

## CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** County File #CDLP21-02005  
Horse Boarding and Riding Facility “Center Line Equestrian Center”
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County  
Department of Conservation and Development  
30 Muir Rd.  
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Everett Louie, Planner II  
(925) 655-2873
4. **Project Location:** 2300 Cummings Road, Knightsen, CA 94513  
Assessor’s Parcel Number: 020-210-023
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Christopher Manuel  
2300 Cummings Road  
Knightsen, CA 94513
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within an Agricultural Lands (AL) General Plan land use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is located within an A-2 General Agricultural District (A-2)
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant is requesting approval of a Land Use Permit application to permit an existing horse boarding facility and horse-riding facility for up to 50 horses located at 2300 Cummings Road in Knightsen. All buildings and structures exist. No development, beyond establishing unpaved parking spaces (a total of 20 on-site parking spaces) and relocating four existing horse shelters to the interior of the parcel is proposed at this time. The proposed hours of operation are 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM and the proposed hours of operation for the riding academy are 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM. The riding academy will have a maximum of 12 riding lessons per day (with a maximum of 6 riders per lesson). The applicant is also proposing to hold special events, which includes two summer camps, one Halloween camp, one Easter camp and two birthday parties. The maximum number of people at special events is 16 participants. The business will have three full-time employees. The project includes a Variance Permit from the Off-Street Parking requirements for: access requirements; parking lot surfacing; striping, markings, and signage; lighting; and landscaping.

The project also includes an exception request in accordance with Chapter 92-6 from the collect and convey requirements specific in Chapter 914-2 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is a 10.71-acre rectangular shaped lot located directly north from the intersection of Cummings Road and Murphy Lane, both privately

maintained roads in the Knightsen area of unincorporated Contra Costa County. The site gains access via Cummings Road from Sunset Road, a publicly maintained road. Cummings Road is an unpaved gravel road and no additional frontage improvements or offers of dedications are required as part of this application. There is a 60-foot roadway easement along the south and west property lines that is dedicated to Contra Costa County with the creation of the Minor Subdivision that created this parcel.

The subject property is rectangular in shape and flat. It is developed with horse pastures along the northwestern portion of the parcel, two rectangular sand riding areas (approximately 20,600 sf and 25,544 sf) located on the southwest corner of the parcel and a smaller 8,712 sf sand riding area located on the eastern side of the parcel. Scattered throughout the property are multiple buildings related to the horse use including one hay storage located on the western property line (building I), three horse barns located around the center of the parcel (buildings A, E, F, G), six horse shelters located on the northeastern corner and middle of the parcel (buildings B, C, D). 20 parking spaces are provided within the center of the parcel. In the southeast corner of the parcel is an existing single-family residence, detached garage and related accessory agricultural uses. There are a few trees around the property, including a few lining the private roadway to the west, a few around the single-family residence and a few sparsely spread out within the parcel.

All of the parcels surrounding the project site are zoned for agricultural uses (A-2 and A-3 Zoning) and all parcels within a half-mile of the project parcel have a General Plan Designation of Agricultural Lands. Surrounding uses include single-family homes, agricultural buildings, and agricultural uses such as crop farming, nurseries, and equestrian facilities. Within a 3,000-foot radius, there is at least four horse boarding facilities and horse-riding facilities.

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

- Contra Costa County, Department of Conservation and Development, Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County, Public Works Department
- Contra Costa Environmental Health Department
- East 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, has consultation begun?**

A Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation was sent on December 7, 2022, in accordance with section 21080.3.1 of the California Resources Code to the Wilton Rancheria and Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation. The Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation responded on December 13, 2022 stating that they had no concerns on this project at this time. Therefore, consultation with Native American tribes has not occurred in relation to this project. As a courtesy, the County will provide a copy of this environmental document for the Tribe's comments.

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would have been potentially affected by this project, but have been mitigated in a manner as to not result in a significant effect on the environment:

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

### Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Everett Louie  
Project Planner  
Contra Costa County  
Department of Conservation & Development

4/5/2023  
Date

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant 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 subject property is not located within or adjacent to a major scenic resource and will therefore have a less than significant impact on a scenic vista.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Figure 5-4 (Scenic Routes Plan) of the Contra Costa County Transportation and Circulation Element identifies the roadways which form the Countywide scenic routes plan. The project site is located just north of the intersection of Cummings Road and Murphy Lane in the Knightsen area of unincorporated Contra Costa County, which is not identified as a scenic route. The nearest scenic route or highway is a portion of Highway 4 over 1.5 miles southwest and Byron Highway which is more than 1.2 miles east of the project site. Since the subject property is not readily visible from a state scenic highway and no new construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time, the project would not damage

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

scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- 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 previously mentioned, the subject property is not located near a major scenic resource and is not visible from a state scenic highway. No new construction of new buildings or structures are proposed, and the visual character of the property will remain agricultural in appearance, which is compatible with the surrounding agricultural area. The surrounding area is not urbanized but characterized as rural with farms and single-family homes spaced around. The project would match the visual character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the project is not expected to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

- 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:** Approval of the project would allow the operation of a horse boarding facility at the project site. The maximum number of horses that can be boarded at the site is 50 horses, and no expansion is proposed at this time. Although headlamp light/glare can be expected from cars visiting the site, the proposed hours of operation for this site are Monday – Sunday between 8am – 8pm and the proposed hours of operation for the riding academy are Monday – Saturday between 9am – 7pm. Thus, the amount of headlamp light/glare from cars can be expected to be reduced after operational hours. The project also proposes to include five temporary 300w LED solar lights to be placed around one of the sand riding arenas for safety and security. The nearest residence is approximately 335 feet to the east from the location of the proposed temporary lights. Additionally, a condition of approval would require the lights to be motion sensor to reduce the amount of light pollution during the night hours. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on new light or glare for the area.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 5: Transportation and Circulation Element.” 2005-2020.  
<http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 9: Open Space Element.” 2005-2020.  
<http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30919/Ch9-Open-Space-Element?bidId=>

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

<b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 *California Important Farmland Finder* map, the project site is designated as other land and 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:** The project site is located within the A-2, General Agricultural District. Dude ranches, riding academies and stables may be allowed by issuance of a land use permit. Therefore, the project will not conflict with the existing zoning. In addition, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will not conflict with the existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract.

