be removed include two Valley Oak and two Coast Live Oak trees ranging from 6.5 inches to 34 inches diameter at breast height (DBH). Construction work would take place within the drip lines of eight Valley Oak and four Coast Live Oak trees ranging from 9 inches to 27 inches DBH. The proposed approximately 600-foot-long driveway would connect the residence to the eastern terminus of the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac that runs parallel to the main Olympic Boulevard arterial. The residence is at an elevation of approximately 316 feet while the cul-de-sac is at an elevation of approximately 188 feet. Installation of the driveway includes grading of approximately 100 cubic yards of fill and approximately 1,700 cubic yards of cut, and construction of a three-foot-tall retaining wall along the southeast side of the driveway, and placement of a Fire Code-compliant gate near the cul-de-sac.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is comprised of two adjoining parcels, including a 13.19-acre parcel that includes the single-family residence at 300 King Drive (APN: 186-011-035) and

an 0.13-acre parcel that is adjacent to the eastern terminus of the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac (APN: 238-012-025). Aside from one single-family residence, built in 2006, the rest of the 300 King Drive parcel remains undeveloped with clusters of mature oak trees near the residence and other oak trees spaced within grassland areas. The project site is located along the southern edge of the unincorporated Saranap area of Walnut Creek, southwest of the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and Tice Valley Road. Access to the property is from King Drive, a road that is publicly maintained between the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac and El Dorado Road, and privately maintained south of El Dorado Road. From El Dorado Road, the private section of King Drive spans approximately 1,000 feet before reaching the existing residence at its southern terminus. The topography of the project site is severely sloped. At its lowest contour, the property starts at approximately 188 feet and increases up to 410 feet in elevation at the southwest corner. The existing single-family residence is at an elevation of, approximately 320 feet.

The project site is adjacent to developed residential lots to the west and north and vacant lots to the south. To the east, the parcel abuts a more commercial array of properties. The immediate vicinity generally consists of lands in the R-10 Single-Family Residential District and R-20 Single-Family Residential District to the north, west and south; and NB Neighborhood Business District, O-1 Limited Office District, and M-12 Multiple-Family Residential District to the east.

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

Department of Conservation and Development, Building Inspection Division,

Public Works Department

Contra Costa Fire Protection District

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

In accordance with Section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, a Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was sent on September 13, 2024 to the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation and the Wilton Rancheria, the California Native American tribes that have requested notification of proposed projects within unincorporated Contra Costa County. Pursuant to section 21080.3.1(d), there is a 30-day time period for the Wilton Rancheria and/or the Villages of Lisjan Nation to either request or decline consultation in writing for this project. To date, no response has been received from either the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation or the Wilton Rancheria.

Previously, the Wilton Rancheria had requested consultation in response to a Notice of Opportunity for a different project that led to a meeting between staff and a representative of the Wilton Rancheria. At that meeting, a tentative agreement was reached between staff and the Wilton Rancheria that the Native American tribe will be notified of any discovery of cultural resources or human remains on a project site. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requested that pursuant to State law, the NAHC shall be notified of any discovery of human remains rather than the Native American tribe.

Standard Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division (CDD) Conditions of Approval – see Conditions of Approval Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2 in Environmental Checklist Section 5 (Cultural Resources) – provide for notice to the California Native American tribes of any discovery of cultural resources and notice to the NAHC of any discovery of human remains on the site. Any future construction activity on the project site would be subject to CDD Conditions of Approval Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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.

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

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (No Impact)*

Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges & Waterways) of the Contra Costa County General Plan Open Space Element identifies the major scenic resources in the County, including major ridges and scenic waterways, which should be considered when evaluating nearby development proposals. Views of these identified scenic resources are considered scenic vistas. The project site is not located near a major scenic resource and will therefore have no impact on a scenic vista.

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

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the State Scenic Highway program and maintains a list of eligible and officially designated State Scenic Routes on their website. There are no officially designated or eligible state scenic highways in the project in the project vicinity. Thus, the project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

Figure 5-4 of the County General Plan’s Transportation and Circulation Element identifies County designated Scenic Routes, including Tice Valley Road. There are limited views of the project site from Tice Valley Road, mainly between buildings along the scenic route. The scope of work

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

involves removal of four code-protected trees as well as construction activity within the drip lines of 12 code-protected trees to grade and construct a new second driveway. Although the scope involves removal of trees, the property is heavily wooded and removal of four trees would not significantly impact the aesthetic quality of this resource. There are also conditions of approval in place to plant additional trees as means of restitution to those that are to be removed. In addition, there are no historic buildings, or other natural characteristics of the property project site that would be considered a scenic resource. Considering the lack of structural development and given that the project is to install a new driveway, the aesthetic impact on Tice Valley Boulevard would be minimal and would mainly occur during the construction period due to operation of light and medium duty trucks and equipment.

- 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

As discussed in Environment Checklist Section 1.b. above, views of the project site would not change significantly as a result of the project. The overall character would remain heavily wooded, and only a few of trees (four code-protected trees) would be removed for the construction and grading of the new second driveway.

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

Removal of four code-protected trees as well as encroachment into the drip lines of 12 code-protected trees for the construction of a new second driveway to an existing residence would not significantly cause a change in ambient nighttime light levels on the project site. The site would maintain most of its existing vegetation, and additionally there are no proposed structures being built that would affect adjacent light-sensitive areas. Any future additional source of lighting would come from vehicles utilizing the new driveway, which would be a less than significant impact to an area surrounded by other residential properties.

