

CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Ali Carriage Rental Homes – Development Plan project for construction of 8 townhomes, County file #CDDP22-03021
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 III, (925) 655-2873
4. **Project Location:** The project area is identified as 4301 Appian Way, El Sobrante, CA 94803 (APN: 425-142-030).
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
Applicant:
Numair Ali
2021 Elderberry Drive
San Ramon, CA 94582
(925) 789-0564

Owners:
Shakil and Anita Ali
835 Alhambra Avenue
Martinez, CA 94553
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within the Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) and the Resource Conservation (RC) General Plan land use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is located within the Downtown El Sobrante Planned Unit Development (P-1) Zoning District.
8. **Description of Project:** The applicant seeks approval of a Development Plan application to develop eight rental townhomes under County File #CDDP22-03021. Project details are as follows:

Number of Buildings/Unit Types: The project includes construction of two buildings. The building closest to the frontage will contain (5 units) Unit 1-5 while the building located at the rear will contain (3 units) Units 6-8. All 8 units will be of a three-story design with a maximum height of approximately 33'-6 ½". All units will have the same floor plan layout and square footage with the upper level containing two bedrooms with 744 square feet, the main level will contain a living area approximately 744 square feet and a 30-square-foot-deck and the lower level will consist of a 616-square-foot, two-car garage (ground level).

Underground Utilities: The County Ordinance Code requires all overhead utilities along the frontage of public streets to be removed and placed underground. Utility services in this area have already been placed underground and therefore, all new utilities that will be used to service the project will also be required to be installed underground.

Tree Removal: The project parcel contains eight trees and four tree stumps of numerous species. The project will remove eight trees and the four stumps. The species of trees included Deodar Cedar, Douglas Fir, Citron, Tree Privet, Common Pear, Common Fig, Olive and Northern California Black Walnut. Diameters at breast height in inches ranges from 1 to 37.

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance: The project includes the construction of eight rental units as the project is subject to County Ordinance Code, Chapter 822-4. The ordinance requires at least 15 percent of the dwelling units in a residential development of five or more rental units to be developed as inclusionary units. The project is required to provide 1.2 inclusionary units. The applicant/owner, and/or developer (applicant) has submitted an Inclusionary Housing Plan to construct one inclusionary unit which will be available to and occupied by a very low-income household (50% area median income). The applicant has indicated that they will pay the partial in-lieu fee for the remaining fractional 0.2 inclusionary unit with a fee of \$32,267.40.

Grading: The project will require approximately 200 cubic yards of cut and 750 cubic yards of fill for grading.

Exception: One exception to Code Section 914 of the County Ordinance Code which requires that all storm water entering and or/ originating on the 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 stormwater to an adequate natural watercourse. The applicant is requesting an exception from the "collect and convey" requirements of the County Ordinance Code.

Deviation: The Downtown El Sobrante P-1 Zoning requires a 27-foot height max. The project is requesting a deviation to this development standard to allow for a 33'-6 ½" building height in accordance with the County Zoning Code.

- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject parcel is located at 4301 Appian Way in the El Sobrante area of Contra Costa County. The site fronts Appian Way to the southeast. Directly south is a small retail shopping plaza and directly north is a church. To the rear of the property (west) is single-family residential development and across Appian way is a mixture of area servicing retail and single-family residential development. The project site topography is generally level from Appian way which starts at 111 feet above mean sea level and slopes just slightly towards the rear at 109 feet above mean sea level. At the very rear of the property is Appian Creek which bisects the property at the rear property line. At the creek portion, the topography slopes steeply, going from 107 feet above mean sea level at the creek bank, sloping downward to 97 feet above mean sea level for the creek bed. The site consists of one parcel. Assessor's parcel number 425-142-030. The site contains several trees of various species and sizes.

Currently, the parcel contains a 10' wide storm drain easement along the south side yard property line, an existing detached garage and an existing single-family residence. The existing garage and residence will be demolished as part of this project.

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

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Contra Costa County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
- East Bay Municipal Utility District
- West County Wastewater District

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

Notification of an opportunity to request consultation was circulated. No comments of concern were returned.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☒ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☒ Air Quality |
| ☒ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☒ Geology/Soils | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality | ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☒ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing | ☐ Public Services |
| ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☐ Utilities/Services Systems | ☐ Wildfire | ☐ 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

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

11/7/2025

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

SUMMARY:

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Less than Significant Impact)*

Figure COS-12 (Scenic Resources) of the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element identifies scenic resources of Contra Costa County as scenic routes and scenic ridges. The intent of the scenic resource designations is to preserve and protect areas of identified high scenic value, where practical, and in accordance with the Conservation, Open Space and Working Lands Element. The subject property is located approximately 250 feet southeast of the Appian Way and Santa Rita road intersection in the El Sobrante area of Contra Costa County and is not located on a property designated as a scenic resource. The project is located more than 2 miles west of the nearest scenic ridge (Sobrante Ridge Botanic Regional Preserve). Because the project is located more than 2 miles from the scenic resource, views of the scenic resource are negligible. There are no scenic highways or scenic routes within a 2.5-mile radius of the project site. The closest is a section of Pinole Valley Road which is a County-Designated Scenic Routes more than 2.8 miles to the east. Therefore, there is a less than significant adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

The Scenic Resources Map (Figure COS-12) of the County General Plan's Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element identifies scenic routes in the County, including both State Scenic Highways and County designated Scenic Routes. The subject property is located

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

approximately 250 feet southeast of the Appian Way and Santa Rita Road intersection in the El Sobrante area of Contra Costa County. Neither road is considered a scenic route, nor is the property within the local vicinity of one. Although the project site is not located in the vicinity of a state scenic highway or County-designated scenic route as designed in the County's General Plan, a section of Highway 4 which is more than 4.31 miles northeast is identified as a State-designated scenic highway and a section of Pinole Valley Road which is 2.8 miles east is identified as a County-designated scenic route. However, because Highway 4 is 4.31 miles northeast and Pinole Valley Road is 2.8 miles east of the site, the project does not have potential for significant impacts to tree resources, rock outcroppings, or historic structures on the property within a scenic highway as a result of the proposed project.

- 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? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (**Less than Significant Impact**)*

The subject property is located within the Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) and Resource Conservation (RC) General Plan land use designation and within the Downtown El Sobrante Planned Unit Zoning District (P-1). The subject property is located in an urbanized area, primarily surrounded by mixed uses (area serving retail with single-family residential). The property is also within the Urban Limit Line. The project which is to create 8 new townhouse will comply with the zoning and therefore, would not conflict with the applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and would be less than significant.

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

The existing site has a single-family house and a garage. This existing use may have some light associated with daily use of the house. However, project will increase the potential sources of light associated with the project because the project would consist of typical sources of lighting associated with a residential development including lighting from the newly constructed residences, and vehicles traveling to and from the project site. The 8 new townhouses will have two exterior light fixtures on either side of the garage to provide lighting at the front. At the rear elevations of the townhouses, there will be one additional light fixture per unit. Two more light fixtures will be placed on the exterior wall per side on the right and left elevation. The development of the 8 new townhomes will increase lighting above existing levels. However, Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-1 would require exterior lighting to be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent excessive light spillover. With the implementation of MM AES-1, lighting impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-1: New exterior lighting from the project site could adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Proposed exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent glare or excessive light spillover. All exterior lighting shall be turned off during the daytime hours.

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

Sources of Information

- Project Application and Plans
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 8, Zoning Ordinance.
- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element

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

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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? (**Less than Significant Impact**)*

Pursuant to the California Important Farmland Finder, the subject property has been categorized as "urban and built-up land." Figure COS-1 (Agricultural Land) of the County General Plan does not identify the property as an important agricultural area. The property is zoned as the Downtown El Sobrante Planned Unit Development (P-1) and has a General Plan land use designation of Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) and Resource Conservation (RC). The project is to develop 8 townhouse units and install improvements related to the development. The proposed residences are a use that is consistent with the zoning and general plan. Therefore, the potential for converting Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as categorized by the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use is less than significant.

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

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

The project site is located within a Planned Unit zoning district. The subject property is not currently in a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or with a Williamson Act contract.

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

The project site is not considered forest land as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined by California Public Resources Code Section 4526, or zoned Timberland Production as defined by California Government Code section 51104(g). The project site is zoned for mixed-use development including multiple family within the Downtown El Sobrante Planned Unit Development. The project includes a development plan to allow for multiple family residential development. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland.

California Public Resources Code Section 12220, under the Forest Legacy Program Act, defines "forest land" as land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Public Resources Code 4526, under the Forest Practice Act, defines "timberland" as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species are determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others.

California Government Code 51104, under the Timberland Productivity Act, defines "timberland" as privately owned land, or land acquired for state forest purposes, which is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, and which is capable of growing an average annual volume of wood fiber of at least 15 cubic feet per acre. "Timberland production zone" or "TPZ" means an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 51112 or 51113 of the Government Code and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, as defined in Public Resources Code 4526 or 12220. With respect to the general plans of cities and counties, "timberland preserve zone" means "timberland production zone." The Conservation, Open Space and Working Lands Element Figure COS-1 of the County General Plan does not designate any land within the County as timber harvesting land. Therefore, the project would have no impact on any existing timberland.

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

- 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 an approximately 0.71-acre (30,750-square-foot) residential property. The site does not contain any forest land. For the project, all vegetation and trees will be removed in order to construct the townhouses and their associated improvements. The project site is in a developed area within El Sobrante and the project site is currently zoned for residential uses. Thus, the project would 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 the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use? (No Impact)*

The project site is surrounded by primarily residential and mixed-use/retail business uses such as restaurants, grocery stores and churches. The project is to develop 8 townhouses and related improvements. Construction of a residence is allowed use within the Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) General Plan designation. Moreover, Appian Way of El Sobrante does not have any farmland and thus, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Sources of Information

- Government Code section 51104(g)
- California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)
- California Public Resources Code Section 4526
- Contra Costa County Code, Title 8, Zoning Ordinance.
- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element
- California Department of Conservation. California Important Farmland Finder (Webpage)

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The 2017 Clean Air Plan, prepared by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the most recent plan prepared to fulfill state and federal air pollution reduction requirements. The 2017 plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate, as well as describing how the air district will continue to progress toward attaining all state and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities from exposure to air pollution among Bay Area communities. To accomplish this, the 2017 plan describes a multi-pollutant strategy to simultaneously reduce emissions and ambient concentrations of ozone, fine particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, as well as greenhouse gases (GHG) that contribute to climate change. The development of eight townhouses and associated improvements, or any other aspects of the proposed project, does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans for the region; therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on this analysis category.

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

In developing thresholds of significance for criteria air pollutants, the BAAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively significant. As such, if a project exceeds the identified thresholds of significance, its emissions would be significant in terms of both project- and cumulative-level impacts, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Thus, this impact analysis and discussion is related to the project- and cumulative-level effect of the project's regional criteria air pollutant emissions.