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

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

*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) or timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any properties zoned as forest land.

- 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 above. Nevertheless, no trees are proposed to be removed with this proposal. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As previously mentioned, the project site is located within the A-2, General Agricultural District. Dude ranches, riding academies and stables may be allowed by issuance of a land use permit. This designation states that dude ranches and riding academies are compatible uses within the agricultural district. Since approval of the land use permit would legalize the operation of a horse boarding facility at the project site (no new development proposed), the project would not result in changes to the existing environment, which due to their location or nature would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County Code. “Title 8 – Zoning.” Accessed in 2022.  
[https://library.municode.com/ca/contra\\_costa\\_county/codes/ordinance\\_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO](https://library.municode.com/ca/contra_costa_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO).

California Department of Conservation. “California Important Farmland Finder.” Accessed in 2022.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact (a-b):** Contra Costa County is within the San Francisco Bay air basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“BAAQMD”). In May 2017, BAAQMD updated its Air Quality Guidelines, which included operational and construction-related emissions screening criteria. If the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that exceed the thresholds of significance for the criteria air pollutants.

Contra Costa County is within the San Francisco Bay air basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) pursuant to the Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. The purpose of the Clean Air Plan is to bring the air basin into compliance with the requirements of Federal and State air quality standards. BAAQMD has prepared CEQA Guidelines to assist lead agencies in air quality analysis, as well as to promote sustainable development in the region. The CEQA Guidelines support lead agencies in analyzing air quality impacts. If, after analysis, the project’s air quality impacts are found to be below the significance thresholds, then the air quality impacts may be considered less than significant. The Air District developed screening criteria to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether the proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If all of the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project’s air pollutant emissions. Since all buildings and structures are existing, and the land use permit would allow the operation of the horse boarding facility, it can be assumed that the project would not be in conflict with the Clean Air Plan or obstruct its implementation and would not contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact (c-d):** Equestrian-related odors (e.g.: manure) are anticipated to originate from the site. California Health and Safety Code Sec. 41700(a) states that “Except as otherwise provided in Section 41705, a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any of those persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.” The proposed project is exempt from the above code section under 41705(5) of the California Health and Safety Code which classified horse boarding and riding facilities as an agricultural operation. In addition, the project site and vicinity are located within the A-2 zoning district, which allows for all types of agriculture, including general farming, wholesale horticulture and floriculture, wholesale nurseries and greenhouses, mushroom rooms, dairying, livestock production, fur farms, poultry raising, animal breeding, aviaries, apiaries, forestry, and similar agricultural uses. Many of these uses emit agricultural odors during daily operations. A horse stable and horse-riding facility are similar in nature to these odor producing activities. Additionally, dude ranches, riding academies and stables may be allowed upon issuance of a land use permit. Moreover, the project site is located in an area that contains agricultural uses including similar horse-riding facilities and boarding facilities. The surrounding area is already subject to agricultural odors that the continued operation of an existing horse operation would not substantially increase pollutant concentrations. Lastly, the majority of the parcels here are large and allow for space between parcels which reduces the range of odor emissions. Thus, equestrian-related odors are to be expected, and the project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

**Sources of Information**

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. “California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines.” May 2017. [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa\\_guidelines\\_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en).

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. “Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final, 2017 Clean Air Plan.” Adopted 19 April 2017. [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a\\_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en).

California Health and Safety Code. Accessed in 2022. [https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=HSC&division=26.&title=&part=4.&chapter=3.&article=1](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=HSC&division=26.&title=&part=4.&chapter=3.&article=1).

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

<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** It is unlikely that the project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status, due to the location of the project site (parcel that has been historically used as agricultural uses within an agricultural zoning district) and lack of suitable habitat (there are no, creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats located on the subject parcel). According to Figure 8-1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan, the site is not identified as an area of significant Ecological Areas. Furthermore, the project will not modify any habitat than what is

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

currently existing as there is no major ground disturbing construction proposed. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact on any habitat identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- 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:** 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 by the CDFW. 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, the project site is not located in or adjacent to a significant ecological resource area. In addition, the property contains no perennial or intermittent streams, creeks or other riparian habitat. Therefore, the project would not 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 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:** Wetlands are defined and identified under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act 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.” According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory map, no wetlands are located at or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands are expected to occur as a result of this project.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** There are no creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats located on the subject parcel. As previously mentioned, the project site is disturbed by the existing horse facilities, and all improvements are existing. In addition, surrounding parcels have been developed with single-family homes, agricultural buildings, and agricultural uses, such as crop farming, nurseries, and equestrian facilities. As previously mentioned, Figure 8-1 of the County General Plan states that the site does not contain any Significant Ecological Areas, the Wetlands Inventory Map shows that there are no wetlands located at or adjacent to the project site and the site was not identified as a sensitive community by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native

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

resident, or migratory fish, or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of nursery sites, based on existing site conditions and the surrounding land uses.

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

**No Impact:** The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal while allowing for reasonable development of private property. On any property proposed for development approval, the Ordinance requires tree alteration or removal to be considered as part of the project application. The proposed project would not require the removal of any protected trees, nor would any development take place within the dripline of a tree protected under the Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance. Therefore, no conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

- 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), which 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 eastern Contra Costa County. On May 3, 2021, the HCP sent an email stating that they had no comments on the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan.

**Sources of Information**

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). “CDFW Public Access Lands.” Interactive Map. Accessed in 2022. <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/lands/>.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 8: Conservation Element.” 2005-2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30918/Ch8-Conservation-Element?bidId=>.

East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy. “East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy Website.” Accessed in 2022. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/cd/water/HCP/>.

East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy. Returned Agency Comment Request Form. Date received on May 3, 2021.

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

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). “Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.” Website. Accessed in 2022. <https://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/how-wetlands-are-defined-and-identified-under-cwa-section-404#:~:text=%22Wetlands%20are%20areas%20that%20are,life%20in%20saturated%20soil%20conditions>.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. “National Wetlands Inventory.” Interactive Map. Accessed in 2022. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>.