Since minimal structural development is proposed for this project, the project has little to no potential to result in substantial surface areas of reflective surfaces. Therefore, the project would not expectedly result in glare that could adversely affect daytime views in the area.

Given that the project would not impact light-sensitive land uses or create significant glare, the project would have less than significant impact on day or nighttime views in the area due to glare or light.

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

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element*.
- Caltrans website (Accessed 5/16/24) - [Scenic Highways | Caltrans](#).

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) *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? (No Impact)*

As shown on the California Department of Conservation’s Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2020 map, the project site does not contain farmland designated “Prime”, “Unique”, or of “Statewide Importance”. Therefore, the project would not result in any impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

The project site is within a R-10 Single-Family Residential District. The project proposes a new second driveway which is consistent with uses permitted within the R-10 District. The property is not zoned for agricultural use and the property is not included in a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact arising from a conflict with existing agricultural uses.

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

The project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526, or zoned Timberland Production as defined by Government Code section 51104(g). Furthermore, the project site is within a R-10 Single-Family Residential District and the proposed use is consistent with permitted uses therein. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland.

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

The project site is not considered forest land, as discussed in Environment Checklist Section 2.c above.

- 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? (No Impact)*

The project site is not currently used for agricultural production, and therefore, development of the project would not involve changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature would result in conversion of Farmland to non- agricultural use. The project would add a new second driveway to a previously developed property with an existing single-family residence. Thus, the project has no potential to result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County Code, Title 8, Zoning Ordinance.
- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Land Use Element*.
- California Department of Conservation. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2020*.

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

The primary goals of the CAP are to protect public health and protect the climate. The CAP identifies a wide range of control measures intended to decrease both criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The BAAQMD does not provide a numerical threshold of significance for project-level consistency analysis with the CAP. A measure for determining whether the proposed project supports the primary goals of the CAP is if the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the air quality plans. This measure is determined by comparing project emissions to the significance thresholds identified by the BAAQMD for construction- and operation-related pollutants. These significance thresholds are discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 3.b below. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 3.b, **if emissions control measures are not implemented, fugitive dust could be significant during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse**

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

environmental impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement Mitigation Measure Air Quality 1.

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

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

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

<u>Land Use Type</u>	<u>Operational Criteria Pollutant Screening Size</u>	<u>Construction-Related Screening Size</u>
Single-Family Residential	421 dwelling units	254 dwelling units

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

With respect to the estimated project emissions of fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), the BAAQMD does not recommend a numerical threshold for fugitive dust particulate matter emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD bases the determination of significance for fugitive dust on considering the control measures to be implemented. If all appropriate emissions control measures are implemented for a project as recommended by the BAAQMD, then fugitive dust emissions during construction are not considered significant. However, **if emissions control measures are not implemented, fugitive dust could be significant during grading and other earthwork on the project site,**

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

resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

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

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- g. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
- h. Unpaved roads providing access to sites located 100 feet or further from a paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch layer of compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.
- i. Publicly visible signs shall be posted with the telephone number and name of the person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's General Air Pollution Complaints number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

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

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

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

Construction and grading of a new second driveway to an existing single-family residence is not typically associated with the generation of criteria pollutants in any significant quantity. However, if approved, the construction phase of the project would involve extensive site grading activities, necessitating the use of heavy diesel-powered equipment. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines state that 85% of the inhalation cancer risk from toxic air contaminants (TACs) is from diesel engine emissions.

Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, such activities would generate construction-related emissions that could have a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement BAAQMD-recommended mitigation measures of **Air Quality 1** to reduce construction dust impacts. In addition, the applicant is required to implement BAAQMD construction Best Management Practices in Air Quality 2 to reduce construction-related exhaust emissions.

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

- a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- c. The applicant shall require construction contractors to reduce construction related fugitive VOC emissions by ensuring that low-VOC coatings having a VOC content of 50 grams per liter or less are used during the coating of the buildings interiors and exterior surfaces.

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

- d. All construction equipment larger than 50 horsepower used at the site for more than two continuous days or 20 hours total shall utilize diesel engines that are USEPA certified “Tier 4 final” emission standards for particulate matter and be equipped with CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters. Prior to the CDD stamp approval of any construction plans for the issuance of demolition, construction, or grading permits, the construction contractor shall submit the specifications of the equipment to be used during construction to CDD staff.

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

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

As stated in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the populations and is subjective. Objectionable odors are typically associated with agricultural or heavy industrial land uses such as refineries, chemical plants, paper mills, landfills, sewage-treatment plants, etc. There is nothing in the project description that would indicate that the proposal would be a source of objectionable odors beyond that which is ordinarily associated with the grading/paving of a new driveway to an existing single-family residence. However, the BAAQMD recommends operational screening criteria that are based on the distance between receptors and types of sources known to generate odors. For projects within the screening distances, the BAAQMD has the following threshold for project operations: An odor source with five or more confirmed complaints per year averaged over 3 years is considered to have a significant impact on receptors within the screening distance shown in TableAQ-4 below.