By its nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact resulting from emissions generated over a large geographic region. The non-attainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development within the Air Basin, and this regional impact is a cumulative impact. In other

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

words, new development projects (such as the proposed project) within the Air Basin would contribute to this impact only on a cumulative basis. No single project would be sufficient in size, by itself, to result in non-attainment of regional air quality standards. Instead, a project's emissions may be individually limited, but cumulatively significant when taken in combination with past, present, and future development projects.

The cumulative analysis focuses on whether a specific project would result in cumulatively significant emissions. According to Section 15064(h)(4) of the CEQA Guidelines, the existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone does not constitute substantial evidence that the project's incremental effects would be cumulatively significant. Rather, the determination of cumulative air quality impacts for construction and operational emissions is based on whether the proposed project would result in regional emissions that exceed the BAAQMD regional thresholds of significance for construction and operations on a project level. The thresholds of significance represent the allowable amount of emissions each project can generate without generating a cumulatively significant contribution to regional air quality impacts. Therefore, a project that would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance on the project level also would not be considered to result in a cumulatively significant impact with regard to regional air quality and would not be considered to result in a significant impact related to cumulative regional air quality.

Construction of the Project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, haul truck trips, and vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the site. In addition, fugitive dust PM₁₀ emissions would result from excavation, trenching, and other construction activities. Site preparation consists of tree removal and associated grading. Approximately 200 cubic yards of cut and 750 cubic yards of fill are proposed to be included for grading activities for the project.

Construction-related effects from fugitive dust from the proposed project would be greatest during the site preparation and grading phases due to the disturbance of soils. If not properly controlled, these activities would temporarily generate particulate emissions in the area of the construction site. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit dirt and mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. PM₁₀ emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity (amount of equipment operating), local weather conditions (such as wind speed), and characteristics such as soil moisture and silt content of the soil. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would be dispersed over greater distances from the construction site. For mitigation of fugitive dust emissions, the BAAQMD recommends implementing best management practices (BMPs), as a pragmatic and effective approach to controlling fugitive dust emissions (BAAQMD, 2017a). The BAAQMD notes that individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 percent to more than 90 percent. The BAAQMD considers any project's construction-related impacts to be less than significant if the required dust-control measures are implemented. Without these measures, the impact is generally considered to be significant, particularly if sensitive land uses are located in the project vicinity. There are a number of sensitive receptors located at the border of the project site (restaurant to the southwest, residences to the northwest and southeast and church to the north) that could be impacted by fugitive dust generated by construction activities. Therefore,

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

implementation of these BMPs would ensure the Project's fugitive dust emissions remain below a level of significance.

Impact AIR-1: Exhaust emissions and particulate matter produced by construction activities related to the project may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

- A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- C. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- E. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- H. The applicant shall post a publicly visible sign with the developer/project manager's name and telephone number regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

The project includes construction of eight townhouses and related improvements. The surrounding properties are a mix of residential and area serving retail/commercial uses. There are two schools in the nearby vicinity. Wildcat Canyon Community School is approximately 0.46 miles south of the project site and Sheldon Elementary School is approximately .49 miles east of the project site. It is anticipated that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to significant pollutant concentrations due to the scale of the proposed project. Residential uses typically do not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. Furthermore, the construction activities will be restricted to specific days of the week and to a limited number of work hours in order to lessen the amount of time during the week that sensitive receptors would be exposed to construction-related air quality impacts.

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

- 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**)*

The project includes construction of 8 townhomes and related improvements. During construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coating would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. It is anticipated that by the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality or odor concern. Therefore, construction odors impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed 8 new townhomes would not likely generate objectionable odors. The types of uses that are considered to have objection odors include wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer station, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), or petroleum refineries. The proposed project is residential in nature, and it is not anticipated to generate objectionable odors which may affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan*.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Guidelines*.

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

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (**Less than Significant with Mitigation**)*

The project site is located along Appian Way in the El Sobrante area and is not within the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan as shown in Figure COS-3 of the Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan. The project site is also not identified as a priority conservation area in Figure COS-4. Moreover, this area of El Sobrante is built up and urbanized with the majority of the area along Appian way being developed with residences, commercial and retail uses. The project site also has been developed with a single-

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

family residence and a detached garage. The project will remove all trees on site to make room for the 8 townhouses. The project applicant submitted a biological resources assessment prepared by BIOMAAS Inc, dated September 2, 2025. The biological resources assessment reviewed the site for any special-status wildlife species. As part of the biological assessment, reconnaissance level wildlife survey was conducted, and no special-status wildlife was observed. However, the biological assessment identified three species with low potential which are the Cooper's Hawk, White-tailed Kite Bird and the Pallid Bat. The applicant will be required to comply with the project biologist protection measures to ensure that impacts to special status species will be less than significant.

Impact BIO-1 – BIO-4: Grading and construction activities could have an adverse effect on protected species and habitat. Therefore, the developer/applicant is required to implement the following biological resource mitigation measures to reduce impacts to special status species to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: A protective buffer of 30 to 50 feet from Appian Creek shall be established by the project applicant. Silt fence or similar Best Management Practices (BMPS) shall be established to prevent construction related debris and runoff from entering the creek during construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: At least 5 days prior to vegetation removal, tree removal during the nesting season, (February 1 through August 31) a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist who is familiar with the nesting behavior of a variety of species and can establish protective buffers around the nest based upon the type of construction activity. Nest buffers should be adhered to by all construction related personnel and can only be removed by the biologist after the nest is no longer active.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: At least 5 days prior to beginning ground disturbance and/or construction, a qualified wildlife Biologist shall conduct surveys for special-status bats during the appropriate time of day to maximize detectability to determine whether bat species are roosting near the work area. If the Biologist determines bats are present, the Biologist shall exclude the bats from suitable spaces by installing one-way exclusion devices. After the bats vacate the space, the Biologist shall close off the space to prevent recolonization.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Vegetation removal, if necessary, shall be kept to a minimum. If riparian vegetation removal is required, a CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement, and RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification if required prior to removal.

- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Less than Significant Impact)*

The parcel is in an area of El Sobrante that has been urbanized with single-family residences and commercial/retail uses and because of the development, the project surroundings would not be considered undeveloped. The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence, a

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

detached garage and a driveway. The site contains a few trees spread throughout the site and at the rear, Appian Creek bisects the property which is considered riparian habitat. Because there is a creek on the property, the project is subject to County Code Section 914-14.012 – Structures setback lines for unimproved earth channels. With a height of top bank of less than 20', the setback distance for the project is 30'. The project plans show that the townhouses will comply with the 30' creek structure setback. The biological resources assessment prepared for the project site reviewed the potential impact to riparian habitat and concluded that should the project adhere to the required riparian setback, the project would not have an adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, because the project complies with the creek structure setback line and because the project site is not within a sensitive natural community since the surrounding area is largely developed, the project would have a less than significant impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

- 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? (Less than Significant Impact)*

The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Corps) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are two of the primary Federal agencies which enforce the Clean Water Act and administer the associated permitting program. As such, these agencies define wetland as areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater 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. The project biologist preformed a site reconnaissance survey and determined that there are no state or federally protected wetlands on the site. The project biologist concluded that the project site would not be categorized as a wetland as defined above nor does the subject site have a marsh, vernal pool or is located in a costal area. The surrounding area is largely developed and urbanized and does not exhibit wetland characteristics. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project having an adverse effect on a federally protected wetland.

- 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 with Mitigation)*

As discussed in section a above, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to special-status species with incorporation of mitigation. As such, the project's potential to 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 is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Impact BIO-5: Grading and construction could have an impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1 -BIO-4** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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

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

The Contra Costa County Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of certain trees by regulating tree removal and development within their drip lines 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 includes the removal of eight trees (five of which are code protected) and four dead tree stumps. The proposed tree removal has been evaluated by CDD staff pursuant to the Tree Protection and Preservation Ordinance as well as the project plans for construction of new townhomes, driveways, stormwater control, and other site improvements. As the project includes the removal of eight trees (five of which are code protected) and four dead tree stumps, a tree permit is required in order to remove the trees. The project will require findings for approval or denial, and, if approved, will receive standard conditions of approval for restitution in order to reasonably restore the natural resources on-site. With the standard review and conditions implemented, the project will have a less than significant impact.

- 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? (Less than Significant Impact)*

The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy oversees implementation of the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which provides regional conservation and development guidelines to protect natural resources while improving and streamlining the permit process for projects that will impact endangered species and sensitive habitat. The HCP/NCCP allows local agencies to authorize endangered species permitting for activities and projects in the region, while providing comprehensive species, wetlands, and ecosystem conservation and contributing to the recovery of endangered species in northern California. According to Figure COS-3 – East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/natural Community Conservation Plan Area of the Conservation, Open Space and Working Lands General Plan Element, the subject property is not within the covered area for the HCP/NCCP. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the HCP/NCCP.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan, *Chapter 7: Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element*.
- East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Plan
- Biological Resources Assessment, prepared by BIOMAAS Inc, received September 15, 2025

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

Setting:

The project area totals 0.71 acres and is approximately 100 feet above sea level. It slopes gently downward from Appian Way northwest toward Appian Creek. Site soils are alluvium laid down in the Holocene era, classified by the USDA as part of the Cropley Complex, a clayey bottomland soil (Witteret al. 2006; USDA 2023). The project area lies between San Pablo Creek, 360 feet (110 meters) to the southeast, and Appian Creek, which flows along the northwest edge of the project area. The parcel is currently developed with a single-family home built circa 1938.

In the early historic era, the environment of the project area was oak woodland, with grassland alternating with groves of coast live oak, buckeye, and bay laurel. Underneath and between the oak groves was low herbaceous vegetation characterized by native grasses and wildflowers. The dense woodlands were very beautiful, and settlers often compared their appearance to parks or orchards. This park-like environment was likely a reflection of Native American forest management practices, which often used fire to remove understory plants allowing space for trees and meadows to flourish.

Evidence gathered from the archaeological sites in the region indicates that this part of Contra Costa County is known to have been occupied by the Huchiun people. Huichun territory appears to have extended from Temescal Creek in present-day Oakland northward along the bay shore to San Pablo Bay. In prehistory, the San Francisco Bay region was densely populated compared to most hunter-gatherer societies.

The first direct Spanish contact with the Huchiun seems to have been during 1772 when a Spanish expedition came to a village on the southeast shore of San Pablo Bay. Mission Dolores was founded in San Francisco in 1776. With the establishment of the Mission, Mission Dolores established a cattle station on San Pablo Creek by 1820. In 1823, Mission Dolores agreed to give up the San Pablo cattle station, which was transferred to Francisco Maria Castro as part of the Rancho Cochiyumes or Rancho San Pablo land grant. Rancho San Pablo included four square leagues (almost 18,000 acres), including present-day Richmond, San Pablo, and Kensington. The project area is at the eastern edge of the grant. After Castro's death, the land was divided between his widow and 11 children. The Rancho San Pablo grant was confirmed to Castro's heirs by the Mexican government in 1834 and patented by the United States government in 1852.