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

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

**No Impact:** The parcel is not a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, because:

1. It is not a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources;
2. It is not a resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code; and
3. Has not been determined to be historically or culturally significant by a lead agency.

- 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:** According to Figure 9-2 of the Open Space Element of the County General Plan, the project site is an area of medium archaeological sensitivity. The proposed project is to legalize an existing horse boarding and horse-riding facility. There is no new ground disturbing activities that could cause a substantial adverse change in an archaeological resource. Additionally, the site is not located in the Historic Resources Inventory as designated by the Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee. Thus, the project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As previously mentioned, no ground disturbance (e.g.: new construction) is proposed at this time. The site and surrounding area has not been used as a formal

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

cemetery. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

***Sources of Information***

Contra Costa County. “Historic Resources Inventory.” Accessed in 2022.

[https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=.](https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=)

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) serves as the basis for the design and construction of buildings in California. Specifically, the California Energy Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) was first adopted by the California Energy Commission in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce energy consumption in California and contains energy conservation standards applicable to all residential and non-residential buildings throughout California. These standards are updated periodically to allow for the consideration and inclusion of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.

The California Building Standards Commission adopted the California Green Building Standards Code, also known as CALGreen, (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11) to improve public health, safety and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices. Although the CALGreen Code was adopted as part of the State’s efforts to reduce GHG emissions, the standards have co-benefits of reducing energy consumption from residential and nonresidential buildings subject to this standard. The applicant will be required to comply with the updated 2022 CALGreen Code when they apply for building permits to legalize the buildings.

The project proposes solar lights which would run off the sun and would not require additional energy. A horse boarding facility and horse-riding academy is not a use that would require substantial energy. Therefore, because all buildings and structures are existing and that no construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time and the operation of a horse boarding facility requires minimal energy consumption (given that activities take place outdoors and during the daytime), the project would not be expected to have a significant impact regarding wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction (no construction required) or operation.

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

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

As previously mentioned, since all buildings and structures are existing (no construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time), and the operation of a horse boarding facility requires minimal energy consumption (since activities take place outdoors), the project would not be expected to have a significant impact regarding wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project operation. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

**Sources of Information**

California Building Standards Commission. “2022 California Green Building Standards Code – CalGreen – California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11.” Accessed in 2022. <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CAGBC2022P1>.

Contra Costa County. “CalGreen / Construction & Demolition (C&D) Debris Recovery Program.” Accessed in 2022. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4746/CalGreen-Construction-Demolition-Debris->

Contra Costa County. “Climate Action Plan.” Adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on 15 December 2015. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/39791/Contra-Costa-County-Climate-Action-Plan?bidId=>.

California Energy Commission. “2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards For Residential and Nonresidential Buildings.” Accessed in 2022. <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2018publications/CEC-400-2018-020/CEC-400-2018-020-CMF.pdf>.

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

<b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. According to the California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, implemented by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest Earthquake Fault zone (Marsh Creek Fault) is over 11 miles southwest.

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

Because the site is not within an official Earthquake Fault Zone, the risk of fault rupture is generally regarded as very low.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building code and the County Grading Ordinance. The County has adopted the California Building Code (CBC), which requires use of seismic parameters in the design of all structures requiring building permits, including mixed use structures and most accessory structures. Seismic parameters are based on soil profile types and proximity of faults deemed capable of generating strong/violent earthquake shaking. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. All buildings and structures exist, but do not currently have building permits. The applicant will be required to apply for building permits through the County Building Inspection Division who will review the plans in accordance with the California Building Code. Moreover, as stated above, the project site is over 11 miles southwest of the nearest fault. Therefore, the impacts from seismic ground shaking would be expected 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 within a Liquefaction Zone. However, since all buildings and structures are existing and 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, the environmental impact from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be expected to be less than significant.

iv) *Landslides?*

**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 Landslide Zone. Since the site is not within a Landslide Zone, potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, the soil series mapped on the site is Brentwood clay loam and Dehli sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes. Brentwood clay loam is described as well drained, and runoff is low. Dehli sand is described as somewhat excessively drained, and runoff is very low. Since clay and sandy soils are less prone to erosion, soil erosion hazards can be considered less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As previously mentioned, the site is not within a Landslide Zone and is in a liquefaction zone. In addition, the risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building code and the County Grading Ordinance. The County has adopted the California Building Code (CBC), which requires use of seismic parameters in the design of all structures requiring building permits, including mixed use structures and most accessory structures. Seismic parameters are based on soil profile types and proximity of faults deemed capable of generating strong/violent earthquake shaking. Quality construction, conservative design and compliance with building and grading regulations can be expected to keep risks within generally accepted limits. All buildings and structures are existing and will be required to obtain buildings permits from the County Building Inspection Division which will ensure that the existing buildings are built to the California Building Code. Therefore, potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, the soil series mapped on the site is Brentwood clay loam and Dehli sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes. Clay soils are generally classified as expansive (expansive soils expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out). However, no construction of new buildings or structures are proposed as part of this project. In addition, most activity takes place outdoors (and not within an enclosed building). Furthermore, buildings requiring permits related to the project (e.g.: Horse Shelters, Hose Barns, Hay Barn) will be reviewed for structural requirements based on site soil types as part of the building permit process. Therefore, because the project will be required to obtain the proper building permits, potential impacts can be considered less than significant.

- e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site already relies on well water and a septic system that is permitted by the Contra Costa County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Department. Moreover, the project will not require the use of a septic tank as the business will utilize a portable toilet that will be serviced bi-weekly. The project was referred to the Contra Cosa Environmental Health Department for comments. The Environmental Health Department reviewed the request for portable toilet facilities and stated that the applicant must obtain Environmental Health compliance for the proposed portable toilet facilities. Therefore, the project will not introduce a substantial burden on the existing septic tank that would create soils incapable of supporting it.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** There are no known paleontological resources located at the project site nor have any unique geological features been identified. No ground disturbance (e.g.: new construction of new buildings or structures) is proposed at this time. The project site is flat and has been used as a horse boarding facility for some time. Therefore, the project is not expected to destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature directly or indirectly.