Two circumstances have the potential to cause odor impacts:

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

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

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

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

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

Project Operation

Land uses typically associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste disposal facilities, agricultural operations, or other operations listed in Table AQ-2. The proposed second driveway project is not within the odor screening distances for a sewage treatment plant, refinery, or other odor producing sources. Therefore, odor impacts associated with the location of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Project Construction

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

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

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

Sources of Information

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

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

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

According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Public Access Lands map, the project site is not located in or adjacent to an area identified as a wildlife or ecological reserve. According to the Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plant Species Areas map (Figure 8-1) of the County General Plan’s Conservation Element, the Saranap area does not have any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The installation of the second driveway would take place on roughly 0.28 acre of the 13.32 acre project site. The site includes an existing single-family residence and due to the level of human activity on the site and the limited area of disturbance, the project is not expected to have a less than significant adverse environmental impact on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

- b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)*

There are no creeks, streams, wetlands, or other waterways on or adjacent to the project site. All project activities would be limited to the site, and no substantial modifications to the land would be required to establish the proposed project. Given the lack of waterways in the project vicinity, the project has little to no potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

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

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

The proposed project will have no impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish species, since there are no water bodies on the site. Minor wildlife movement occur on the project site given that most of it is open space. Some resident mammals, birds and occasional

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

migratory bird may utilize the area, but none of the wildlife is unique or rare. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 4.a, the project site does not support a special-status or unique wildlife population. Furthermore, the project will occur on roughly two percent (0.28 acre) of the project site while the remaining 98 percent (13.04 acres) of the site will remain undisturbed. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.

Regarding wildlife nursery sites, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 makes it illegal to kill, harm or otherwise “take” any migratory bird, including their nests, eggs, or young. Pursuant to Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 10.13, migratory birds include geese, ducks, shorebirds, raptors, songbirds, wading birds, seabirds, and passerine birds. Similarly, California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5 prohibit the taking of protected birds, their nests, or eggs.

Existing vegetation on the project site includes clusters of mature oak trees near the residence and other oak trees spaced within grassland areas, which may provide nesting and foraging habitat for a variety of raptors and passerine bird species. Accordingly, **there would be a potentially significant adverse environmental impact on nesting birds during project construction.** Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

Biological Resource 1. If project grading or construction work is scheduled to take place between February 1 and August 31, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days of construction, covering a radius of 500 feet for non-listed raptors and 100 feet for non-listed passerines at all locations. Copies of the preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division (CDD) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

If an active bird nest is found within the survey radii, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. If an active nest is present, a minimum exclusion buffer of 100 feet shall be maintained during construction, depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with stakes and flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. A survey report by a qualified biologist verifying that no active nests are present, or that the young have fledged, shall be submitted prior to initiation of grading in the nest-setback zone. The qualified biologist shall serve as a biological monitor during those periods when construction activities occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. All buffers shall be shown on all sets of construction drawings.

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

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact on the nesting birds to a less than significant level.

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

The Conservation Element of the General Plan has various vegetation and wildlife goals and policies intended to protect ecologically significant lands, wetlands, and plan and wildlife habitats. The proposed project has been reviewed for consistency with the General Plan, and Figure 8-1 in the Conservation Element indicates that there are no significant ecological areas on or in the project vicinity.

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any undeveloped or underdeveloped property including a parcel that can be further subdivided such as the project site, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. The project proposes to remove four code protected trees, along with associated grading and construction activities within the drip lines of 12 code-protected trees (all Valley or Coast Live Oaks with diameters between 6.5-inches and 34-inches) that are to be preserved. Therefore, Contra Costa County Tree Ordinance requires a tree permit that will incorporate tree protection and preservation conditions along with financial assurances to the County for replanting removed and damaged trees. County tree permits require construction protection measures, such as tree fencing that aid to identify in the field the trees to be preserved, as well as prevent construction activities in the root zones or under their canopies. The Tree Ordinance also requires replanting of replacement trees as restitution for trees that are permitted to be removed. Implementation of the standard requirements of the Tree Ordinance renders the impact of the loss of trees to a less than significant impact level.

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

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

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

into any of these categories, the project is not covered by, or in conflict with the adopted HCP/NCCP.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Accessed September 13, 2024. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/lands/>.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. *Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity*. Accessed September 19, 2024. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios6/?bookmark=648>.
- East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy, Habitat Conservation Plan. Accessed August 5, 2024. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4343/East-Contra-Costa-County-Habitat-Conserv>.

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

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

There is one existing building on the project site, a 5,370-square-foot single-family residence constructed in the 2000’s. Neither the building nor the property itself is of known historical significance. Thus, the project to remove four code-protected trees and install a second driveway

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

would have a would less than significant impact on any known historical or culturally significant resources.

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

The archaeological sensitivity map (Figure 9-2) of the County’s General Plan Open Space Element identifies the Saranap area as having low to moderately sensitive areas in terms of potential for significant archeological resources. While the project does not involve construction of new buildings or structures, installation of the second driveway will require ground disturbing activities over 0.28 acre of the 13.32-acre site. Installation of the second driveway on the project site would result in a **possibility that buried archaeological resources could be present and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site, resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact on archaeological resources**. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

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

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

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

- c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation)*

No human remains or cemeteries are known to exist within or near the project site: however, there is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. Consequently, **construction activities on the project site could result in a potentially**

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

significant impact due to disturbance of human remains. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure.

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

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

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.

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

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project entails the grading and construction of a new second driveway to an existing residence. The project would use energy during project construction. Given the nature of the project, there would be no wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project operation. During construction, there would be energy consumption through the

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

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

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

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

The State of California has routinely adopted legislation to address climate change and clean energy production that has resulted in efforts to increase the efficiency of vehicles, buildings, and appliances and to provide energy from renewable sources. Locally, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan in December 2015. The County Climate Action Plan includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County.

The project entails tree removal and tree drip line encroachment, and the construction of a new second driveway to an existing residence. The construction activities would be subject to compliance with the Climate Action Plan including debris recovery. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted Climate Action Plan, and would not impede any State or local initiatives for increasing renewable energy or efficiency.