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

When California joined the Union in 1850, the extended Castro family had to defend their land against American squatters who occupied large tracts of the rancho. Although rights to the rancho were collectively held, some Castro family members sold specific lots to American newcomers, creating uncertainty about land title in the area that culminated in the Emeric vs. Alvarado case, involving hundreds of claimants and settled by the California Supreme Court in 1889, with a final partition decision in 1894.

As noted above, members of the Castro family sold parts of the undivided rancho to American newcomers after 1852. In the 1880s, the project area was part of a 336-acre property owned by Linder and McGee. Reynold Linder was an agricultural products salesman in San Pablo (Contra Costa Assessor 1883, 1887; Martinez News-Gazette 1879). No information was available on McGee or on land use in the project area.

At the final partition of Rancho San Pablo in 1894, the project area was part of a 426-acre tract owned by Theodore Hittell. Hittell was a native of Ohio who arrived in California in 1855 and was a reporter, land use lawyer, state senator, author, and historian of California (Dickey et al. 1918). His residence was in San Francisco, and the El Sobrante parcel was one of many properties he owned; no evidence was found of his direct connection to the project area. Hittell owned the project area until at least 1908. By 1924, however, it was part of the Jack McMahon dairy ranch. McMahon was a rancher from Ireland who operated the Varsity Creamery Company (Richmond Independent 1914). He may have been in partnership with George Mulligin; a 1930 county map shows the project area as part of a 425-acre tract owned by Mulligin and McMahon.

Appian Way began to be subdivided in the 1930s and was part of the Santa Rita Acres subdivision by 1938 (Arnold 1938). The current house on the property was constructed circa 1939. Appian Way was paved in 1953, and was widened in the late 1980s.

Results of the Record Search

The project was referred to the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center which concluded that the "proposed project area has the possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites". Therefore, the applicant submitted an Archaeological Survey Report prepared by Daniel Shoup of AHC-Heritage.

On behalf of Daniel Shoup, staff at the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, conducted a record search of the project vicinity on January 17, 2024 (File No. 23-0807). Information on previous cultural resource surveys, known historic or prehistoric sites, and listed or eligible National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Resources properties within a ¼ mile radius of the project area was gathered to identify and evaluate the potential for the presence of cultural resources. The study included a review of archaeological, ethnographic, historical, and environmental literature as well as records and maps on file at the California Archaeological Inventory.

NWIC search results indicated there were no resources listed within the project area, five resources within the ¼-mile radius and multiple reports within ¼-mile of the project area.

Survey #	Author	Date	Report Title	Resources
S-007131	Banks	1985	An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Appian Way Widening Project: Phase II, El	07-000097, 07-000276

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

			Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California.	
S-007131	Banks	1986	Subsurface Archaeological Investigations for the Appian Way Widening Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California	Approx. 800 feet N and NE of project area.
S-007131	Banks	1986	Historic Property Survey Report for Appian Way Road Widening and Improvement Project	Approx. 600 feet SE of project area.
S-007131	Banks	1986	Historic Structures Survey Report for Appian Way Road Widening and Improvement Project	
S-007131	Banks	1986	Subsurface Archaeological Investigations for the Appian Way Widening Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California (Revised)	
S-011534	Flynn	1988	Archaeological survey of property located at 4247 Appian Way, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County (letter report)	
S-001999	Baldrice	1980	An Archaeological Survey of the Kraus Property, Contra Costa County, California.	
S-006577	Baker	1984	Archaeological Reconnaissance of the El Sobrante Condominiums Development, Contra Costa County, California	
S-006592	Banks	1984	An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Appian Way Widening Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California.	
S-007988	Orlins	1986	A Cultural Resource Investigation for the San Pablo Dam Road Widening Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California.	07-000068
S-008100	Baker	1986	Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Tyson Property, Parcel #425-170-025, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County.	
S-008852	Miller and Baker	1986	Archaeological Reconnaissance of the El Sobrante Partnership Property, El Sobrante, California	
S-009687	Flynn	1987	Archaeological survey of lot at 4221 San Pablo Dam Rd., El Sobrante, Contra Costa County (Co. File No. 3027-87, APN 425-160-008)	
S-010228	Wood	1988	The Archaeological Monitoring of Excavations for Three Electrical Vaults on Appian Way, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California	

Environmental Issues			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
S-011533	Flynn	1988	Archaeological evaluation of 4158 Santa Rita Road, El Sobrante, Contra Costa Co., Subdivision MS 7-88 (letter report)			
S-012297	Flynn	1991	Archaeological evaluation of 4201 Garden Lane, El Sobrante, Contra Costa Co., Project No. MS 192-90 (letter report)			
S-022273	Schneyder	1999	A Cultural Resources Study of 4439 Appian Way (APN# 425-110-021), El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California		07-000839	
S-027935	Holson	2004	Archaeological Survey and Record Search Results for 4150 Appian Way, El Sobrante (APN 425-170-030) (letter report)			
S-031545	Pastron	2006	Phase II - Cultural Resources Evaluation of an Approximately 1.2-acre Parcel Located at 4441 Appian Way, City of El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California (letter report)		07-000276	
S-044169	DeGeorgey and Snyder	2013	Cultural Resources Constraints Report: Santa Rita and Penny GPRP ED El Sobrante			
S-051734	Whitaker	2018	Historic Property Survey Report for the San Pablo Dam Road Sidewalk Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California, 4-CCO-HSIPL-5928(133)		07-000068	
S-051734	Whitaker et al.	2018	Archaeological Survey Report for the San Pablo Dam Road Sidewalk Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California			
S-051734	Parker et al.	2018	Extended Phase I Report for the San Pablo Dam Road Sidewalk Project, El Sobrante, Contra Costa County, California			

Native American Heritage Commission

Daniel Shoup contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California, by letter with a description of the proposed development in Contra Costa County, California. The letter included a request for a listing of local, interested Native American representatives and information on traditional or sacred lands within the project area and vicinity.

NAHC staff member Cody Campagne wrote in response a letter dated December 15, 2023 to Daniel Shoup that a "search of the NACH Sacred Lands File was completed and the results were positive." Included in the NAHC response was a list of interested Native American contacts. On May 29, 2025, the County mailed a *Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation*, pursuant to section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, to Wilton Rancheria and Confederated

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

Villages of Lisjan Nation for their review of the project proposal. County staff did not receive a request for consultation in response to these notices.

Results of the Survey

Alexi Atteberry of AHC-Heritage conducted a survey of the project area on December 28, 2020. The objective of the cultural resource survey was to locate and record all cultural resources within the project area and evaluate them for significance. The project area was surveyed in approximately 10-meter transects. The majority of ground surface within the project area was unpaved and soil exposure using a hand trowel was conducted throughout the transects. Ground visibility of was good, except for the southeast part of the property, where a single-family home and driveway are located. Most of the project area is covered with grass and small trees, with moderate obstruction of view near the creek due to a heavy growth of English ivy (*Hedera helix*). Due to significant rainfall prior to survey, observed soils fell within range of damp to wet, affecting the Munsell color reading. Throughout the project area, the soil type was observed as a loam with rock inclusions ranging from 10% in the majority of the survey area to approximately 20% in the west-northwest part of the property near the creek bank. In the northeast corner the soil color was a very dark grayish brown (Munsell 10YR 3/2) with low moisture, transitioning to a very dark brown (Munsell 10YR 2/2) loam with increased moisture in the northwest; and finally a black (Munsell 10YR 2/1) loam in the southwest area. Observed materials throughout the project area include brick fragments and other building debris such as nails and wood, as well as modern refuse near the creek. No cultural material from the historic or prehistoric periods was observed throughout the project area.

Native American Archeological Site Sensitivity

Archaeological sites are most often found in flat locations with access to a perennial source of fresh water. Soils deposited during the Holocene era (since 11,700 years ago), especially young alluvium from the last 2,000-3,000 years, are more likely to contain buried archaeological deposits. Native American sites are most often found within ½-mile of major and ¼-mile of minor watercourses, and within 500 feet of shorelines (Meyer and Kaijankoski 2017).

The project is mostly flat, located on Holocene-era alluvial soils, and is adjacent to two perennial watercourses. The vicinity is known to have had a dense pre-contact Native American population, and four Native American archaeological sites are located within ¼ mile of the project area. The project area thus appears to have a high sensitivity for buried Native American archaeological resources.

Historic-Period Archaeological Site Sensitivity

Several factors can be used to infer an area's sensitivity for buried historic-period archaeological resources. These include surface scatters of artifacts, documentary sources (historic maps, deeds, or photographs), standing buildings or structures that suggest patterns of land use (homes, barns, ponds, fences, industrial facilities), and ecological or landscape features (steep hills, bodies of water, wetlands).

Historical research did not identify any development on the project area prior to 1939. Before that, it was likely used intermittently for cattle grazing. While trash deposits associated with the current residence may be present on the project area, they are unlikely to have sufficient information

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

potential to make them eligible to the California Register of Historical Resources. The project area thus has a low sensitivity for buried historic-period archaeological deposits.

An assessment of the historical significance of the main house at 4301 Appian Way was made following CEQA Guidelines (Title 14.CCR Chapter 3. Sec 15064.5(3)) which state that, generally, a resource shall be considered to be historically significant if the resource meets criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852). A historical resource must be significant at the local, state or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

- (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The house does not appear to meet any of these criteria and, therefore, should not be considered historically significant. However, the project includes the demolition of the existing house and garage and may contain unrecorded archaeological resources.

Impact CUL-1: The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5. Subsurface construction activities have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources. Historic resources can include wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources, there could be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: The project area has a high sensitivity for buried Native American archaeological deposits, and is located within 1000 feet of four shell midden sites (CA-CCO-126, CA-CCO-151, CA-CCO-155, and CA-CCO-505), three of which are known to contain burials. To ensure that the project does not cause substantial adverse impacts to historical resources as defined at 14 CCR §15064.5, the following shall be implemented prior to any ground disturbing activity:

1. Prior to any ground-disturbing activity, construction crews should receive a cultural resources training from a qualified archaeologist. The training should review the types of cultural resources that might be found, the legal obligations of the contractors, and steps to follow if archaeological materials or human remains are identified.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a qualified archaeologist should design a subsurface testing program to assess the presence or absence of buried archaeological sites in the project area. Mechanical trenching of a representative sample of the project area to the level of potential ground disturbance or four feet, whichever is greater, should be completed in order to evaluate the presence and depth of possible cultural soils. Mechanical trenching

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

may be supplemented by hand augering or other sampling strategies as needed. All mechanical excavations should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and representative of the Native American community. If cultural resources are identified, it may be necessary to collect additional data to evaluate the significance of the resource.