**Sources of Information**

California Department of Conservation. “EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application.” Accessed in 2021. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 10: Safety Element.” 2005-2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30920/Ch10-Safety-Element?bidId=>.

United States Department of Agriculture. “Web Soil Survey.” Accessed in 2022. [Web Soil Survey - Home \(usda.gov\)](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Products/soil).

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**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.

Senate Bill 97 directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA Guidelines for evaluation of GHG emissions impacts and recommend mitigation strategies. In response, OPR released the Technical Advisory: CEQA and Climate Change, and proposed revisions to the State CEQA guidelines (April 14, 2009) for consideration of GHG emissions. The California Natural Resources Agency adopted the proposed State CEQA Guidelines revisions on December 30, 2009 and the revisions were effective beginning March 18, 2010.

A bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>/year is a numeric emissions level below which a project's contribution to global climate change would be less than "cumulatively considerable." This emissions rate is equivalent to a project size of approximately 60 single-family dwelling units. The proposed project does not exceed the threshold of 60 single-family dwelling units because the project consists of permitting existing buildings and does not include any new single-family dwellings. The land use permit would allow the continued operation of the horse boarding facility which is a use that does not generally increase greenhouse gases as a horse boarding facility does not generally use machines or equipment that creates greenhouse gases. Because the proposed project is less than the construction of 60 single-family dwellings units, it can be reasonably assumed that the project will have a less than significant impact on the environment regarding greenhouse gas emissions.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As discussed above in subsection-a and in accordance with the Contra Costa County Climate Action Plan, which was discussed in the Air Quality section of this study, any impacts of the proposed project would result in negligible increases to the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in the County. The 2017 Thresholds of Significance set forth in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines include an analysis and screening criteria for determining if a project would contribute to a significant impact to the environment due to the projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As is done with the regulated air pollutants, if the proposed project would generate GHG emissions above the identified threshold, then the project would be seen as having the potential for a significant impact. As indicated in the Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance (Table 2-1) of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a project with total Operational-Related GHG emissions from other than stationary sources that are at a minimum 1,100 metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year level or otherwise are not in compliance with a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would have a significant impact on the environment. All buildings and structures are existing. No construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time. It is reasonable to anticipate that the project will not conflict with any policies or regulations in relation to greenhouse gases because the project will not exceed the 1,100 MT carbon dioxide threshold and will not result in significant levels of Greenhouse Gases. There may be some increase in greenhouse gases as a result of the project, but they would be considered less than significant due to the nature of the project. Therefore, the proposed horse facility would not substantially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

**Sources of Information**

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. “California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines.” May 2017. [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa\\_guidelines\\_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en).

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. “Spare the Air, Cool the Climate Final, 2017 Clean Air Plan.” Adopted 19 April 2017. [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a\\_-\\_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_-_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en).

California Energy Commission. “2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards For Residential and Nonresidential Buildings.” December 2018. <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2018publications/CEC-400-2018-020/CEC-400-2018-020-CMF.pdf>.

Contra Costa County. “Climate Action Plan.” Adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on 15 December 2015. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/39791/Contra-Costa-County-Climate-Action-Plan?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County. “Municipal Climate Action Plan. Measures to Reduce Municipal Greenhouse Gas Emissions.” December 2008. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/2905/Municipal-Climate-Action-Plan-1208-Attachment-A?bidId=>.

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

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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:** Project operation would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of horse manure. According to the project proponent, the horse stalls are cleaned seven days a week and the manure is subsequently spread in the designated areas within the horse pastures located on the north side of the property, away from all structures that would house people and locations of where people would visit the property. The areas chosen are not located near water sources and will be composted and spread over the pastures. The manure is turned to imitate and maintain the natural composting process and is subsequently used as an all-natural soil amendment on the subject property. To manage the fly population, the project plans to spread the manure quickly which allows for it to dry faster which is unattractive to flies. Additionally, the applicants subscribe to a biological fly control (fly predators) that prevent adult flies from

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

developing. The fly predators remove the fly population in the pupa stage, preventing them from becoming adult pest. In addition, the site will not keep any standing water on the property. All horses are watered utilizing automatic waters that would allow water to flow and not become standing water to reduce / eliminate the growth of mosquitos. The project was reviewed by the Contra Costa Mosquito & Vector Control District who provided a returned agency comment letter on April 26, 2021. The comments provided will be included as conditions of approval which will require the project to eliminate any standing water beyond 72 hours. The project was also reviewed by the Contra Costa Environmental Health Department who stated that all manure will be required to comply with the California Department of Food and Agriculture and must comply with all regulations including setbacks and regulations to any onsite wells and groundwater.

Based on the management practices currently in place, long-term impacts associated with handling, storing, and dispensing of horse manure from project operation would be considered less than significant, especially since the project site is located within an agricultural zoning district and agricultural by products are a normal part of 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:** No evidence reviewed by staff suggests that the project would include foreseeable conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment. The operation of a horse boarding facility would not involve the handling, use, or storage of substances that are acutely hazardous. In addition, prior to initiation of the use (if the project is approved), the applicant shall submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval of the Public Works Department. The SWPPP shall document Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the project to minimize the discharge of pollutants from the project. The SWPPP shall include BMPs related to manure management, horse washing, and other activities that have the potential to result in pollutant discharges related to the horse stable and boarding facility. Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected.

- 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:** As previously mentioned, no evidence reviewed by staff suggests that the project would include foreseeable conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment. In addition, the closest school appears to be Knightsen Elementary School, which is approximately 0.48 miles to the north and an approximate 1.6 miles driving distance. Because of the distance between the project site and the school, it is reasonable to conclude that the project would not impact on the nearest school.