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County, *Climate Action Plan*. 2015.

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Concord fault, which is mapped approximately 4.7 miles east of the project site.

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

According to the California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, implemented by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not within the Concord A-P zone. Because the site is not within an official Earthquake Fault Zone, the risk of fault rupture can be considered to be less than significant.

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

Figure 10-4 (Estimated Seismic Ground Response) of the General Plan Safety Element identifies the site in an area rated “Lowest” damage susceptibility (Hard Bedrock) indicating that sound structures sited on bedrock typically perform satisfactorily if foundation materials and critical slopes are stable. The risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building code and the County Grading Ordinance. The building code requires use of seismic parameters which allow the structural engineer to design structures to be based on soil profile types and proximity of faults deemed capable of generating strong/violent earthquake shaking. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and/or grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. Since the project does not involve structural development, potential impacts resulting from seismic ground shaking would be considered to be less than significant.

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

According to the California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, implemented by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not within a Liquefaction Zone. However, any future construction (or replacement) of buildings and/or structures would be subject to the building code, which contains general building design and construction requirements relating to fire and life safety, structural safety, and access compliance, and therefore, the environmental impact from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be expected to be less than significant.

iv) *Landslides? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)*

Although the project does not involve construction of structures, it does involve significant grading activity. Pursuant to the Geologic Peer review completed by Darwin Myers Associates in August 2024, the proposed driveway is entirely within the area considered at risk of earthquake induced landslide hazard. Further, the CGS map suggests that there is a risk of slope failure/ landslide displacement. Such steep hillside areas are likely to be sensitive to grading, changes in drainage and removal of trees. Landslides and ground slippages may be triggered by strong ground motion accompanying a major earthquake. Areas that are subject to slides and slippages from other natural causes may be very hazardous under earthquake conditions. Earthquake effects will be more extensive if a major earthquake occurs during the rainy season when ground conditions are favorable to

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

landslide displacement and ground slippage. The General Plan Safety Element contains policies that provide a context for determining of a project is including effective measure to protect development from landslide hazards and minimize grading of steep slopes. Although the proposed driveway is not a structure for human occupancy, **the driveway may be damaged and unusable for emergency egress due to landslides resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact.** Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measures.

Geology I: All of the following mitigation measures are required to reduce the impacts of potential geotechnical slope stability hazards to less than significant levels:

- Prior to issuance of construction permits the project proponent shall provide evidence of plan review and approval by the project geotechnical engineer. The recommendations for site grading contained in the approved grading plans shall be followed during construction unless modifications are specifically approved in writing by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development.
- The applicant shall provide prior notice acceptable to the geotechnical engineer so that he can be onsite to observe and approve all keyway excavations, removal of weak surficial deposits down to stable bedrock or in- place material, and installation of all subdrains, including their connections. All fill slope construction shall be observed and tested by the project geotechnical engineer, and the density test results and reports submitted to the County to be kept on file. Cut slopes and keyways shall be observed and mapped by the project engineering geologist who will provide recommendations for modifications based on actual geologic conditions encountered during grading Approval from the Building Division shall be obtained prior to any modification.
- Prior to requesting a final building inspection, the project proponent shall submit a letter- report from the geotechnical engineer to the Building Inspection Division, Grading Section documenting the observation and testing services performed during final grading, foundation work, and lot drainage. The report of the geotechnical engineer shall also provide a professional opinion on the consistence of the as-graded/ as-built project with recommendations in the approved geotechnical report.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of landslides to a less than significant level.

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

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

The soil series that occur on the project site includes Botella clay loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) on the north-facing slope of the site closest to the Olympic Boulevard terminus of the second driveway and Lodo clay loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) on the bulk of the site. The Botella series is described as consisting of very deep, well drained al soils that formed in alluvial material from sedimentary rocks. The hazard of erosion of Botella clay loam is none to slight where soil is tilled and exposed. The Lodo series consists of shallow, somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in material weathered from hard shale and fine-grained sandstone. The hazard of erosion of Lodo clay loam is moderate to high where soil is bare. Thus, swales for conveying surface runoff are lined with rip rap to limit erosion, as shown on the project plans. Notwithstanding, **due to the installation of the second driveway on the Lodo clay loam, the potential for soil erosion is a significant adverse environmental impact.** Thus, the applicant is required to implement the following mitigation measure.

Geology 2: The applicant shall implement the following erosion control measures during project construction.

- Primary grading for the second driveway shall be performed during the April through October low rainfall season.
- If grading must be done during rainy periods, or if erosion is occurring on previously graded areas, the applicant shall take corrective actions for erosion control, which may include the installation of ground cloth or the placement of hay bales.
- The applicant shall hydroseed graded areas which are not to be developed as the driveway within 90 days of the completion of grading.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of soil erosion to a less than significant level.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 7.a.iii above, although the project site is not within a liquefaction area, it is within a landslide area. Thus, **the driveway may be damaged and unusable for emergency egress due to landslides resulting in a potentially significant adverse environmental impact. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures Geology 1 above.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of landslides to a less than significant level.

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 7.b, the soil series mapped on the site includes Botella clay loam and Lodo clay loam. Towards the north and near Olympic Boulevard, the soil is Botella clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. The vast majority of the parcel consists of Lodo Clay Loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes. With regard to its engineering properties, the underlying clayey soil is moderately expansive and moderately corrosive. The expansion and contraction of soils could cause cracking, tilting, and eventual collapse of structures. Considering that the project involves installation of a second driveway, the soils on the site would not create a significant risk to life or property.