3. Should subsurface testing not prove feasible, ground-disturbing activity on the project area should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and representative of the Native American community until sufficient information has been gathered to demonstrate the presence or absence of archaeological resources within the area that will be disturbed by the proposed project.
4. If human remains are found during monitoring, the monitor will stop all activity within a 100-foot radius, and the Contra Costa County Coroner will be informed. If the remains appear to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified and invited to identify a Most Likely Descendant, who will make recommendations regarding reburial of the human remains, per §15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

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

An archaeological survey report was prepared by Daniel Shoup of AHC-Heritage which surveyed the site for its sensitivity for buried historic-period archaeological resources. The report concluded that the "project area thus has a low sensitivity for buried historic-period archaeological deposits." However, during construction activities, sensitive resources may encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to undiscovered archaeological resources.

Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities may have a significant impact to previously undiscovered archaeological resources.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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

No human remains or cemeteries are known to exist within or near the project site. On May 29, 2025, the County mailed a *Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation*, pursuant to section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, to Wilton Rancheria and Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation for their review of the project proposal. County staff did not receive a request for consultation in response to these notices. However, there is a possibility that human remains could be present and accidental discovery could occur. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously human remains, there could be a potentially significant

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

impact. If human remains or any associated funerary artifacts are discovered during construction, all work must cease within the immediate vicinity of the discovery. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), the Contra Costa County Sheriff/Coroner must be contacted immediately. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will in turn appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD) to act as a tribal representative and confirm next steps. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

Impact CUL-3: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered human remains.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Sources of Information

- Archaeological Survey Report by Daniel Shoup dated January 2024.

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

6. ENERGY – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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**)*

Environmental effects related to energy include the project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type during construction and operation; the effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies; the effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy; the degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards; the effects of the project on energy resources; and the project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives, if applicable. The following factors demonstrate a project's significance in relation to these effects: (1) Why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed; (2) The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste; (3) The potential for reducing peak energy demand; (4) Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems; and (5) Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

Energy consumption includes energy required for the construction of the proposed project and the operational use of the 8 townhomes. The proposed project's energy demand would be typical for a development of this scope and nature and would be required to comply with current state and local codes concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, enforced by the Building Inspection Division. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact due to energy consumption.

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

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

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

recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County. The construction and operation of the eight new single-family residences would be subject to the measures promulgated by the 2024 Update and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Thus, the project would be consistent with the strategies of the adopted Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update, and would not impede any State or local initiatives for increasing renewable energy or efficiency.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County, 2024. *Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update*.

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

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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 (A-P) zones along the known active faults in California. The nearest fault considered active by CGS is the Hayward

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

fault, which is mapped approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the project site. No faults are mapped within the subject project.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated)

According to the Health and Safety Element Figure HS-17: Earthquake Hazards, El Sobrante the site is in an area rated "violent shaking." Project design of the project will incorporate conservative design and quality construction which would keep ground shaking damage to a minimum, but cannot eliminate ground shaking completely in the event of an earthquake. The risk of damage from ground shaking is controlled both by use of sound engineering judgement and compliance with the latest provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), as a minimum. The seismic design provisions of the CBC prescribe minimum lateral forces applied statistically to the structure(s), combined with the gravity forces and dead-and-live loads. The code-prescribed lateral forces are generally considered to be substantially smaller than comparable forces that would be associated with a major earthquake. The intent of the code is to enable structures to (i) resist minor earthquakes without damage, (ii) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage but with some non-structural damage, and (iii) resist major earthquakes without collapse but with some structural as well as non-structural damage. A geotechnical report prepared by Geotecnia on August 12, 2024, reviewed the potential for strong seismic ground shaking. In the report, it was determined that because the site is approximately 1.2 miles southwest from the Hayward fault (a major Type-A Fault), the site may be exposed to moderate to strong earthquake shaking during the life of the improvements. Therefore, to address the potential for strong seismic ground shaking, the project applicant will comply with the following mitigation measures.

Impact GEO-1: The project may be subject to strong seismic ground shaking which could potentially damage the structures.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Prior to issuance of building permits , the applicant shall prepare a geotechnical report to address liquefaction hazards. The evaluation of the liquefaction hazard shall be based on analysis of the Cone Penetration Test (CPT) data. The Seismic hazard zone report should include a) Project description, b) Review of published geologic mapping and seismicity of the El Sobrante area, c) Provide justification for all assumptions used as inputs to the computer analysis of liquefaction potential based on analysis of CPT date. The methodology used by the project geotechnical engineers to evaluate liquefaction shall be consistent with guidelines adopted by the California Geological Survey for liquefaction analysis. If the CPT analysis confirms the presence of potentially liquefiable sands in the subsurface, the amount of anticipated total settlement and differential settlement across a building site shall be provided.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall evaluate the potential hazard posed by corrosive soils and provide mitigation for any substantial hazard posed by corrosive soils.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit a geotechnical update of the 2024 Geotecnia report. The purpose of the update is to provide

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

an opportunity for the geotechnical engineer to review and modify recommendations as warranted, based on the design level plans.

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: The applicant/contractor shall require adequate geotechnical monitoring to verify the design-level recommendations of Geotecnia are fully/correctly implemented in the field and documented in a final report from the geotechnical engineer. That report shall include monitoring dates on site, identify the location/nature of the features observed, provide any test results, and provide the engineer's professional opinion of compliance of the as-graded, as-built project with geotechnical recommendations.

Mitigation Measure GEO-5: All required reports shall be subject to peer review by the County Peer Review Geologist and shall be subject to review and approval by the Department of Conservation and Development.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (**Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**)*

According to Figure HS-18A: Liquefaction Susceptibility, the project site is located within a medium liquefaction susceptibility zone. The General Plan contains policies related to properties in liquefaction zones including prohibiting constriction of buildings intended for human occupancy in areas where liquefaction cannot be adequately mitigated and to require a Geotechnical Report to provide recommendations for the site. The applicant provided a geotechnical report prepared by Luis Moura of Geotecnia. The report reviewed the site and determined that the surficial soils at the site have a expansion potential of high. Expansive soils tend to swell with increases in moisture content and shrink with decreases in moisture content. These moisture fluctuations typically occur in the upper 4 feet of the clay soils during annual and seasonal variations in precipitation. Moisture fluctuations can also occur from irrigation, changes in site drainage, or the presence or removal of trees. As the soil shrinks and swells, improvements supported on the expansive soils may fall and rise. These movements may cause cracking and vertical and horizontal deformations of the improvements.

When expansive soil behavior occurs on slopes, such as at the rear of the site, there is a component of movement parallel to the downslope direction within about 15 feet from any downslope. Slope creep is a slow process, typically involving a small fraction of an inch per year (about 0.1 inches or less per year); however, this movement accumulates over the years and can result in several inches of lateral movement over the life of a structure, in addition to the differential vertical movements.

The report concludes that the potential for liquefaction is low at the site because (a) no loose, saturated granular soils were encountered in the five borings drilled for this study, and (b) the site is underlain by predominantly stiff to very stiff clay soils. However, to address the potential for liquefaction on this site, the project applicant will comply with the following mitigation measures.

Impact GEO-2: The project may be subject to liquefaction.

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

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4 and GEO-5** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

iv) Landslides? (Less than Significant Impact)

The Health and Safety Element of the General Plan Figure HS-18B: Landslide Hazards, maps out the location of landslide seismic hazard zones within the County. The project site is not mapped as a land slide zone. Since there are no landslides indicated on the site by mapping of the USGS, and because the official SHZ map indicates that site is not considered to be at risk of earthquake-triggered landslide displacement, the risks of landslide related ground failure are not substantial for this project. The geotechnical report prepared by Geotecnia also reviewed the potential for landslides and determined that the soils are very stiff clay soils which are not subject to landsliding and that during site reconnaissance, there was no observation of deep-seated, active instability and that groundwater surface is generally deeper than 18 feet which leads to a low potential for landsliding at the site. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact for landslides.

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

The project proposes grading of 200 cubic yards of cut and 750 cubic yards of fill. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant will be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Erosion Control Plan which is a routine requirement of projects requiring grading permits. The SWPPP identifies the "best management practices" that are most appropriate for the site, and the "Erosion Control Plan," which is required for the grading permit, provides the details of the erosion control measures to be applied on the site and maintained throughout the winter rainy season. Therefore, because the applicant will be required to comply with all County grading permit requirements, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

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

The geotechnical report prepared for the project indicates that the geologic data indicates that the proposed development is feasible with the implementation of the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report. The site is on very stiff clay soils and an 18-inch-thick layer of medium dense clayey sand. The Geotecnia report provides preliminary standards and criteria for site grading, drainage and foundation design. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact for the project.

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 With Mitigation Incorporated)

The Geotecnia report reviewed the site for expansive soils. The results of the field exploration and laboratory testing indicated that the surficial soils at the site have a high expansion potential.

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

Expansive soils tend to swell with increases in moisture content and shrink with decreases in moisture content. These moisture fluctuations typically occur in the upper 4 feet of the clay soils during annual and seasonal variations in precipitation. Moisture fluctuations can also occur from irrigation, changes in site drainage, or the presence or removal of trees. As the soil shrinks and swells, improvements supported on the expansive soils may fall and rise. These movements may cause cracking and vertical and horizontal deformations of the improvements.

When expansive soil behavior occurs on slopes, such as at the rear of the site, there is a component of movement parallel to the downslope direction within about 15 feet from any downslope. Slope creep is a slow process, typically involving a small fraction of an inch per year (about 0.1 inches or less per year); however, this movement accumulates over the years and can result in several inches of lateral movement over the life of a structure, in addition to the differential vertical movements.

The Geotecnia report provides recommendations on building design including foundation support and the location of any retaining walls. This will be a requirement included in mitigation measure GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4 and GEO-5.

Impact GEO-3: The project site is located on expansive soil.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, GEO-4 and GEO-5** would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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

The project is expected to be served by public sewers.

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

The possible opportunity for fossil material to be exposed would occur during trenching for utility lines (including storm drainage, sewers, domestic water, electrical and TV cable). Trenches would likely penetrate native soils. Standard CDD practice is to require that work shall stop if such materials are uncovered during grading, trenching, or other onsite earthwork until a certified paleontologist has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation as deemed necessary. The following mitigation measure will address any unexpected discovery or find which may occur during the construction phase of the project.

Impact GEO-4: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features.

Mitigation Measure GEO-6: Should any significant fossils (e.g., bones, teeth, or unusually abundant and well-preserved invertebrates or plants) be unearthed, the construction crew shall not attempt to remove them, as they could be extremely fragile and prone to crumbling, and to ensure their occurrence is properly recorded; instead, all work in the immediate vicinity of the

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

discovery shall be diverted at least 15 feet until a professional paleontologist assesses the find and, if deemed appropriate, salvages it in a timely manner. All recovered fossils shall be deposited in an appropriate repository, such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), where they would be properly curated and made accessible for future study.

Sources of Information

- *Geotechnical Study Proposed 8-Unit Residential Development by Geotechnia, dated August 12, 2024.*
- Geologic Peer Review and CEQA Section by Darwin Meyers Associates dated March 29, 2006.
- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – Health and Safety Element

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

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

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 for consideration of GHG emissions. The California Natural Resources Agency adopted the proposed State CEQA Guidelines as discussed below.