- 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?*

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

**No Impact:** The subject property is not identified as a hazardous materials site, according to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Therefore, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- 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 subject property is not located within an area covered by the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, nor is the project located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. Therefore, 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 site gains access via Cummings Road which can be accessed from Sunset Road (publicly maintained road), and from Murphy Drive or Cunha Drive (privately maintained roads). Cummings Road, Murphy Lane and Cunha Drive are unpaved gravel roads with no additional improvements or offers of dedications are required as part of this application. Since the project does not involve any roadway modifications, and work within a public right-of-way would be subject to review by the Contra Costa County Public Works Department (to ensure that such work will not disrupt vehicular travel on public roadways), the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

It should also be noted that the project was referred to the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District (ECCFPD) for comments regarding compliance with applicable provisions of the California Fire Code pertaining to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. In an comment letter received on April 22, 2021, the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District would required the following; (a) The Permittee shall request that the Project site be annexed into the most current Community Facilities District for fire protection and emergency response services (if applicable), or the developer will provide an alternative funding mechanism acceptable to the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District for the provision of fire protection and emergency response services. (b) The Permittee shall pay all fire facility impact fees at the time of the issuance of the first building permit, at the then-current rate. (c) The Permittee shall construct the proposed building in accordance with the current edition of the California Building, Fire Code and the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District Ordinance. The requirements of the California Health and Safety Code, section 122385 will apply requiring a fire alarm and fire sprinkler system. The applicant will be required to comply with all ECCFPD requirements, and therefore, the project is not expected to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

- 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 is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site is classified as Non-Wildland / Non-Urban lands. In addition, as previously mentioned, the project shall be conditioned to comply with all of the requirements set forth by the Fire District. Therefore, a less than significant impact would be expected regarding the risk of loss, injury or death involving exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County. “Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.” 13 December 2000. [http://www.cccounty.us/DocumentCenter/View/851/Cover-Introduction-and-County-wide-Policies?bidId=.](http://www.cccounty.us/DocumentCenter/View/851/Cover-Introduction-and-County-wide-Policies?bidId=)

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 5: “Transportation and Circulation Element.” 2005-2020. [http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=.](http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=)

Contra Costa County Public Works Department. “Land Use Permit CDLP21-02005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval.” Dated 19, April 2022. Agency Comment Response Memo.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. “Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese).” Accessed in 2022. [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site\\_type=CSITES,FUDS&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,FUDS&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29)

California State Geoportal. “California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer.” Accessed in 2022. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>.

East Contra Costa Fire Protection District. “RE: Contra Costa County File #CDLP21-02005.” Dated 22 April 2021. Email.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality because the applicant will be required to comply with all rules, regulations and procedures of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for municipal, construction and industrial activities as promulgated by the California State Water Resources Control Board, or any of its Regional Water Quality Control Boards Central Valley - Region IV. Compliance will include developing long-term best management practices (BMPs) for the reduction or elimination of stormwater pollutants. The project design will incorporate wherever feasible, long-term BMPs in accordance with the Contra Costa Clean Water Program for the site's stormwater drainage.

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

In addition, prior to initiation of the use (if the project is approved), the applicant will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval of the Public Works Department. The SWPPP shall document Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the project to minimize the discharge of pollutants from the project. The SWPPP will include BMPs related to manure management, horse washing, and other activities that have the potential to result in pollutant discharges related to the horse stable and boarding facility. Any permanent structural BMPs must be constructed and inspected prior to final inspection for building permits.

- 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 is not served by public water or by public sewer and instead relies on well water and a septic system. The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface that would prevent groundwater recharge and does not propose a type of project that requires a substantial increase in water. The project will be conditioned to require the applicant to contact the Contra Costa Environmental Health (CCEH) to determine if the applicant need to obtain approval from CCEH prior to initiation of the use so that the County can ensure adequate service can be provide to the project site. Additionally, an advisory note will be added (if the project is approved) to ensure that the applicant knows to contact CCEH. This will ensure that the potential impact of the project on groundwater supplies will be less than significant.

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

- i) *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
- ii) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site*
- 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?*
- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

**Less Than Significant Impact (i-iv):** Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code requires that all storm water entering and/or originating on this property to be collected and conveyed, without diversion and within an adequate storm drainage system, to an adequate natural watercourse having a definable bed and banks or to an existing adequate public storm drainage system which conveys the storm water to an adequate natural watercourse. The applicant is not proposing to construct any new structures and will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern onsite,

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

therefore the applicant has requested an exception to Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code. In the Staff Report & Recommended Conditions of Approval letter from Public Works dated April 19, 2022, the Public Works Department reviewed the project and has no objection to the granting of an exception provided there are no existing drainage problems in the area, no concentrated runoff is being directed to adjacent parcels, and the existing drainage pattern is maintained. Therefore, because the project was reviewed by the Public Works Department, the project is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not lie within the Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year flood boundary) as designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Maps and is located in a Flood Zone X. In addition, the project site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone, pursuant to the Contra Costa County Tsunami Inundation Maps produced collectively by tsunami modelers, geologic hazard mapping specialists, and emergency planning scientists from CGS, Cal OES, and The Tsunami Research Center at the University of Southern California. In addition, the project area is not located in close proximity to any waterbody (e.g.: no large lakes or reservoirs) capable of producing a sizable seiche. Thus, resulting in a less than significant impact from these hazards.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because the applicant will be required to comply with all rules, regulations and procedures of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for municipal, construction and industrial activities as promulgated by the California State Water Resources Control Board, or any of its Regional Water Quality Control Boards Central Valley - Region IV. Compliance will include developing long-term best management practices (BMPs) for the reduction or elimination of stormwater pollutants. The project design will incorporate wherever feasible, long-term BMPs in accordance with the Contra Costa Clean Water Program for the site's stormwater drainage. Thus, project impacts are expected to be less than significant.

**Sources of Information**

California Department of Conservation. “Contra Costa County Tsunami Inundation Maps.” Accessed in 2020. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Pages/Tsunami/Maps/ContraCosta.aspx>.

Contra Costa County Public Works Department. “Land Use Permit LP21-02025 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval - Revision.” Dated 19 April 2022. Agency Comment Response Memo.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is located at the end of Cummings Road, just north of the intersection of Cumming Road and Murphy Lane. Cummings Road is a privately maintained road in the Knightsen area of unincorporated Contra Costa County. Surrounding properties have been developed with single-family homes, agricultural buildings, and agricultural uses, such as crop farming, nurseries, and equestrian facilities. Due to the agricultural zoning (A-2, General Agriculture District) of the project vicinity, the proposed development would not divide an established community because it is proposing dude ranches and stables that are compatible uses with the surrounding area. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

- 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 subject property has an Agricultural Lands General Plan land use designation. The purpose of the Agricultural Lands designation is to preserve and protect lands capable of and generally used for the production of food, fiber, and plant materials. Uses that are allowed in the Agricultural Lands designation include all land dependent and non-land dependent agricultural production and related activities. In addition, guest or dude ranches, horse training and boarding ranches may be allowed with the issuance of a land use permit. A land use permit includes conditions of approval that mitigate the impacts of the use upon nearby properties. For example, off-site parking could be restricted as a condition of approval for the project (in an attempt to address concerns regarding the use of the private road).