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

The Central Contra Costa Sanitary District provides sanitary and sewer services to the project site. Given that the project will not generate any demand for septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal, the project is not expected to have an impact.

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

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

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

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Safety Element*.
- Darwin Myers Associates, *Geologic Peer Review/Driveway Grading, August 15, 2024*.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1977. *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California*.

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

- [Web Soil Survey - Home \(usda.gov\)](https://www.usda.gov/web-soil-survey), 2024. *USDA Web Soil Survey*.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

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

Future construction and operation of the new second driveway will generate some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. This determination has been made using the screening criteria provided in the 2017 BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines, which specifies 56 dwelling units as the operational greenhouse gas screening size; the BAAQMD does not have any standards for construction-related greenhouse gases. If the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions that exceeds the threshold of significant.

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

At a regional scale, the BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan that addresses GHG emissions as well as various criteria air pollutants. The BAAQMD Plan included a number of pollutant reduction strategies for the San Francisco Bay air basin. Within Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Climate Action Plan in December 2015. The Climate Action Plan includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County. All building/grading activities associated with the project are subject to compliance with

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

these measures. Thus, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted Climate Action Plan.

The proposed project, including the installation of the second driveway, would generate some GHG emissions, but not at levels that would result in a conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Sources of Information

- [attachment-a -proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf \(baaqmd.gov\)](#), 2024. *Spare the Air, Cool the Climate, Final 2017 Clean Air Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- [CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update \(baaqmd.gov\)](#), 2024. *CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update, 2022 CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- Contra Costa County, *Climate Action Plan*. 2015.

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

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

Subsequent to removal of four code-protected trees, the second driveway and associated drainage improvements would be installed. There would be associated use of fuels and lubricants, and other construction materials during the construction period. The use and handling of hazardous materials during construction would occur in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, including California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (Cal/OSHA) requirements. With compliance with existing regulations, the project would have a less than significant impact from construction.

Operation of the second driveway would not involve transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials as the driveway would provide a second access to the single-family residence on the project site. Because no hazardous materials would be used during operation of the driveway, there would not be an impact from project operation.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 9.a above, operation of the second driveway would not involve transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The residential use of the project site does not involve handling, use, or storage of substances that are acutely hazardous. Thus, the risk of release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)*

Pied Piper Preschool at 2263 Whyte Park Avenue and Miss Maria’s Daycare at 2224 Whyte Park Avenue are located approximately 0.18 mile to the northeast of the project site. Due to the nature of the operation of the second driveway and the existing residential land use of the site, impacts on the preschool and daycare due to hazardous substances at the site during project operation would be less than significant.

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

With respect to construction-related impacts, as assessed in Environmental Checklist Sections 3.c and 3.d, although grading and construction activities would be temporary, there would be potentially significant air pollutant emissions and odors. Therefore, **there could be a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction due to the release of potentially hazardous emissions. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement mitigation measures Air Quality 1 and Air Quality 2.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from potentially hazardous emissions to a less than significant level.

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

The property is currently in residential use. A review of regulatory databases maintained by County, State, and federal agencies found no documentation of hazardous materials violations or discharge on the project site. The site is not listed on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites (Cortese) List. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. The Cortese List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. Thus, there would be no impact.

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

The project is not located within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is Buchanan Field Airport, which is approximately 7.3 miles north of the project site. The airport influence area is delineated in the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The site is not within the Buchanan Field Airport influence area. Thus, the proposed project is not considered to be located within an area where airport operations present a potential hazard.

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

The second driveway would access the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac that is parallel to Olympic Boulevard, which is the County-designated arterial that would be used in the event of an emergency requiring evacuation of the local neighborhood. If the project is approved, the Public Works Department will require a Code-compliant intersection of the driveway with the cul-de-

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

sac terminus. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on emergency response and emergency evacuation plans.

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

The project site and vicinity are in a high fire hazard severity zone in a local responsibility area. Consequently, the existing single-family residence is required to conform to the provisions of the California Building Code and California Fire Code related to construction in wildland urban interface fire areas. The second driveway is intended to provide a second means of egress in the event of a wildfire on or near the single-family residence on the project site. As a result, the driveway would reduce the fire-related risks of the project site and the risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- [EnviroStor \(ca.gov\)](http://envirostor.ca.gov), California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2024. Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese).
- Contra Costa County, 2000. Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.
- Calfire, 2007. Contra Costa County Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project must comply with applicable Contra Costa County C.3 requirements. Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and 16 incorporated cities in the county have formed the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. In October 2009, the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) adopted the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Regional Permit for the Program, which regulates discharges from municipal storm drains. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control storm water runoff. The County has the authority to enforce compliance with its Municipal Regional Permit authority in its adopted C.3 requirements. The C.3 requirements stipulate, that projects creating and/or redeveloping at least 10,000 square feet of impervious surface shall treat storm water runoff with permanent storm water management facilities, along with measures to control runoff rates and volumes. The proposed project would add a second driveway that is approximately 600 feet long and 20 feet wide that would create 12,000 square feet of new impervious surface area. Thus, the proposed project would be required to include storm water management facilities.

The C.3 requirements stipulate that projects that create or replace 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface must incorporate specific measures to reduce runoff, such as dispersion of runoff to vegetated areas, use of pervious pavement, installation of cisterns, and installation of bioretention facilities or planter boxes. The applicant is required to prepare a stormwater control plan (SWCP) for the proposed project that includes storm water controls as required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. The project storm water controls include dispersion to a natural onsite drainage channel reinforced by riprap and directing stormwater flow to a curb inlet located at the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac terminus. The SWCP will be reviewed by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development and/or the Department of Public Works. With implementation of the SWCP, the project would have a less than significant impact on water quality.

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

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

The project site receives water service from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). Since water service at the site is provided by EBMUD, no groundwater wells are required. The proposed project would therefore have no effect on groundwater supplies.

The applicant has included enhancement of the onsite drainage channel for storm water control, which would facilitate groundwater recharge and help offset the increase in impervious surface on the project site created by installation of the second driveway. Storm water on the upland portion of the project site would be directed to the drainage channel that would allow for percolation into the ground. Accordingly, the proposed project would have a less than significant adverse environmental impact on groundwater recharge.

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

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

Lodo clay loam occurs on the project site. This soil is characterized by moderate to high erosion hazard. As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.a, project storm water controls include dispersion to a natural onsite drainage channel reinforced by rip rap and directing stormwater flow to a curb inlet located at the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac terminus. During installation of the second driveway and drainage improvements, there would be surface grading and excavation. As evaluated in Environmental Checklist Section 7.b., **due to the installation of the second driveway on the Lodo clay loam, the potential for soil erosion is a significant adverse environmental impact. Thus, the applicant is required to implement the Geology 2 mitigation measures.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact from soil erosion to a less than significant level.

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

As discussed above in Environmental Checklist Section 10.c.i, with the proposed project drainage improvements, storm runoff would flow towards the onsite drainage channel or along the second driveway towards the northerly portion of the site to the curb inlet.

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

Accordingly, there would be a less than significant impact on the existing drainage system and would not result in on or off-site flooding.

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

Construction drawings for the second driveway and associated drainage improvements would be reviewed by the Building Inspection Division and/or the Public Works Department to ensure that there would be no substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on or off-site flooding. With the proposed project drainage improvements, which would consist of an improved onsite drainage channel and direction of storm runoff on the lower portion of the driveway towards the curb inlet, the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the operation of existing and planned stormwater drainage systems.

- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows? (Less Than Impact)*

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is located FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) Flood Map 06013C0289G. As shown on the FEMA Flood Map, land in the project vicinity is classified as being in Zone X, which is considered to be an area of minimal flood hazard. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on flood flows.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.c.iv above, the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is also not in an area that would be susceptible to inundation by seiche or tsunami. The California Geological Survey (2009) has projected and mapped the tsunami hazard posed by a tidal wave that passes through the Golden Gate and into San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay and Carquinez Strait. As mapped, the tsunami hazard in Contra Costa County is limited to the lowland areas immediately adjacent to these waterways. A seiche is a water wave in a standing body of water such as a large lake or reservoir that is caused by an earthquake, a major landslide, or strong winds. This hazard does not exist within the project vicinity as there are no large lakes or reservoirs in the area.

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.a above, the applicant is required to prepare a stormwater control plan (SWCP) for the proposed project that includes storm water controls as

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

required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. The project storm water controls include dispersion to a natural onsite drainage channel reinforced by riprap and directing stormwater flow to a curb inlet located at the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac terminus. The SWCP will be reviewed by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development and/or the Department of Public Works. With implementation of the SWCP, the project would have a less than significant impact on water quality. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan.

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 10, Division 1014. *Stormwater Management and Discharge Control*.
- [SoilWeb: An Online Soil Survey Browser | California Soil Resource Lab \(ucdavis.edu\)](https://soilweb.ucdavis.edu/). UC Davis, California Soil Resource Lab, 2024. *SoilWeb*.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil conservation Service, 1977. *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California*.
- [FEMA Flood Map Service Center | Search By Address](https://www.fema.gov/flood-maps), 2024. *FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency), Flood Map 06013C0289G, effective 03/21/2017*.
- California Emergency Management Agency, 2009. *Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning: Richmond Quadrangle/San Quentin Quadrangle, Mare Island Quadrangle, Benicia Quadrangle*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Safety Element*.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

Development of the second driveway would not physically divide an established community. The project site includes an existing single-family residence that will remain on the site. The residential property is located along Olympic Boulevard within an established R-10 Single-Family Residential District. Since the land use of the property with the second driveway will remain

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

consistent with the R-10 District and is substantially similar to those on adjoining parcels, and therefore, the project will not divide an established community.

- b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Less Than Significant Impact)*

The project involves the establishment a secondary driveway on the project site, consistent with the R-10 District. There are currently no applicable specific area policies for the Saranap Area adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, nor are there any specific to this land use type. Considering the small scale of the proposed project and use, and its compatibility with permitted uses in the single-family residential zoning district in which the project is located, the project has less than significant potential to conflict with land use plans or regulations for the Saranap and surrounding areas.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020.

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

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

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

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

Sources of Information

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

The purpose of the project is to construct and grade for a new second driveway to an existing residence. The use of the property would not substantially change with the second driveway. Accordingly, activities at the project site are not expected to expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of the Community Noise Exposure Levels shown on Figure 11-6 of the General Plan Noise Element. Parcels previously developed with single-family residences adjoin the project site to the south and west. Figure 11-6 shows that levels of 60 dB or less are normally acceptable and noise levels up to 70 dB are conditionally acceptable in residential areas. Since the project is not altering the use, and the driveway will be utilized for accessing the property, the noise levels would be minimal during long-term use of the driveway.

During project grading and construction, there may be periods of time where there would be loud noise from construction equipment, vehicles, and tools. The maximum projected noise level of construction equipment operating on the project site could be up to 88 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. **Although the grading and construction activities would be temporary, the activities could have a potentially significant impact during project construction on adjacent**

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

residences. Consequently, the applicant is required to implement the following noise mitigation measures.

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

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

New Year’s Day (State and Federal)

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

Washington’s Birthday (Federal)

Lincoln’s Birthday (State)

President’s Day (State)

Cesar Chavez Day (State)

Memorial Day (State and Federal)

Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)

Independence Day (State and Federal)

Labor Day (State and Federal)

Columbus Day (Federal)

Veterans Day (State and Federal)

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

Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)

Day after Thanksgiving (State)

Christmas Day (State and Federal)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The nearest public use airport is the Buchanan Field Airport, which is approximately 7.3 miles north of the project site, and the nearest public airport is the Oakland International Airport, located approximately 24.9 miles to the southwest. Accordingly, the project site would not be located within an area where there would be excessive airport-related noise.

Sources of Information

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

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project would result in the construction of a second driveway with no other expansion or creation of infrastructure in the area. As such, the potential project-related increase in population would be less than significant.

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

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

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

a) Fire Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Fire protection and emergency medical response services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD). Fire protection at the project site would be provided by Fire Station 3 located at 1520 Rossmoor Parkway, approximately 0.8 mile driving distance to the southeast. If necessary, additional fire protection support would be provided by Fire Station 15 located at 3338 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, approximately 2.2 miles driving distance to the northwest. Prior to construction of the second driveway, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the CCCYPD. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project on fire protection services would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the Saranap neighborhood. In addition to regular patrol service, backup police protection services would be provided by the Valley Station of the Sheriff's Office, located at 150 Alamo Plaza #C, approximately 4 miles driving distance to the southeast of the project site. The addition of the second driveway on the project site would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the Olympic Boulevard portion of the Saranap neighborhood.

c) Schools? (No Impact)

The second driveway would not affect occupancy of the project site. Accordingly, the proposed project would not affect any school.

d) Parks? (No Impact)

The second driveway would not affect occupancy of the project site. Thus, the project would not affect the use of any park.

e) Other public facilities? (No Impact)

The second driveway would not affect occupancy of the project site, and therefore would not affect the use of any library or health facility.

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

Sources of Information

- <https://www.cccfpd.org/station-address>, 2024. *Fire Stations, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.*
- [Valley Station | Contra Costa Sheriff, CA \(cocosheriff.org\)](http://cocosheriff.org), 2024. *Contra Costa County office of the Sheriff, Valley Station.*

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? (No Impact)*

As described in Environmental Checklist Section 15.d, the second driveway would not affect occupancy of the project site, and therefore, would not affect the use of any park. Similarly, the project would not affect the use of any regional facility.

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

The proposed project is the construction of a second driveway. There are no plans to construct or expand any onsite recreational facility. Therefore, there would be no impact arising from a recreational facility on the project site.

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242).*

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

17. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

Implementation Measure 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the General Plan requires a transportation impact analysis of any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips. Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers peak period trip generation rate of 0.74 AM peak hour trip and 0.99 PM peak hour trip per dwelling unit for single-family residences, the existing single-family residence on the project site generates a total of 2 (1 AM and 1 PM) peak hour trips. The second driveway on the project site would not affect the use or occupancy of the onsite residence. Accordingly, a project-specific traffic impact analysis is not required. Since the project would yield less than 100 AM or PM peak hour trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the circulation system in the Olympic Boulevard area of the Saranap neighborhood.

Similarly, since the second driveway would not affect the use or occupancy of the existing single-family residence, there would be no change in the effects of the project site on public transit, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities in the Saranap neighborhood.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 9.f, the second driveway would access the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac that is parallel to Olympic Boulevard. If the project is approved, the Public Works Department will require a Code-compliant intersection of the driveway with the cul-de-sac terminus. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to design features and it would have a less than significant impact.

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

The intent of construction of the second driveway is to provide adequate emergency access for the existing single-family residence on the project site. The driveway would meet the requirements of the County Code for second driveways and would be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Department, the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development, and the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Accordingly, the project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access.

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

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Growth Management Element*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020. *Transportation and Circulation Element*.
- Contra Costa County, 2020. *Contra Costa County Transportation Analysis Guidelines*.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017. *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*.
- Urban Crossroads, 2021. *Crooked Creek Trip Generation & VMT Screening Assessment*.
- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.

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>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 5.a above, no historical resources are on the project site. There is one existing building on the project site, a 5,370-square-foot single-family residence built in the 2000’s. Neither the building nor the property itself is of known historical significance. Thus, the project would have a would less than significant impact on any known historical or culturally significant resources. visible tribal cultural resources.

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

- b) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 50241, the lead agency shall consider significance of the resource to a California Naïve American tribe? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 5.b and 5.c above, grading and other earthwork associated with project construction could encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources and human remains. **Damage or destruction of archaeological resources and disturbance of human remains during project construction would be potentially significant impacts. Implementation of Cultural Resources 1 and Cultural Resources 2 would reduce the impacts to less than significant levels.**

Regarding paleontological resources, as discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 7.f, there is a possibility that buried fossils and other paleontological resources or hidden geologic features could be present and encountered during grading and other earthwork. **Damage or destruction of paleontological resources during project construction would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Cultural Resources 1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.**

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020. *Open Space Element*.

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 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 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"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

The project does not involve the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunication infrastructure. The project site is currently served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, and PG&E. These utility providers would continue to provide services to the existing single-family residence on the site. The project would not increase the demand for utility service as there is no proposed construction of any new buildings.

As described in Environmental Checklist Section 10.a, the proposed project must comply with applicable Contra Costa County C.3 requirements and include storm water management facilities. Accordingly, the applicant is required to prepare a SWCP for the proposed project that includes storm water controls such as dispersion to a natural onsite drainage channel reinforced by riprap and directing stormwater flow to a curb inlet located at the Olympic Boulevard cul-de-sac terminus. The SWCP will be reviewed by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development and/or the Department of Public Works. With implementation of the SWCP, no significant impacts related to storm drainage would be expected.

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

The site is currently served by East Bay Municipal District (EBMUD). Since there is no new development that would require water service, the construction and grading of a new second driveway will not affect water supplies as there will not be an increase in water consumption. Any future development would be required to obtain approval from EBMUD to ensure that the site has adequate supplies of water. Therefore, the project is expected to have no impact on the existing demand for water resources during dry, or multiple dry years.

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

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

The project site is within the service boundaries of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. The project does not include any structural development that would connect to the public sewer system. Thus, the project would not be expected to produce an added capacity demand on the wastewater system. As proposed, the project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project would have no impacts on water treatment facilities.

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

Installation of the second driveway would generate some construction solid waste. Construction waste would be hauled to the Acme Landfill, located at 890 Waterbird Way in Martinez. Future construction of the second driveway would incrementally add to the construction waste headed to the landfill; however, the impact of the project-related incremental increase is considered to be less than significant. Further, construction on the project site would be subject to the CalGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program administered by the Department of Conservation and Development at the time of application for a building permit. The Debris Recovery Program would reduce the construction debris headed to the landfill by diverting materials that can be recycled to appropriate recycling facilities.

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

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

Sources of Information

- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- [Acme Landfill – Contra Costa County's Pioneer Sanitary Landfill](#), 2024. *Acme Landfill*.
- [CalGreen / Construction & Demolition \(C&D\) Debris Recovery Program | Contra Costa County, CA Official Website](#), 2024. *Contra Costa County, Conservation and Development Department, CalGreen / Construction & Demolition (C&D) Debris Recovery Program*.

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

20. WILDFIRE – <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: (Less Than Significant Impact)

- a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than significant):*

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 9.g, the project site and vicinity are in a high fire hazard severity zone in a local responsibility area. Consequently, the existing single-family residence on the project site is required to conform to the provisions of the California Building Code and California Fire Code related to construction in wildland urban interface fire areas. The second driveway is intended to provide a second means of egress in the event of a wildfire on or near the single-family residence on the project site. Thus, the driveway would improve emergency response and evacuation of the existing single-family residence, and the impacts of the project would be less than significant.

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

As discussed above, the second driveway would improve emergency response and evacuation of the onsite single-family residence. Further the construction drawings for the driveway would be

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

reviewed and approved by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD). Accordingly, the secondary access to and from the residence would be reviewed and approved by the CCCFPD, and therefore, would not be expected to be substantially encumbered due to a wildfire, and persons on the project site would be able to readily evacuate if necessary. Furthermore, the Tree Permit application is to remove four code-protected trees on the project site order to accommodate the driveway. Along with the CCCFPD review of the project plans and the CCCFPD-required weed abatement, the tree removal would reduce risks posed by fires on the site and in the Saranap neighborhood. Therefore, wildfire risk to the occupants of the single-family residence on the project site would be less than significant.

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

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 7.a.iv and 7.c, **the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts due to landslides which could be exacerbated by a wildfire. Accordingly, the applicant is required to implement the Geology 1 mitigation measures.**

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the wildfire risks due to landslides to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- Calfire, 2007. *Contra Costa County Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map.*

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

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY:

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Sections 3 (Air Quality), 4 (Biological Resources), 5 (Cultural Resources) 7 (Geology and Soils), and 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources), the proposed project would have potentially significant construction impacts on air quality, nesting birds, and due to the accidental discovery of buried archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. Mitigation measures, including Air Quality 1, Air Quality 2, Biological Resource 1, Cultural Resources 1, and Cultural Resources 2 are proposed that address these potentially significant impacts. If the proposed project is approved, the mitigation measures will be conditions of approval of the proposed project and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures. With implementation of the mitigation measures, project impacts will be less than significant.

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

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

Removal of four code-protected trees, work within the drip lines of 12 code-protected trees, and installation of the second driveway over a 0.28 portion of the 13.32-acre site would be relatively minor in scale, and therefore, would not create substantial cumulative impacts. The project would not alter the use of the project site or increase the number of persons or housing units on the site. Thus, the proposed project would be consistent with the existing surrounding single-family residential land use in the Saranap neighborhood and would have less than significant cumulative impacts.

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

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

REFERENCES

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

- Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, 1971. *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*. U.S.E.P.A. Office of Noise Abatement and Control, Contract 68-04-0047.
- California Department of Conservation. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2020*.
- California Emergency Management Agency, 2009. *Tsunami Inundation Maps for Emergency Planning: Richmond Quadrangle/San Quentin Quadrangle, Mare Island Quadrangle, Benicia Quadrangle*.
- Darwin Myers Associates, *Geologic Peer Review/Driveway Grading, August 15, 2024*.
- Humann Company, Inc., 2023. *Grading and Drainage Plans, Bennet Family Trust (10 M 242)*.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017. *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition*.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1977. *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, California*.
- Urban Crossroads, 2021. *Crooked Creek Trip Generation & VMT Screening Assessment*.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Site & Grading Plan**
- 3. Arborist Report**