The bright-line numeric threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂/yr 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 an approximately 541,000-square-foot industrial use. Future construction of eight townhomes and related improvements would create some GHG emissions; however, the amount generated would be below the above-noted emission rate and not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. As the project does not exceed the screening criteria, the project would not result in the generation of GHG emissions that exceed the threshold of significance.

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

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

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

and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update on November 5, 2024, which includes a number of GHG emission reduction strategies. The strategies include measures such as implementing standards for green buildings and energy-efficient buildings, reducing parking requirements, and reducing waste disposal. Green building codes and debris recovery programs are among the strategies currently implemented by the County. The updated Climate Action and Adaptation Plan policies were included in the County General Plan and as such, any project that is consistent with the County General Plan is consistent with the updated CAP.

The project would create eight new townhomes within one lot and install frontage and drainage improvements which would generate some GHG emissions, but not at levels that would be in conflict with either the CAP or the 2024 update. Additionally, the project will be subject to implementing standards for energy-efficient buildings, green building codes and debris recovery programs. Therefore, because the project will not generate GHG emissions at levels that would result in a conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and because the project is consistent with the General Plan, the project would have a less than significant impact.

Sources of Information

- CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaamd.gov), 2024. *CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update, 2022 CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.*
- Contra Costa County. *Title 8: Zoning Ordinance.*
- Contra Costa County, 2024. *Climate Action and Adaptation Plan 2024 Update.*

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

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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)*

The project site is currently occupied by a single-family residence, a detached garage and various hardscape and landscape features. Therefore, the existing use has a low possibility of containing hazardous materials such as (e.g., underground storage tanks. etc.) However, during construction the proposed project would be expected to involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuels, aerosols, and paints. The proposed project would be subject to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, California Public Resources Code, and other State and local regulations that would reduce and limit the associated risks. Any handling, transporting, use,

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

or disposal would comply with applicable laws, policies, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies and regulations.

During project operations, small quantities of hazardous materials may be handled on the project site. Because of the nature of the project, hazardous materials used on-site may vary but would likely be limited to small quantities of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, solvents, cleaning agents, and similar materials used for daily residential operations and maintenance activities. These types of materials are common for residential developments such as the project and represent a low risk to people and the environment when used as intended. Further, compliance with applicable plans and regulations, would provide public protection from hazards associated with the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous substances. Therefore, operational impacts related to public hazard risk as a result of hazardous materials transport, use, or disposal would be less than significant.

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

Construction activity would be expected to involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuels, aerosols, and paints. The use of these materials would be subject to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, California Public Resources Code, and other State and local regulations that would limit the use of hazardous materials and reduce the associated risks of exposure. Any handling, transporting, use, or disposal would comply with applicable laws, policies, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies and regulations, including the Environmental Protection Agency, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Caltrans, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, and the Contra Costa County Hazardous Materials Program. Therefore, construction impacts related to hazardous materials upset risk would be less than significant.

The project proposes construction of eight (8) townhomes and related residential improvements including landscaping, and a creek at the rear. As such, the proposed project would not be expected to include industrial or retail development that involves hazardous materials such as gas stations, paint stores, or auto parts stores. Unlike industrial or retail facilities, residential development does not involve the type or quantity of hazardous materials that could pose a significant environmental accident.

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

Wildcat Canyon Community School is approximately 0.46 miles south of the project site and Sheldon Elementary School is approximately 0.49 miles east of the project site. Because the project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, construction and operational impacts related to hazardous emissions proximate to a school would be less than significant.

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

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

Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the project site is not identified as a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this respect.

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

The project site is located more than 13 miles west of the Buchanan Field Airport. There would be no safety hazard or excessive noise related to a public airport or public use airport.

- 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 project site is primarily accessed from Appian Way in El Sobrante which is a County maintained road. There are many streets off of Appian Way that are perpendicular and would utilize this roadway in an emergency. However, no aspect of the project will impede or reduce access to Appian Way because of its construction or operation. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) has reviewed the project plans and provided routine comments for the site. The applicant will be required to comply with all Fire District requirements including providing emergency access, providing no parking fire lanes, designing the buildings to have emergency escape and rescue openings, automatic fire sprinklers installed and submitting construction plans for the review and approval from the Fire District. The Fire Protection District would review the construction drawings for the project at the time of submittal of a building permit application. Additionally, the proposed project will not affect any existing communication/utility structures such as power poles or telecommunications towers, which may be necessary for an existing emergency response or evacuation plan. Thus, project impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be less than significant.

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

The project site is located within a "Locally Adopted Moderate FHSZ" as indicated in the County's mapping system in Accela. The fire hazard severity zones reflect the degree of severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail in the area. The construction of the new townhomes would be subject to building standards required for structures within "Locally Adopted Moderate" Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The building standard for the Fire Hazard Severity Zones would be enforced as the project is reviewed by the Building Inspection Division and the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. As the project will comply with these standards, there would be a less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.

Sources of Information

- County's Mapping System in Accela.
- Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – "Cortese List."
- Contra Costa County. 2000. *Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.

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

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2045. *Transportation Element*
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, *Agency Comment Letter*.

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

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project would comply with applicable water quality and discharge requirements. Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and 16 incorporated cities in the county have formed the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. In October 2009, the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB) adopted the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Regional Permit for the Program, which regulates discharges from municipal storm drains.

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

Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control stormwater runoff. The County has the authority to enforce compliance with its Municipal Regional Permit through the County's adopted C.3 requirements. The C.3 requirements stipulate that projects creating and/or redeveloping at least 10,000 square feet of impervious surface shall treat stormwater runoff with permanent stormwater management facilities, along with measures to control runoff rates and volumes. Due to the potential impervious areas that would be created for the residential and access improvements on the site (approximately 15,180 square feet), this project triggers threshold requiring submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP).

The applicant submitted a Stormwater Control Plan prepared by Humann Co. and was deemed to be "preliminarily complete" by the Contra Costa County Public Works Department. A final Stormwater Control Plan will be required to be submitted which will include any design level change prior to the issuance of a building permit and to ensure that the site is brought to full compliance with C.3 stormwater requirements. The applicant is requesting an exception from County Code Section 914 'collect and convey". The applicant submitted a Hydrology and Hydraulics report which demonstrated residual capacity available in the bioretention basins to mitigate the additional runoff volume resulting from the increased impervious surface. The Contra Costa County Public Works reviewed the exception request and had no objection. With implementation of the practicable stormwater controls, the project would be compliant with applicable water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, resulting in a less than significant impact.

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

The proposed project would have new impervious surfaces of approximately 15,180 square feet. However, the proposed project would incorporate techniques as described in the SWCP. The proposed project would not interfere substantially with groundwater supply, recharge, or groundwater management. Furthermore, the project site will be serviced by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and was initially reviewed by the utility district. Since water service at the site is provided by EBMUD, no groundwater wells are required. Therefore, potential impacts related to the groundwater recharge and supply would 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? (Less than Significant Impact)*

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 site currently appears to slope slightly towards Apian Creek located in the northwest of the property. Two bio-retention basis are

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

proposed on this site, with storm drain lines to convey drainage towards Appian Creek in the back of the property. The applicant submitted a Hydrology and Hydraulics report that demonstrated residual capacity available in the existing bioretention basins which would capture any discharge from the proposed impervious surface created from the project. The drainage analysis show the treatment basins have sufficient capacity to meter the stormwater runoff and satisfy the drainage requirements cited above. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact regarding erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

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

The proposed project would comply with regulations of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit consistent with Division 1014 of the Ordinance Code. The County's Public Works Department finds the Preliminary SWCP adequate to accommodate the rainwater runoff generated during storm events. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on- or off-site flooding.

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

Two bioretention basins are proposed to capture and treat the stormwater runoff. The storm drain lines will be directed to convey and drain towards Appian Creek in the back of the property. The applicant's engineer submitted an exception request from the "collect and convey" requirements of Division 914 which was reviewed by the County Public Works Department. In the exception request, a Hydrology and Hydraulics report was submitted to demonstrate residual capacity available in the bioretention basins to address any additional runoff volume resulting from the increase impervious surface area being created by the project. The County Public Works Department in their conditions of approval does not object to the granting of the exception. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on drainage.

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

The northwestern boundary of the property lies within the Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year flood boundary) Flood Plan B and AE due to the Appian Creek bisecting the northwest most property line. The County Public Works Department reviewed the applicant and determined that the buildings as proposed appear to meet the County Code Requirements. Additionally, Public Works determined that the project meets the creek structure setback requirements. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on flood flows.

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

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

As discussed in Environmental Checklist Section 10.c.iv above, portions of the property lie within the Special Flood Hazard Area (100 year flood boundary) as designated on the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map. The project will be required to comply with the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and the County Floodplain Management Ordinance as they pertain to development and construction of any structures on this property. The County Public Works Department reviewed the initial submittal and determined that the "proposed buildings appear to meet the Code requirements." However, the project will also be subject to standard Contra Costa County Public Works conditions of approval which require the submittal of a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) or Revision (LOMR) for building housing Units 6, 7 and 8 as they encroach into the Special Flood Hazard Area delineated by FEMA. Compliance with the Public Works Conditions of Approval would result in a less than significant impact.

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

As stated above, the proposed project would comply with applicable water quality and discharge requirements. Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit places requirements on site design to minimize creation of impervious surfaces and control stormwater runoff. The Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) prepared for the proposed project includes stormwater controls as required by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program and Municipal Regional Permit. Thus, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. 2025. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated January 23, 2025.*
- Humann Company Inc, *Hydrology & Hydraulics Report*, prepared October 2024.

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature, such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks, or the removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge that would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. The proposed project does not proposed construction of such a feature. Moreover, the subject property is currently used for residential activities. The surrounding properties are mixed use including retail/commercial to the southwest, residential to the north and east. The project proposed 8 townhomes that would be accessed from Appian Way. Thus, the project would not physically divide any of the nearby communities, or adversely impact the manner in which people enter or exit those communities.

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

The project site has a General Plan land use designation Mixed-Use Low (MUL) and Resource Conservation (RC). The project will be located within the MUL portion of the parcel. The MUL General Plan Designation allows for various housing types including townhouses with a Density range of 10-30 and a FAR of 1.0. The project has 0.67 net acres which allows for a density range of 7 units to 20 residential units. The project is proposing 8 residential units which is within the density range for the MUL General Plan Designation.

The project site is zoned P-1 Downtown El Sobrante Planned Unit Development. Within this area of El Sobrante, multiple-family residential units is a permitted use with a development plan application. The proposed project will be a multiple-family residential use which is compatible with the El Sobrante P-1. There are no land use plans applicable to the subject site aimed at mitigating environmental impacts.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2045 *Land Use Element*.
- Contra Costa County. *Title 8 – Zoning Ordinance*.

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

12. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 COS-13 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan's Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element. No known mineral resources have been identified in the project vicinity, and therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource.

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

Pursuant to Figure COS-13 (Mineral Resource Areas) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located within any area of the County identified as a significant mineral resource area. Therefore, there is no potential for the proposed project resulting in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan, 2045, *Conservation, Open Space, and Working Lands Element*.

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

13. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUMMARY:

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

The Health and Safety Element of the County General Plan discusses the County's goal to improve the overall environment in the County by reducing annoying and physically harmful levels of noise for existing and future residents, and for all land uses. According to the Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure by Use (Tale HS-3) in the County General Plan, environments with ambient noise levels of up to 60 dB (decibels) are considered "normally acceptable" and noise levels between 55 dB to 70 dB are "conditionally acceptable" in residential areas. The project will result in the types and levels of noise generated from new residential uses that are consistent to noise levels from the existing residential development in the area. Therefore, the impact on ambient noise levels in the vicinity would be less than significant.

According to the County's GIS and the County's General Plan 2045 Roadway Noise Contours (Figure HS-21), the subject property is located within a noise level of 65 dBA due to the proximity to Appian Way which is a major noise contributor. Vehicular traffic generated by the eight proposed townhomes along with noise typically associated with residential uses (e.g., yard maintenance, recreation, etc.), would increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. However, the types and levels of noise generated from the eight proposed townhomes will be similar to noise levels from the existing residential and mixed-use developments in the area. Furthermore, this area of Appian Way consists of normally acceptable noise generating uses such as restaurants, retail uses and single-family residences, and therefore, the impact on ambient noise levels in the vicinity would be less than significant.

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

During project grading and construction activities, there may be periods of time where there would be loud noise from construction equipment, vehicles, and tools. Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, such activities could have a potentially significant adverse environmental impact during project construction. Consequently, the project proponent is required to implement the noise mitigation measure **NOI-1** to bring potential noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Impact NOI-1: Construction related activities could generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: The following noise reduction measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans.

1. Unless specifically approved via prior authorization from the Zoning Administrator, all construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:

New Year's Day (State and Federal)
 Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
 Washington's Birthday (Federal)
 Lincoln's Birthday (State)
 President's Day (State)
 Cesar Chavez Day (State)
 Memorial Day (State and Federal)
 Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)
 Independence Day (State and Federal)
 Labor Day (State and Federal)
 Columbus Day (Federal)
 Veterans Day (State and Federal)
 Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
 Day after Thanksgiving (State)
 Christmas Day (State and Federal)

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

Federal Holidays: Federal Holidays (opm.gov)
 California Holidays: <http://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutftb/holidays.shtml>

2. Transportation of heavy equipment (e.g., graders, cranes, excavators, etc.) and trucks to and from the site shall be limited to weekdays between the hours of 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM and prohibited on Federal and State holidays. This restriction does not apply to typical material and equipment delivery or grading activities.
3. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary

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

noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.

4. The applicant shall notify neighbors within 300 feet of the subject property at least one week in advance of grading and construction activities
5. The applicant shall designate a construction noise coordinator who will be responsible for implementing the noise control measures and responding to complaints. This person's name and contact information shall be posted clearly on a sign at the project site and shall also be included in the notification to properties within 300 feet of the project site. The construction noise coordinator shall be available during all construction activities and shall maintain a log of complaints, which shall be available for review by County staff upon Request
6. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a preconstruction meeting shall be held with the job inspectors, designated construction noise coordinator, and the general contractor/onsite manager in attendance. The purpose of the meeting is to confirm that all noise mitigation measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are completed and in place prior to beginning grading or construction activities. The applicant shall provide written confirmation to CDD staff verifying the time and date that the meeting took place and identifying those in attendance.

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

Project construction includes grading of approximately 750 cubic yards of fill and 200 cubic yards of cut. Grading will occur temporarily at the site during construction, and implementation of NOI-1 requires mufflers on combustion engines and limits when heavy construction vehicles can be on the site. Therefore, the amount of ground borne vibration or noise generated by the project will be less than significant.

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

As discussed in Section 9.e, the project site is located more than 13 miles west of the Buchanan Field Airport and located more than 15 miles north of Oakland International Airport. Thus, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County General Plan. 2045. *Health and Safety Element*.

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

The proposed project would result in the construction of 8 townhomes that would potentially increase the housing stock in Contra Costa County. Given the Census 2020 estimates 2.89 people per household for El Sobrante, the population in the project area would be increased by approximately 23 people for this location. This amount is a non-substantial increase in the population. The subject property as currently zoned allows for residential uses and the surrounding area is mixed use including retail, commercial and residential which would be consistent with the project. The proposed use for this district would allow for residential uses and the project is consistent with the County's General Plan. Moreover, because the development is already zoned for residential use, the development of the proposed project would result in growth that was already envisioned and evaluated as part of the General Plan and would represent an increase of less than 1 percent of the County's anticipated total unincorporated population as of 2030. Therefore, the potential to induce a substantial unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, would be less than significant.

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

The subject property is currently developed with one single-family residence which will be demolished for the proposed development. The proposed project consists of constructing 8 townhomes that will provide much-needed housing to the area. The project is also subject to the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Per the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, the applicant is required to provide 1.2 inclusionary units. The applicant has indicated in their proposal that they will provide one inclusionary unit within the townhouses to be occupied by a very low-income household and the 0.2 fractional unit will be paid for by the in-lieu fee. Therefore, the project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or housing and would provide more replacement housing.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Finance 2025 – Population and Housing Estimates.

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

- Contra Costa County. *Title 8 – Zoning Ordinance.*

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

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*)

The Public Facilities and Services Element of the County General Plan requires all discretionary projects to be reviewed by the Fire Protection District. The project is served by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District and is 0.4 driving miles north from Contra Costa County Fire Station #69. The project was referred out to the Fire District and in a returned agency comment letter dated June 1, 2022, the Fire District indicated that upon review of the application submittal, it was found that the project will need to comply with access requirements and to submit a land development permit for the review and approval from the Fire District. In addition, as detailed in the comment letter for the proposed project from the Fire District, the project is required to comply with the California Building Code, and applicable Contra Costa County Ordinances that pertain to emergency access, fire suppression systems, and fire detection/warning systems. Furthermore, prior to the issuance of building permits, the construction drawings would be reviewed and approved by the Fire District. All townhomes will be equipped with an automatic fire suppression sprinkler system. As a result, potential impacts of the proposed project relating to fire protection would be less than significant.

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

Police protection services in the project vicinity are provided by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, which provides patrol service to the El Sobrante area. The proposed project would increase the population of unincorporated Contra Costa County by approximately 23 persons, which is less than the facility standard and is a non-substantial increase. The project does not propose a subdivision of land which would have necessitated a per-parcel fee for police services. Thus, the addition of eight townhomes to the project area would not significantly affect the provision of police services to the area.

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

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

The project will be subject to childcare fees for each unit which will go toward childcare facility needs in the area as established by the Board of Supervisors. Since the project would not significantly increase the population in the El Sobrante area, it would have a less than significant impact on enrollment at existing local schools.

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

The average size of a household in the Contra Costa County area is approximately 2.85 persons per household. The proposed project would increase the population by approximately 23 people. The Contra Costa County Public Facilities and Services Element strives to provide at least 3 acres of local parkland per every 1,000 residents. Because the project will approximately increase the population by approximately 23 people, a new park would not be required. Thus, the project would not result in a significant increase in the use of existing recreational public resources in the area. A Park Impact Fee and Park Dedication fee is required to be paid by the applicant prior to issuance of a building permit. Given the project's negligible addition to the population, the impact of the proposed project on parks would be less than significant.

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

Libraries:

The Contra Costa Library operates 28 facilities in Contra Costa County. The Contra Costa Library system is primarily funded by local property taxes, with additional revenue from intergovernmental sources. A portion of the property taxes on the project site will contribute to the Contra Costa Library system. Accordingly, the impact of the use of the public libraries by the residents of the eight new townhouses created would be less than significant.

Health Facilities:

The Contra Costa County Health Services Department (CCCHSD) operates a regional medical center (hospital) and 11 health centers and clinics in the County. County health facilities generally serve low income and uninsured patients. CCCHSD is primarily funded by federal and state funding programs, with additional revenue from local taxes, including a portion of the taxes on the project site. Thus, the impact of the use of public health facilities by the residents of the eight multi-family units created would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Finance 2024.
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. *Agency Comment Letter dated June 1, 2022.*

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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? (**Less than Significant Impact**)*

Given the relatively minor scale of the project, resulting in the creation of eight town-homes within an established neighborhood, the project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project site. Building permit fees for the new townhomes will be subject to park impact and park dedication fees, which fund the acquisition and maintenance of parks and recreational facilities in Contra Costa County. Given the minor scale of the project and its contribution of the aforementioned park fees, it is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration of nearby public facilities, nor would the project accelerate such deterioration. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected in this regard

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

The project does not proposed the construction of new recreational facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impacts in this respect.

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

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

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 GM-P2.3 of the Growth Management Element of the County General Plan requires a traffic impact analysis of any project that is estimate to generate more than 100 peak-hour trips to determine their effects on the regional transportation system. The project was reviewed by the Transportation Planning Section of the Department of Conservation and Development and determined to generate 6 AM peak hour trips and 8 PM peak hour trips. Therefore, the project is not required to have a project-specific traffic impact analysis since the project would yield less than 100 peak hour AM or PM trips. The project would not conflict with the circulation system in the El Sobrante area.

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is responsible for ensuring local government conformance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP), a program aimed at reducing regional traffic congestion. The CMP requires that each local jurisdiction identify existing and future transportation facilities that will operate below an acceptable service level and provide mitigation where future growth degrades that service level. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority has review responsibility for proposed development projects that are expected to generate 100 or more additional peak-hours trips. As the project would yield less than 100 additional peak hour AM or PM trips, the proposed project would not conflict with the CMP and would result in a less than significant impact.

The goal of the CCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) is to encourage biking and walking through improvements to the countywide bicycle and pedestrian network. The CBPP identifies the existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities network throughout Contra Costa County. There is a Class II bike lane that currently exists on Appian Way. However, the project will prohibit parking along Appian Way to reduce impacts to the bike lane usage.

The County's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance requires a residential project with 13 or more units to develop a TDM program. Since the project involves eight new

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

townhouses, a TDM program is not required. Overall, the project will not interfere with existing transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and therefore, would have a less-than-significant impact.

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

In analyzing land use projects under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. On June 23, 2020, in compliance with SB 743 (2013), the Board of Supervisors adopted Transportation Analysis Guidelines (TAG)¹, which defines the County's approach to analyzing VMT impacts from certain projects. As a result of SB 743, VMT is the metric used to define transportation impacts in a CEQA review. The VMT screening criteria for projects consisting of 20 residential or less will not require a VMT analysis as residential projects consisting of 20 units should be expected to cause a less than significant impact under CEQA. Since the project is well under 20 residential units, the project is assumed to have a less than significant impact on traffic. Therefore, the project 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 project involves the creation of eight townhomes on a single parcel within an established mixed-use neighborhood. The proposed land use is identical to the existing in that the parcel will remain residential in nature. The project is accessed via Appian Way which is a County maintained road. The project will relocate the existing driveway off Appian Way further north to serve the new residential units. The project was reviewed by the Public Works Department of Contra Costa County and is required to provide a 15-foot right of way dedication, pavement widening and to match the neighboring curb and sidewalk improvements. The new driveway and all right-of-way improvements will be subject to the requirements of County Department of Public Works design specifications in order to ensure it meets all applicable safety standards. Thus, no significant transportation impacts, whether due to a design feature or incompatible land uses, are expected to result from the project.

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

The project plans were referred to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District and in a returned agency comment letter dated June 1, 2022, the Fire District stated that the project would need to comply with Fire District Access requirements and to submit a land development permit to the Fire District to allow review for access and water supply. Prior to occupancy for any of the new townhouses, construction plans will be subject to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District review for consistency with applicable Fire Codes that are in effect at the time when the application for a building permit is submitted. Therefore, the routine review of construction plans will ensure that final development plans for the resultant parcels will not result in a condition with inadequate emergency vehicle access.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – *Transportation Element*.

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

- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated January 23, 2025.*
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. *Agency Comment Letter June 1, 2022*
- Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Transportation Planning Section. *Agency Comment Letter June 22, 2022*

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

As discussed in the Cultural Resources section of this Initial Study, no cultural material from the historic or prehistoric periods was observed throughout the project area and the existing house does not appear to meet any of the CEQA Guidelines listed in Sec 15054.5(3)). Additionally, there is no evidence in the record at the time of completion of this study that indicates the presence of human remains at the project site. On May 29, 2025, the County mailed a *Notice of Opportunity to Request Consultation*, pursuant to section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code, to Wilton Rancheria and Confederated Villages of Lisjan Nation for their review of the project proposal. County staff did not receive a request for consultation in response to these notices.

Nevertheless, the possibility remains that buried archaeological resources and/or human remains could be present on the project site, and accidental discovery could occur during grading and other earthwork on the project site resulting in potentially significant impacts. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 (identified previously within the Cultural Resources section of this report), would reduce potential impacts from accidental discovery to less than significant levels.

- 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 with Mitigation**)*

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

While unlikely, subsurface construction activities always have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources such as wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse, if encountered. This would represent a potentially significant impact related to historic resources if not mitigated. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce the impact to undiscovered historical resources to a less than significant level.

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

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The project does not involve the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage infrastructure. The project parcel currently contains an existing single-family residence that is serviced by utilities. Therefore, the project is considered an in-fill project surrounded by similar residential and mixed uses. Water, gas, electrical, and sanitary sewer service would be extended from existing tie-in within Appian Way. All utility providers have been contacted and responded with confirmation that capacity exists within their respective systems to serve the project. Therefore, the project would not require construction of new off-site wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities.

- 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)*

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

The project has been referred to the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) for comment. In a comment letter dated June 6, 2022, EBMUD staff advised that the project site is located within EBMUD's service district boundaries, and that service is available to the project site via an existing water main located within Appian Way and that the applicant will be required to install water meters for the townhomes. If the project is approved, an application to establish new water service to the subdivision is required and is subject to review/approval by EBMUD. It is the applicant's responsibility to contact EBMUD's New Business Office to establish new water service for the subdivision. Thus, the applicant's compliance with applicable EBMUD requirements for establishing new water service will ensure a sufficient supply of water is available to the project now and for the foreseeable future.

- 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 located within the West County Wastewater (WCW) service boundaries. In a comment letter dated May 13, 2022, WCW stated that wastewater service is available for the proposed project. If the project is approved, the applicant will submit construction documents to WCW for their review and approval. Therefore, the project would expectedly have a less than significant impact in this regard.

- 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)*

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

With respect to residential waste, Contra Costa County contracts with franchise haulers for solid waste, recycling, and organics collection service for about one half of the unincorporated County. The Department of Conservation and Development, Solid Waste and Recycling Section administers four franchise agreements with Allied Waste Systems, Crockett Sanitary Service, Garaventa Enterprises, and Richmond Sanitary Service. Republic Services collects residential waste under the Allied Waste, Crockett Sanitary, and Richmond Sanitary agreements. Mt. Diablo

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

Resource Recovery collects residential waste under the Garaventa Enterprises agreement. In the other half of unincorporated County, collection service is managed by three different sanitary districts, the Kensington Community Services District, the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority (RecycleSmart, a joint powers authority), and the City of San Ramon, where unincorporated areas of San Ramon are served under the city's collection franchise. California Public Resource Code (PRC) Division 30, and Title 14, Natural Resources, of the California Code of Regulations requires the County to show it has a minimum of 15-years of disposal capacity. The capacity of Keller Canyon Landfill is approximately 40 years if the maximum daily capacity was brought to the landfill. As is the case with construction debris, a portion of the residential waste is expected to be recycled and would thereby reduce the residential waste headed to a landfill by a franchise hauler. Thus, residential waste from construction of eight new townhomes and the demolition of the existing single-family residence and accessory structures would incrementally add to the operational waste handled by a franchise hauler; however, the impact of the project-related residential waste is considered to be less than significant.

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

The proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste. The project includes residential land uses that would not result in the generation of unique types of solid waste that conflict with existing regulations applicable to solid waste. The project was reviewed by the Conservation Program of Contra Costa County and the Conservation Program determined that the project will be required to comply with County Cde 418-6 and 418-20 which requires adequate container enclosures to collect all three waste streams and organic waste disposal reduction enclosures to be installed on drains. Furthermore, compliance with CalGreen's solid waste requirements, such as the Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, would result in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws related to solid waste.

Sources of Information

- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan. *Public Facilities and Services Element*.
- Agency Comment Letter, West County Wastewater, dated May 13, 2022
- Agency Comment Letter, EBMUD, dated June 6, 2022
- 2025. *Contra Costa County, Conservation and Development Department, CalGreen / Construction & Demolition (C&D) Debris Recovery Program*. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4746/CalGreen-Construction-Demolition-Debris->
- 2025. *Contra Costa County, Approved Construction & Demolition (C&D) Processing Facilities*. <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/44986/Approved-CD-Processing-Facilities?bidId=>
- 2025. *Contra Costa County, Franchise Agreements*. <https://cccrecycle.org/235/Franchise-Agreements>
- 2025. *Contra Costa County, Waste Hauler Area Map*. <https://cocogis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2c5e6c6b1f7d419eac7005c84a76de90>

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

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

SUMMARY:

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

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

The project site and surrounding vicinity are designated "Locally Adopted Moderate" according to Fire Hazard Severity Maps published by CAL Fire. The nearest "High" is approximately 113 feet south of the site. Because the project site is not located in a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high, the project would have a less than significant impact on any 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? (**Less than Significant Impact**)*

As stated in the section a above, the project site is not within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone. The property has a very slight slope that will not exacerbate wildfire risks. Moreover, because

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

the site is not within a high or very high hazard severity zone, the risk of wildfire is less than significant.

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

The project site is currently developed with residential uses. However, new electrical power and natural gas lines on site and connecting to the project site would be installed underground, minimizing potential ignition and related fire risk above ground, at the project site according to the California Building Code, Uniform Fire Code, and the Contra Costa County General Plan Health and Safety Element Goal HS-7. The project plans will be reviewed and approved by the Fire District prior to issuance of a building permit. Lastly, off-site improvements, including frontage sidewalks and driveway curbs would not exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment is less than significant.

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

A SWCP with C.3 compliant storm water controls including pervious areas, bio-retention basins, and storm drains that would collect storm water was prepared for the project. The C.3 measures would decrease the amount of surface runoff discharged from the site by metering the outflow. The County Public Works Department has reviewed the applicant's preliminary SWCP and determined that it is preliminary complete. Furthermore, the project site is located within a "Moderate" Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area as indicated in the County's mapping system in Accela. Therefore, any impacts would be less than significant.

Sources of Information

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire). [Fire Hazard Severity Zones / OSFM](#)
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, *Agency Comment Letter dated June 1, 2022*.
- Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval dated January 23, 2025*.
- Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan – Health and Safety Element

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

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUMMARY:

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

The project to construct eight townhomes and associated improvements. The property is located in a developed area of the County and contains primarily residential land uses with retail and commercial uses mixed in within the surrounding area. Impacts to the quality of the environment related to Aesthetic, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources are identified, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the adoption of the mitigation measures that are specified in the respective sections of this initial study. Thus, the measures will be conditions of approval of the proposed project and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures.

- 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)

The proposed project to allow eight new townhomes would not create substantial cumulative impacts. County Staff reviewed the immediate area for other surrounding development applications and identified CDDP24-03037, a 3,500 square-foot, five residential unit apartment building proposed approximately 286 feet northeast. However, this project is has been deemed incomplete. Moreover, these multiple family projects will need to obtain property approval from the local agencies and service providers. The project site is located within the Urban Limit Line in an area that is surrounded primarily by single-family residential development. In addition, there will be no significant increase in the demand for public services such as water, sewage disposal, or solid waste disposal that would require new or significantly expanded infrastructure improvements that could impact the environment. The project is consistent with the Mixed-Use Low Density (MUL) General Plan land use designation. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the existing residential development at and surrounding the project site.

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

This Initial Study has disclosed impacts that would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures. All identified Mitigation Measures will be included in the conditions of approval for the proposed project, and the applicant will be responsible for implementation of the measures. The project would also comply with all applicable General Plan policies, County Codes, and other applicable local and state regulations. As a result, there would not be any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

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

1. Project Application and Plans
2. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines
3. Contra Costa County 2045 General Plan
4. California Important Farmland Finder (webpage)
[DLRP Important Farmland Finder](#)
5. Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title 8)
6. Contra Costa County Accela
7. County Geographic Information System (GIS) Data Layers
8. CAL Fire Fire Hazard Severity Zones (webpage) [Office of the State Fire Marshal | OSFM](#)
9. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan*.
10. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. *Air Quality Guidelines*.
11. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - "Cortese List" (Website)
12. Contra Costa County, 2024. *Climate Action and Adaptation Plan*
13. California Department of Finance. 2024.
14. Contra Costa County Department of Public Works. January 23, 2025. *Staff Report and Conditions of Approval*.
15. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. *Agency Comment Response dated June 1, 2022*.
16. Contra Costa County Transportation Planning Section. *Agency Comment Response dated June 22, 2022*.
17. East Bay Municipal Utility District. *Agency Comment Response dated June 6, 2022*.
18. California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center. *Agency comment letter dated June 6, 2022*.
19. Darwin Myers Associates, County Geologist. 2025. *Geologic Peer Review for County File #CDDP22-03021, dated July 14, 2025*.

20. AHC, Daniel Shoup. *Archaeological Survey Report, dated January 2024.*
21. BIOMAASINC, Sandra Etchell, *Biological Resources Assessment, dated September 2, 2025.*
22. GEOTECNIA, Luis Moura, *Geotechnical Study, dated August 12, 2024.*
23. Matthew Trujillo, *Arborist Report, dated June 6, 2025.*

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans
3. Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program

Numair Ali (Applicant) / Shakil and Anita Ali (Owner)

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
County File #CDDP22-03021**

**4301 Appian Way, El Sobrante, CA 94803
Martinez, CA 94553**

November 2025

SECTION 1: AESTHETICS

Impact AES-1: New exterior lighting from the project site could adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Proposed exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent properties and public/private right-of-way to prevent glare or excessive light spillover. All exterior lighting shall be turned off during the daytime hours.

Implementing Action:

COA

Timing of Verification:

Prior to, during, and post construction.

Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:

Project proponent and CDD.

Compliance Verification:

If proposed, include on construction plan set for CDD review.

SECTION 3: AIR QUALITY

Impact AIR-1: Exhaust emissions and particulate matter produced by construction activities related to the project may cause exposure of the public or sensitive receptors to significant amounts of pollutants.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Basic Construction mitigation measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be stated on the face of all construction plans:

- A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- C. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- E. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CDDP22-03021

Page 2 of 9

H. The applicant shall post a publicly visible sign with the developer/project manager's name and telephone number regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Prior to and during construction.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set for CDD review.
SECTION 4: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
Impact BIO-1: Grading and construction activities could have an adverse effect on protected species and habitat. Therefore, the developer/applicant is required to implement the following biological resource mitigation measures to reduce impacts to special status species will be less than significant.	
Mitigation Measure BIO-1: A protective buffer of 30 to 50 feet from Appian Creek will be established by the project applicant. Silt fence or similar Best Management Practices (BMPS) shall be established to prevent construction related debris and runoff from entering the creek during construction.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal for CDD review.
Impact BIO-2: Grading and construction activities could have an adverse effect on protected species and habitat. Therefore, the developer/applicant is required to implement the following biological resource mitigation measures to reduce impacts to special status species will be less than significant.	
Mitigation Measure BIO-2: At least 5 days prior to vegetation removal, tree removal during the nesting season, (February 1 through August 31) a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist who is familiar with the nesting behavior of a variety of species and can establish protective buffers around the nest based upon the type of construction activity. Nest buffers should be adhered to by all construction related personnel and can only be removed by the biologist after the nest is no longer active.	
Implementing Action:	COA

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
CDDP22-03021
Page 3 of 9

Timing of Verification:	Prior to issuance of a building/grading permit or prior to tree removal.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Biological survey to be submitted for CDD review.
Impact BIO-3 Grading and construction activities could have an adverse effect on protected species and habitat. Therefore, the developer/applicant is required to implement the following biological resource mitigation measures to reduce impacts to special status species will be less than significant.	
Mitigation Measure BIO-3: At least 5 days prior to beginning ground disturbance and/or construction, a qualified wildlife Biologist shall conduct surveys for special-status bats during the appropriate time of day to maximize detectability to determine whether bat species are roosting near the work area. If the Biologist determines bats are present, the Biologist shall exclude the bats from suitable spaces by installing one-way exclusion devices. After the bats vacate the space, the Biologist shall close off the space to prevent recolonization.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Prior to issuance of a building/grading permit or prior to tree removal.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Biological survey to be submitted for CDD review.
Impact BIO-4: Grading and construction activities could have an adverse effect on protected species and habitat. Therefore, the developer/applicant is required to implement the following biological resource mitigation measures to reduce impacts to special status species will be less than significant.	
Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Vegetation removal, if necessary, should be kept to a minimum. If riparian vegetation removal is required, a CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement, and RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification if required prior to removal.	
COA	COA
Implementing Action:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
CDDP22-03021
Page 4 of 9

Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal for CDD review.
Impact BIO-5: Grading and construction could have an impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.	
See Mitigation Measure BIO-1 – BIO-4.	
SECTION 5: CULTURAL RESOURCES	
Impact CUL-1: The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5. Subsurface construction activities have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources. Historic resources can include wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse. If during project construction, subsurface construction activities damaged previously undiscovered historic and prehistoric resources, there could be a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation Measure CUL-1: The project area has a high sensitivity for buried Native American archaeological deposits, and is located within 1000 feet of four shell midden sites (CA-CCO-126, CA-CCO-151, CA-CCO-155, and CA-CCO-505), three of which are known to contain burials. To ensure that the project does not cause substantial adverse impacts to historical resources as defined at 14 CCR §15064.5, the following shall be implemented prior to any ground disturbing activity: 1. Prior to any ground-disturbing activity, construction crews should receive a cultural resources training from a qualified archaeologist. The training should review the types of cultural resources that might be found, the legal obligations of the contractors, and steps to follow if archaeological materials or human remains are identified. 2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a qualified archaeologist should design a subsurface testing program to assess the presence or absence of buried archaeological sites in the project area. Mechanical trenching of a representative sample of the project area to the level of potential ground disturbance or four feet, whichever is greater, should be completed in order to evaluate the presence and depth of possible cultural soils. Mechanical trenching may be supplemented by hand augering or other sampling strategies as needed. All mechanical excavations should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and representative of the Native American community. If cultural resources are identified, it may be necessary to collect additional data to evaluate the significance of the resource. 3. Should subsurface testing not prove feasible, ground-disturbing activity on the project area should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and representative of the Native American community until sufficient information has been gathered to demonstrate the presence or absence of archaeological resources within the area that will be disturbed by the proposed project.	

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CDDP22-03021

Page 5 of 9

4. If human remains are found during monitoring, the monitor will stop all activity within a 100-foot radius, and the Contra Costa County Coroner will be informed. If the remains appear to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified and invited to identify a Most Likely Descendant, who will make recommendations regarding reburial of the human remains, per §15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines.	
Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set and submittal of archaeologist report in the event of a find, for CDD review.
Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities may have a significant impact to previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	
See Mitigation Measure CUL-1.	
Impact CUL-3: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered human remains.	
See Mitigation Measure CUL-1.	
SECTION 7: GEOLOGY AND SOILS	
Impact GEO-1 – GEO - 5: Project activities could have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features.	
<u>Mitigation Measure GEO-1:</u> Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall prepare a geotechnical report to address liquefaction hazards. The evaluation of the liquefaction hazard shall be based on analysis of the Cone Penetration Test (CPT) data. The SHZ report should include a) Project description, b) Review of published geologic mapping and seismicity of the El Sobrante area, c) Provide justification for all assumptions used as inputs to the computer analysis of liquefaction potential based on analysis of CPT data. The methodology used by the project geotechnical engineers to evaluate liquefaction shall be consistent with guidelines adopted by the California Geological Survey for liquefaction analysis. If the CPT analysis confirms the presence of potentially liquefiable sands in the subsurface, the amount of anticipated total settlement and differential settlement across a building site shall be provided.	
<u>Mitigation Measure GEO-2:</u> Prior to issuance of construction permits, the applicant shall evaluate the potential hazard posed by corrosive soils and provide mitigation for any substantial hazard posed by corrosive soils.	

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CDDP22-03021

Page 6 of 9

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Prior to issuance of construction permits the applicant shall submit a geotechnical update of the 2024 Geotecnia report. The purpose of the update is to provide an opportunity for the geotechnical engineer to review and modify recommendations as warranted, based on the design level plans.

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: The applicant/contractor shall require adequate geotechnical monitoring to verify the design-level recommendations of Geotecnia are fully/correctly implemented in the field and documented in a final report from the geotechnical engineer. That report shall include monitoring dates on site, identify the location/nature of the features observed, provide any test results, and provide the engineer's professional opinion of compliance of the as-graded, as-built project with geotechnical recommendations.

Mitigation Measure GEO-5: All required reports shall be subject to peer review by the County Peer Review Geologist and shall be subject to review and approval by the Department of Conservation and Development.

Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	Throughout grading and project, review of information submitted.
Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Prior to issuance of construction permits, the applicant will submit a geotechnical report to CDD and the County Geologist.

SECTION 13: NOISE

Impact NOI-1: Construction related activities could generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: The following noise reduction measures shall be implemented during project construction and shall be included on all construction plans.

1. Unless specifically approved via prior authorization from the Zoning Administrator, all construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and are prohibited on State and Federal holidays on the calendar dates that these holidays are observed by the State or Federal government as listed below:

New Year's Day (State and Federal)
 Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. (State and Federal)
 Washington's Birthday (Federal)
 Lincoln's Birthday (State)
 President's Day (State)
 Cesar Chavez Day (State)
 Memorial Day (State and Federal)
 Juneteenth National Independence Holiday (Federal)

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
 Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CDDP22-03021

Page 7 of 9

Independence Day (State and Federal)
Labor Day (State and Federal)
Columbus Day (Federal)
Veterans Day (State and Federal)
Thanksgiving Day (State and Federal)
Day after Thanksgiving (State)
Christmas Day (State and Federal)

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

Federal Holidays: Federal Holidays (opm.gov)
California Holidays: <http://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutftb/holidays.shtml>

2. Transportation of heavy equipment (e.g., graders, cranes, excavators, etc.) and trucks to and from the site shall be limited to weekdays between the hours of 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM and prohibited on Federal and State holidays. This restriction does not apply to typical material and equipment delivery or grading activities.
3. The applicant shall require their contractors and subcontractors to fit all internal combustion engines with mufflers which are in good condition and shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors as far away from existing residences as possible.
4. The applicant shall notify neighbors within 300 feet of the subject property at least one week in advance of grading and construction activities
5. The applicant shall designate a construction noise coordinator who will be responsible for implementing the noise control measures and responding to complaints. This person's name and contact information shall be posted clearly on a sign at the project site and shall also be included in the notification to properties within 300 feet of the project site. The construction noise coordinator shall be available during all construction activities and shall maintain a log of complaints, which shall be available for review by County staff upon
Request
6. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a preconstruction meeting shall be held with the job inspectors, designated construction noise coordinator, and the general contractor/onsite manager in attendance. The purpose of the meeting is to confirm that all noise mitigation measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are completed and in place prior to beginning grading or construction activities. The applicant shall provide written confirmation to CDD staff verifying the time and date that the meeting took place and identifying those in attendance.

Implementing Action:	COA
Timing of Verification:	During initial review of construction plan sets and throughout project.

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
CDDP22-03021
Page 8 of 9

Responsible Department, Agency, or Party:	Project Proponent and CDD.
Compliance Verification:	Include on construction plan set for CDD review.
SECTION 18: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	
<u>Impact TRIBAL-1:</u> The project could potentially have a significant impact related to historic resources during construction related activities.	
See Mitigation Measure CUL-1. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the impact to undiscovered historical resources to a less than significant level.	
SECTION 21: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	
<u>Impact:</u> The project to create eight new townhouses may impact the quality of the environment (Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geological Resources, Noise and Tribal Cultural Resources).	
The impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with the adoption of the recommended Mitigation Measures that are specific in the respective sections of the Initial Study.	

Abbreviations:

Condition of Approval (COA)
Community Development Division (CDD)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
CDDP22-03021
Page 9 of 9