For this particular project, the site requires variances due to the proposed parking configuration will not comply with all of the design and layout requirements in the Off-Street Parking Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant is requesting variances from the Off-Street Parking Ordinance requirements for: Access Requirements; Driveway Aisles; Surfacing; Striping, Markings, Signage; lighting; and landscaping. The Variance findings can be made as the site contains numerous existing constraints that would make the project infeasible if required to comply with the off-street parking requirements. Typically, dirt agricultural lots request variances as paving an agricultural area is infeasible. County Staff has made the three findings required for Variance approval.

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

Lastly, the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding area as this area is dominated by parcels containing horse use facilities. Therefore, the project is not expected to have 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.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County Code. “Title 8 – Zoning.” Accessed in 2021. [https://library.municode.com/ca/contra\\_costa\\_county/codes/ordinance\\_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO](https://library.municode.com/ca/contra_costa_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO).

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 3: Land Use Element.” 2005 – 2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30913/Ch3-Land-Use-Element?bidId=>.

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

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Contra Costa County General Plan Conservation Element. According to Figure 8-4 of the Conservation Element of the County General Plan, no known mineral resources have been identified in the project vicinity, and therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

- b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

**No Impact:** The project site is not within an area of known mineral importance according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan, and therefore, the project would not impact any mineral resource recovery site.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 8: Conservation Element.” 2005-2020.  
[http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30918/Ch8-Conservation-Element?bidId=.](http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30918/Ch8-Conservation-Element?bidId=)

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

- a) *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:** Pursuant to Figure 11-6 in the Noise Element of the County’s General Plan, the normally acceptable standard for outdoor noise levels in agricultural areas is a DNL of 75 dB. In agricultural areas, noise from farm equipment (e.g.: tractors, plows, etc.) and farm animals is expected. The project site has historically been used as a horse boarding and riding facility and surrounding uses also contain similar uses (although it is currently unpermitted). The project will not substantially increase the noise levels from what currently is existing. The proposed project will include occasional events throughout the year. All events are required to obtain a temporary event permit from the Department of Conservation and Development and will be limited in how many events can occur. This will ensure that the project will not substantially increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity. Staff has also included a condition of approval that prohibits the use of amplified music. Therefore, the daily operation of the horse boarding facility is not expected to generate ambient noise levels inconsistent with the surrounding agricultural area.

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

**No Impact:** Groundborne vibration or noise is most commonly associated with heavy construction and/or grading activities, and the operation of land uses such as railroads and airports. All buildings and structures are existing. No construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time. There will be no ground construction that would require the use of heavy

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

equipment. The operation of the horse boarding would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

- 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:** The subject property is not located within an area covered by the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, nor is the project located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. Therefore, it is not expected that the project site would be impacted by flight operations in the project area.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Commission. “Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.” 13 December 2000. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/851/Cover-Introduction-and-County-wide-Policies?bidId=>

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 11: Noise Element.” 2005-2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30921/Ch11-Noise-Element?bidId=>.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site includes an existing residence that is occupied by the property owners. The establishment of a commercial horse boarding facility is not expected to induce permanent population growth directly or indirectly through extension of roads or other infrastructure since the improvements are existing and most people who utilize or would utilize the business (e.g.: board horses or taking riding lessons) reside locally. Moreover, the project does not propose any new services that would induce substantial population growth. Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected.

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

**No Impact:** The project would not displace existing people or housing, nor necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the property owners will continue to occupy the existing residence at the project site. The operation of a dude ranch and horse-riding facility will not require the construction of new housing.

**Sources of Information**

Project Plans, date received on 2 February 2021, 15 June 2021, 28 March 2022 and 31 January 2023.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

a) *Fire Protection?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the project vicinity are provided by the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District (ECCFPD). The project was referred to the ECCFPD for comments regarding compliance with applicable provisions of the California Fire Code pertaining to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. In a response letter received by email dated April 22, 2021, the Fire Protection District indicated that they would require the following: (a) The Permittee shall request that the Project site be annexed into the most current Community Facilities District for fire protection and emergency response services (if applicable), or the developer will provide an alternative funding mechanism acceptable to the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District for the provision of fire protection and emergency response services. (b) The Permittee shall pay all fire facility impact fees at the time of the issuance of the first building permit, at the then-current rate. (c) The Permittee shall construct the proposed building in accordance with the current edition of the California Building, Fire Code and the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District Ordinance. The requirements of the California Health and Safety Code, section 122385 will apply requiring a fire alarm and fire sprinkler system. The project will be required to comply with all of the requirements set forth by the ECCFPD, and therefore, the project’s potential impacts on the Fire District’s ability to provide 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 Department. Pursuant to the Growth Management Element of the County General Plan, a Sheriff facility standard of 155 square feet of station area and support facilities per 1,000 members of the population shall be maintained within the unincorporated area

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

of the County. The project would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the unincorporated Knightsen area because the project would not increase the housing stock (population) in the County.

c) *Schools?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Impacts to schools are usually caused by increases in population. The establishment of a commercial horse boarding facility is not expected to induce permanent population growth and therefore potential impacts to existing school facilities would be less than significant.

d) *Parks?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Pursuant to the Growth Management Element of the County General Plan, the standard is to have a minimum of 3 acres of neighborhood parks for every 1,000 members of the population. The project would not warrant the need for new parks and/or recreational facilities because the project would not increase the housing stock (population) in the County.

e) *Other public facilities?*

**Libraries: Less Than Significant Impact:** The Contra Costa County Library system operates 28 facilities in the County and is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. Impacts to public facilities, such as libraries, are usually caused by increases in population. Since the establishment of a commercial horse boarding facility is not expected to induce permanent population growth, potential impacts to public libraries would be less than significant.

**Health Facilities: Less Than Significant Impact:** The Contra Costa County Health Services District (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 10 health centers and clinics in the County. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes. Impacts to public facilities, such as hospitals, are usually caused by increases in population. Since the establishment of a commercial horse boarding facility with no proposed development is not expected to induce permanent population growth, potential impacts to health facilities would be less than significant.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 4: Growth Management Element.” 2005-2020.  
<https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30914/Ch4-Growth-Management-Element?bidId=>

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

Contra Costa County Library. “Find a Location.” Accessed in 2022. [https://ccclib.bibliocommons.com/locations/?\\_ga=2.246442754.746011243.1597561901-2144760675.1597561901](https://ccclib.bibliocommons.com/locations/?_ga=2.246442754.746011243.1597561901-2144760675.1597561901).

Contra Costa Health Services. “Health Centers & Clinics.” Accessed in 2022. <https://cchealth.org/centers-clinics/>.

East Contra Costa Fire Protection District. “RE: CDLP21-02005 Dated 22 April 2021. Returned Agency Comment Letter.

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

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:** The deterioration, daily use, and demand for neighborhood parks are largely dependent on the number of people that reside in the surrounding area. Pursuant to the Growth Management Element of the County General Plan, the standard is to have a minimum of 3 acres of neighborhood parks for every 1,000 members of the population. The project would not warrant the need for a new park, or substantially accelerate the deterioration of any existing parks or other recreational facilities because the project would not increase the housing stock (population) in the County.

- 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:** As previously stated, the project would not warrant the need for new recreational facilities because the project would not increase the housing stock (population) in the County.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development. “Park Dedication and Park Impact Fees.” Accessed in 2022. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/42080/Park-Fees-Overview?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 4: Growth Management Element.” 2005-2020. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/30914/Ch4-Growth-Management-Element?bidId=>.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Policy 4-c of the Growth Management Element of the County’s General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis for any project that is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips based upon the trip generation rates as presented in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). The ITE Trip Generation Manual does not include trip generation calculations for a horse boarding land use. Therefore, trip generation data from similar equestrian facilities (located in four different jurisdictions) were referenced, and the most conservative trip generation rates were used to calculate the estimated AM and PM peak-hour trips generated from the subject project. Data taken from similar horse boarding land uses suggests that the number of trips correlates to the number of stalls on site. One site in particular, the Shiloh facility which proposed 150 stalls in unincorporated Alameda County had peak-hour trip generation of 0.23 AM and 0.55 PM and a daily AM/PM peak hour trip generation of 8.05 AM and 19.25 PM. Conservatively, the proposed project which has 38 stalls, will have a total peak-hour trip generation of 8.79 AM peak-hour vehicle trips (*9.53 peak-hour AM trips for the horse boarding/riding academy use plus 0.74 peak-hour AM trips from the existing single-family residence*) and 21.89 PM peak-hour vehicle trips (*20.9 peak-hour PM trips for the horse boarding/riding academy use plus 0.99 peak-hour PM trips from the existing single-family residence*). This is because the proposed project has less stalls than the Shiloh facility with which the trip generation data was taken from. Since the proposed development would yield less than 100 peak-hour AM or PM trips, a project-specific traffic impact analysis is not required, and the project is assumed to have a less than significant impact on the circulation system in the project vicinity. Furthermore, compliance with the County’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance would also ensure that the project does not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system in the County.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research and the California Natural Resources Agency has certified and adopted changes to the CEQA Guidelines that identify Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts. However, absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. In addition, 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, should be expected to cause a less than significant impact under CEQA and would not require further VMT analysis.

The ITE Trip Generation Manual, which is typically referenced to calculate the estimated daily and peak-hour trips generated for different types of land use projects, does not include trip generation calculations for a horse boarding land use. Therefore, trip generation data from similar equestrian facilities (located in four different jurisdictions) were referenced, and the most conservative trip generation rates were used to calculate the estimated daily trips generated from the subject project. For the purpose of this project, the County used Sycamore Trails Stables as the most conservative trip generation data. Sycamore Trails Stables, a horse boarding facility in San Juan Capistrano proposed 476 horse stalls. A traffic memo for the Sycamore Facility identifies its daily and peak-hour trip generation rates. The daily AM/PM peak hour trip generation for the 476-horse stall facility was calculated to be 77.35. Therefore, we can assume that because the proposed project would house up to 50 horses in 38 stalls, which is much less than the 476 horse stalls of the Sycamore Facility, the daily AM/PM peak hour trip generation would not exceed 77.35 vehicle trips. Conservatively, the project would have an estimated daily trip generation of 86.79 vehicle trips (*77.35 daily vehicle trips for the horse boarding/riding facility use plus 9.44 daily vehicle trips from the existing single-family residence*). Thus, the project is assumed to have a less than significant impact on traffic and does not conflict 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:** The site gains access via Cummings Road from Sunset Road, a publicly maintained road. Cummings Road is an unpaved gravel road and no additional frontage improvements or offers of dedications are required as part of this application. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature. In addition, the project will not substantially increase hazards due to incompatible land uses because privately held land in the vicinity is located within the A-2 zoning district. Although the A-2 zoning district allows a detached single-family dwelling on each parcel, the intent of the A-2 zoning district is to allow all types of agriculture, including general farming, wholesale horticulture and floriculture, wholesale nurseries and greenhouses, mushroom rooms, dairying, livestock production, fur farms, poultry raising, animal breeding, aviaries, apiaries, forestry, and similar agricultural uses. Dude ranches, riding academies and stables may be allowed upon issuance of a land use permit. Thus, hazards from incompatible land uses are not expected.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project was referred to the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District (ECCFPD) for comments regarding compliance with applicable provisions of the California Fire Code pertaining to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. In an comment letter received on April 22, 2021, the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District would required the following; (a) The Permittee shall request that the Project site be annexed into the most current Community Facilities District for fire protection and emergency response services (if applicable), or the developer will provide an alternative funding mechanism acceptable to the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District for the provision of fire protection and emergency response services. (b) The Permittee shall pay all fire facility impact fees at the time of the issuance of the first building permit, at the then-current rate. (c) The Permittee shall construct the proposed building in accordance with the current edition of the California Building, Fire Code and the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District Ordinance. The requirements of the California Health and Safety Code, section 122385 will apply requiring a fire alarm and fire sprinkler system. The project will be required to comply with all of the requirements set forth by the ECCFPD, and therefore, the project is not expected to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 4: Growth Management Element.” 2005-2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30914/Ch4-Growth-Management-Element?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County General Plan. “Chapter 5: “Transportation and Circulation Element.” 2005-2020. <http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/30915/Ch5-Transportation-and-Circulation-Element?bidId=>.

Contra Costa County Public Works Department. “Land Use Permit CDLP21-02005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval.” Dated 19 April 2021. Agency Comment Response Memo.

Contra Costa County Code. “Title 8 – Zoning.” Accessed in 2022. [https://library.municode.com/ca/contra\\_costa\\_county/codes/ordinance\\_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO](https://library.municode.com/ca/contra_costa_county/codes/ordinance_code?nodeId=TIT8ZO).

East Contra Costa Fire Protection District. “RE: Contra Costa County File #CDLP21-02005.” Dated 22 April 2021. Email.

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). “Trip Generation Manuel, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition.” September 2021. Book.

Project Plans, date received on 2 February 2021.

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

<b>18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</b>				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact (a-b):** As discussed in Section 5 (Cultural Resources), there are no buildings or structures at the project site listed on Contra Costa County’s Historic Resources Inventory, on California’s Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic places, nor is there any building or structure that qualifies to be listed. The scope of the project does not require significant ground disturbing activities that could damage cultural landscapes. In addition, the project was routed to the Wilton Rancheria and Confederated Villages of Lisjan nation on December 7, 2022, for comments. In an email received on December 13, 2022, the Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation stated that they had no further comments on the project. The Wilton Rancheria Cultural Preservation Department provide no comments prior to the preparation of this report. Therefore, it can be assumed that the scope of the project is not of concern to California Native American tribes.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County. “Historic Resources Inventory.” Accessed in 2021.

[https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=.](https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1116/Historic-Resources-Inventory-HRI?bidId=)

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is not served by public water or by public sewer and instead relies on well water and a septic system. Since well water and septic service is already available, and based on the project’s size and scope, the project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities.

Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code requires that all storm water entering and/or originating on this property to be collected and conveyed, without diversion and within an adequate storm drainage system, to an adequate natural watercourse having a definable bed and banks or to an existing adequate public storm drainage system which conveys the storm water to an adequate natural watercourse. The applicant is not proposing to construct any new structures and will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern onsite, therefore the applicant has requested an exception to Division 914 of the County Ordinance Code. Since the Public Works Department has no objection to the granting of an exception from this requirement, provided there are no existing drainage problems in the area, no concentrated runoff is being directed to adjacent

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

parcels, and the existing drainage pattern is maintained, the project is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area and the project would not result in the relocation or construction of storm water drainage facilities.

In addition to the information provided above, the project will not require construction of new off-site electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The applicant will work with Contra Costa Environmental Health (CCEH) to determine if there are additional requirements prior to the initiation of the use. This request will be added as an advisory note within the finding and conditions of approval of this project.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is in an agricultural area that is not served by any municipal water or wastewater system, and therefore, the project would have no effect on water or wastewater treatment facilities. As previously mentioned, the applicant will need to contact CCEH prior to initiation of the use (if the project is approved) to ensure adequate service (water and wastewater) can be provided to the project site.

- 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:** Project operation would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of horse manure. Pursuant to the project proponent, the horse stalls are cleaned 7 days a week and the manure is subsequently stored on the north side of the property, away from the barn, riding areas and locations of visiting people. Weekly, the manure is turned to initiate and maintain the natural composting process and is subsequently used as an all-natural soil amendment on the subject property. The applicant plans to store all manure on-site as there is adequate space for composting of the manure. The project is not expected to be a source of significant additional solid-waste generation that would impact any landfills that serve the area.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project will need to obtain building permits for the buildings that were built without permits. The project will be required to be in compliance with the

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

CALGreen Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program. Project operation is not expected to result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that would conflict with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. Thus, the project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste.

**Sources of Information**

Contra Costa County Public Works Department. “Land Use Permit CDLP21-02005 Staff Report & Conditions of Approval.” Dated 19 April 2022. Agency Comment Response Memo.

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

<b>20. WILDFIRE</b> – <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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUMMARY:**

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

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

**No Impact (a-d):** The project site has a Non-Wildland / Non-Urban Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones pursuant to the California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Therefore, there is no impact in regard to this section.

**Sources of Information**

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

California State Geoportal. "California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer." Accessed in 2022. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>.

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

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

**SUMMARY:**

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** It is unlikely that the project would have a substantial adverse effect on the environment, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status, due to the location of the project site (parcel not located near any known habitat containing fish or wildlife species) and lack of suitable habitat (there are no, creeks, wetlands, or riparian habitats located on the subject parcel). Furthermore, all buildings and structures are existing. No construction of new buildings or structures are proposed at this time and approval of the land use permit would allow the continued operation of a horse boarding facility and riding academy at the project site. Thus, approval of the project would not result in the elimination of important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- 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*

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

*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:** No long-term adverse impacts are anticipated to occur, and as such, the incremental effects of the project would not be considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. The surrounding area is zoned for agricultural uses and the proposed project will establish a use that is consistent with the entire surrounding community. Based on the analysis provided throughout the initial study, approval of a land use permit to allow a commercial horse boarding facility would not result in impacts that would be cumulatively considerable.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on the analysis provided throughout the initial study, approval of a land use permit to allow a commercial horse boarding facility and riding academy will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project is subject to a land use permit that includes a public hearing process that ensures that any concerns regarding a project are viced and addressed, prior to approval or denial of a project. The project will be conditioned to reduce any off-site effects and will be required to obtain the necessary approvals from the appropriate agencies (i.e. Fire, Environmental Health, Public Works, etc.) Furthermore, no evidence has been found in the record that would indicate that the project would have a potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly, so there will be a less than significant impact.

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

## REFERENCES

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

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

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans