

## **DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The following proposed project has been reviewed by the City of Lafayette for the purpose of determining the likelihood of a significant adverse environmental impact occurring as a result of project completion.

NAME OF PROJECT: Wight Residence

PROJECT NO.: HDP20-13

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Request for 1) a Phase II Hillside Development Permit for a new two-story, 9,638 SF single-family residence with an attached 3 car garage with an average height of 28.5 feet and a 365 SF garden room; 2) a Grading Permit for the movement of 4,800 CY of earth (2,900 CY cut/ 1,900 CY of fill); and 3) a Tree Permit for the removal of 19 protected trees on a vacant 13.66 acre parcel located in the Hillside Overlay District within a Class II ridgeline at 1240 Monticello Road.

LOCATION OF PROJECT: 1240 Monticello Road, Lafayette, CA (APN: 245-070-014)

MAILING ADDRESS OF APPLICANT OR AGENT: 21 Northridge Lane, Lafayette, CA 94549

TYPE OF ENTITLEMENT SOUGHT: Phase 2 Hillside Development Plan Permit, Grading Permit, Tree Permit.

EXPLANATION OF REASONS FOR THE FINDING: The Lead Agency has determined that the proposed project could have potentially significant impacts on biological resources. However, mitigation measures listed in the attached Initial Study have been incorporated into the project which will reduce all potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. These measures include the conducting of pre-construction surveys for various protected wildlife species by a qualified wildlife biologist.

PUBLIC HEARING: The Design Review Commission will consider this project in a public hearing on March 10, 2014 and April 14, 2014 as a recommending body to the City Council. The draft document has been made available during the Design Review Commission hearings. Final decision on the project and environmental determination will be made by the City Council, scheduled for May 12, 2014. Copies of all environmental documents are available for review at the Planning Division office located at 3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Lafayette, CA 94549.

Any comments as to whether this Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration should become final or whether an EIR should be prepared for the project must be submitted within 30 days of the posting of this Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. The comment period date is from April 11, 2014 and ends on May 12, 2014.

If this Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration becomes final by City Council action, any person who disagrees with Council action may seek judicial review.

Posted by the Lafayette Planning Department on April 11, 2014.

Notice of Determination to be sent to:

Posting of Notice

County Clerk

Mailed to owners of contiguous

State Clearinghouse

Publish notice

IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, PLEASE CONTACT:

Catarina S. Kidd, AICP, Contract Planner

(925) 299-3241

[ckidd@lovelafayette.org](mailto:ckidd@lovelafayette.org)



**Planning Services Division**  
3675 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 210  
Lafayette, CA 94549  
Tel. (925) 284-1976 • Fax (925) 284-1122  
<http://www.ci.lafayette.ca.us>

### **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **Project Title:** HDP20-13, 1240 Monticello Road
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**  
  
City of Lafayette, 3675 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 210, Lafayette, CA 94549
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**  
Catarina Kidd (925) 299-3241; ckidd@lovelafayette.org
4. **Project Location:**  
1240 Monticello Road, Lafayette, CA 94549  
Contra Costa County Assessor's Parcel Number 245-070-014
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**  
Linda and Steven Wight, 21 Northridge Lane, Lafayette, CA 94549
6. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Residential Single Family; up to .1 dwelling units/acre
7. **Zoning:** LR-10; Hillside Overlay District
8. **Description of the Project:**  
The proposed Project is a two-story, 28.5 foot high, 10,003 gross square foot single family residence on a vacant 13.66 acre parcel located on a Class II ridgeline spur of Lafayette Ridge. Access is from a driveway extension of the access road to the East Bay Municipal Utility District water tank. The existing access road in the vicinity of the project driveway will be expanded to meet Fire District requirements. The 130± foot long driveway will require four to six foot high retaining walls to maintain a 16 percent roadway grade. To accommodate development, 2,900 cubic yards of cut and 1,900 cubic yards of fill would be required. The project incorporates stormwater quality control measures.
9. **Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)*  
The 13.66 acre Project site is located on a hilltop above Lafayette's residential neighborhoods with single-family residential development (R-20 zoning to the east and R-40 zoning to the south); East Bay Municipal Utility Water District (EBMUD) water tank to the east and land owned by the City of Lafayette to the west. An unpaved fire trail (15-13) is located on the eastern side of the property. Site topography consists of a downward slope east to west/southwest with an elevation high of 740' and a low of 510'. The proposed home site is accessed by the gated EBMUD road leading to the water tank. The Project site supports two plant communities: non-native annual grassland and oak woodland.
10. **Other public agencies whose approvals are required:** *(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)*

None expected.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
Catarina Kidd  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
Niroop K. Srivatsa, Planning/Building Services Manager  
For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
<p><i>The Project site is located in the Hillside Overlay District and within the setback of a Class II ridgeline spur of Lafayette Ridge and is subject to the provisions of Chapter 6-20, Hillside Development, Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC). In order to approve the Project, exceptions to development within the 15-degree declination and ridgeline setback must be made. This Project was previously evaluated by the City Council which determined that the findings for exceptions could be made because the house did not silhouette above the ridgeline when viewed from lower elevations at Rose Court, Rose Lane, and Meadow Lane. Other than the portion of the roof that can be seen from the west, the house will be screened from surrounding views by topography and vegetation. Compliance with the following required conditions from this earlier approval (HDP33-11) will reduce impacts on a scenic vista to a less than significant level.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <i>Landscaping plans submitted for the Phase 2 Hillside Development Permit application shall include trees for screening and mitigation for trees removed.</i></li> <li>✓ <i>The Phase 2 Hillside Development Permit application shall include a color and material board and samples where appropriate of muted, natural building materials and colors to help mitigate the offsite visibility of development.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Supporting Source: 57</i></p>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<i>This site is not located within a scenic highway corridor. Supporting Source: 13.</i>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
<i>See 1.a above.</i>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
<p><i>The project will introduce a new source of light to this vacant, ridgeline property. Proposed exterior lighting is shown on sheets L-5 and L-5.1. The applicant revised the original quantity of 168 to 120. Light fixtures contribute to safety, security and aesthetics of a home. The majority of specified lights are for walking paths which are necessary for safety on a semi-rural site with no other light sources (no street lights). Other outdoor fixtures are down directed or under water in the pool or fountain and is therefore not a source of glare. Fixtures proposed to be mounted on the house are down directed and/or are specified on cut sheets to be "Dark Sky" compliant. Supporting Source: 37, 45.</i></p>				
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>				

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
<i>The project site is shown as Grazing Land on the Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map and identified as land on which the existing vegetation is suitable for grazing of livestock. Supporting Source: 31.</i>				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<i>The property is zoned LR-10 Low Density Residential District 10. Surrounding lands are either developed with residential uses or zoned for residential uses. The property is not protected by a Williamson Act contract. Supporting Source: 23, 43.</i>				
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))?				X
<i>The project site is not devoted to or used for growing and harvesting timber and has not been designated as a Timberland Production Zone. Supporting Source: 13.</i>				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
<i>See Ilc, above.</i>				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
<i>The project site is not identified as Farmland. See Ila, above and Supporting Source: 47.</i>				
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The Project site is in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and is subject to the rules and regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD prepares air quality management plans to attain ambient air quality standards in the Basin. Health-based ambient air quality standards have been established for seven air pollutants emitted into the ambient air by stationary and mobile sources and are categorized as primary and/or secondary pollutants. Primary air pollutants are those that are emitted directly from sources. Carbon monoxide (CO), reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb) are primary air pollutants. Of these, CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are "criteria air pollutants," which means ambient air quality standards have been established for them. VOC and NO<sub>2</sub> are Criteria Pollutant precursors that form secondary Criteria Air Pollutants through chemical and photochemical reactions in the atmosphere. Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) are the principal secondary pollutants.*

*The proposed single-family dwelling unit (du) is below the BAAQMD operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold of 325 du, below the operational greenhouse gas screening size of 56 du, and below the construction-related screening size of 114 du. Because the proposed Project would not exceed these thresholds, it would not be considered by BAAQMD to be a substantial emitter of criteria air pollutants and impacts would be considered less than significant.*

*Supporting Source: 4, 58.*

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

*As noted in III.a, above, the Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold. Although the Project is also below the construction-related screening size of 114 du, the Project will involve more than the usual amount of construction activity associated with a single-family dwelling. Also, members of the public have expressed concerns about impacts to air quality from construction. Therefore, an analysis of criteria air pollutants generated during construction activities was conducted using URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4. Criteria pollutants include the following sources:*

- ◆ Exhaust emissions from powered construction equipment;
- ◆ Fugitive dust generated by demolition, earthmoving, excavation, and other construction activities;
- ◆ Motor vehicle emissions associated with vehicle trips; and
- ◆ VOCs from the application of asphalt and architectural coatings.

*As shown on Table 1 at the end of this checklist, Project emissions from the six criteria pollutants are substantially below the thresholds of significance.*

*Supporting Source: 4, 58.*

c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold.*  
*Supporting Source: 4, 58.*

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

*The Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold.*  
*Supporting Source: 4, 58.*

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

*The Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold.*  
*Supporting Source: 4, 58.*

**IV. 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?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

*The Project site supports two plant communities: non-native annual grassland and oak woodland. Non-native annual grassland occurs on the majority of the Project site. This plant community is dominated by non-native grasses such as red brome, soft chess, and wild oats. Some native grasses and plants are also present including June grass, creeping wild rye grass, gray mule ears, poison oak, and some coyote brush. This grassland community provides habitat for lesser goldfinch, golden-crowned sparrow, Botta's pocket gopher, and California meadow vole. Raptors (birds of prey) common to the area are red-tailed hawk and red shouldered hawk. Other animals include wild turkey, Columbian black-tailed deer and coyote.*

*There are groupings of coast live oak and valley oak trees in the northern and western portions of the Project site and a more extensive swath of oak woodland occurs along the Project site's eastern slope. Other trees include California buckeye and California bay laurel. The oaks provide suitable foraging and nesting habitat for birds such as western scrub jay, Nuttall's woodpecker, and Anna's hummingbird. Rotting wood underneath the trees provided habitat for the California slender salamander, sharp-tailed snake, and ring-necked snake.*

*The applicant has submitted a Biological Resources Analysis prepared by Monk & Associates (M&A). M&A biologists conducted a general survey of the site on November 5, 2012. Based on this survey, it was determined that the presence of special-status plants could not be ruled out without conducting focused surveys during the growing season. Focused surveys for special-status plants were conducted on March 14, May 3, and June 8, 2013. All plants were identified to the level required to determine rarity status. No special-status plant species were identified on the Project site.*



Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*M&A biologists identified several large nests of the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat, a California species of special concern that warrants protection pursuant to CEQA. Five woodrat nests were mapped in order to ensure that they could be avoided by the proposed project. All nests are located outside the proposed development footprint and with avoidance measures would not be impacted by the proposed Project. The oak woodland also provides suitable nesting habitat for red-tailed hawk and red shouldered hawk which are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Neither species was observed during the site visit but they are mobile species that may move onto the site. Until nesting surveys are conducted that confirm or negate the presence of these species, impacts would be considered potentially significant. See the mitigation measures below.*

*1. Native vegetation: Landscape plant lists shall be predominantly native plant species indigenous to the Lafayette area (a minimum of 30% or greater). Hydroseed mix used on exposed, newly graded, or barren slopes shall have a high percentage of native grasses and forbs in the mix.*

*2. The southern and western portion of the site would remain undeveloped. The preservation of open space would provide continued wildlife corridors away from the home site area.*

*Supporting Source: 54, 55.*

*3. Nesting Raptor and Passerine Birds: Prior to tree removal and grading within the development area, a determination shall be made as to whether grading or tree removal is proposed during the raptor and passerine bird nesting season (February through August). If grading or tree removal is proposed during the raptor and passerine bird nesting season, a focused tree pre-construction survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the nesting season to identify active nests on the project site. The survey shall be conducted no less than 14 days, and no more than 30 days, prior to the beginning of grading or tree removal. If nesting raptors are found during the focused survey, no grading or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest until the young have fledged as determined by a qualified biologist. If impacts to nest trees are unavoidable, they shall be removed during the non-breeding season.*

*4. The project sponsor shall install protective measures for all trees to remain as identified on the site plan. Protective measures shall be shown on the grading and/or drainage plan. All tree protection measures shall be approved, installed and inspected by the City before any construction may begin. All existing trees to remain shall be protected with the following measures during construction:*

*a. Protective fencing shall be installed prior to any construction activity, including clearing and grubbing, at the project site. Fencing shall be a minimum of one foot beyond the maximum dripline of all trees and may extend well beyond the dripline under certain site conditions.*

*b. Fencing shall be six feet high and shall form a continuous barrier around protected trees. The length, spacing, depth and material of the posts securing the fencing shall be designed to remain solidly in place until the final City inspection is made. Two protection fence detail options are provided in the City's Construction Policies and Guidelines for Tree Preservation and Protection to provide direction for this fencing. The City may require modifications to these details depending on the particular site conditions.*

*c. Other protection measures may be necessary including using hay bales at the base of the trunk for trunk protection of critical trees, if necessary. In addition, 2 x 4s or other approved material may be necessary to protect overhanging limbs that are proposed to be retained.*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*d. The site supervisor shall direct all contractors and subcontractors to remain outside of the fenced area of the dripline and shall not allow any type of construction activity, including parking or storage within the fenced area. The fencing must remain in place for the duration of the project.*

*e. All underground work within tree driplines shall be avoided wherever possible to minimize impacts. Locating utilities and necessary trenching outside of the canopy driplines is the best solution; trenching and grading within the dripline has the potential to seriously compromise the health and structural integrity of the trees. If trenching or grading within the dripline is completely unavoidable because of site constraints, then the project arborist or landscape architect shall be consulted on-site to advise on the least damaging course of action. The trenching shall also be reviewed with the City inspector prior to excavation.*

*f. Trenches within the dripline shall be hand dug. Cuts to tree roots shall be minimized to the extent feasible and shall be treated as exposed. Roots of trees shall never be pulled because of excessive damage. The project arborist or landscape architect shall be on-site to direct treatment of any damaged roots as they are exposed. Treatment shall include cutting the roots cleanly with sharp tools; no wound dressing products shall be used. The roots shall be trimmed, cleaned, and covered with wet burlap and/or shredded mulch. The project arborist or landscape architect shall assess a tree for structural impacts if roots over two inches in diameter are encountered.*

*g. Cutting and filling within the dripline of trees shall be avoided. Any fill mistakenly placed against the trunk of a tree shall be removed to restore the natural flair of the trunk. Appropriate retaining walls shall be constructed along and outside of the dripline area if grade changes approach the drip line and a 2:1 return slope cannot be constructed.*

*h. Access within the dripline shall be granted only as a condition of the tree removal application. If pruning is required for safe access and clearance within the dripline, then necessary pruning shall be to the standards and guidelines of the International Society of Arboriculture. The safety of the construction equipment operators is paramount; however, excessive or improper pruning can seriously impact the health and vigor of the tree. Pruning shall be as minimal as possible, so equipment heights shall be measured and trees pruned accordingly under the direction of a certified arborist. Pruning shall be done prior to construction activities and shall not be done by construction personnel. Pruning more than 30 percent of a tree at one time is considered a significant impact. The project arborist shall identify and monitor all pruning activities during construction.*

*i. Individual or isolated trees subject to the influences of trenching, grade changes, or altered drainage patterns shall be provided with a protective layer of mulch prior to construction activities. Mulch shall be chipped bark material placed in a layer that is 4 to 6 inches deep. Mulch shall be placed away from the trunk and extend out to the dripline of the canopy or the edge of the protective fencing. Any weeds growing beneath the canopy may be removed by hand before mulch is placed. Weeds shall not be sprayed with herbicide within the tree canopy zone. The area beneath the dripline shall be well-watered prior to the placement of the mulch so that moisture is not wicked out of the soil by the mulch itself.*

*j. If necessary, specific instructions for fertilization, disease, pest control, and weed control shall be made for individual trees. In general, chemical controls shall be avoided on the project site so that problems are not exacerbated and overall impacts to the natural balance are minimized.*

*k. Watering during construction to minimize tree stress is crucial when ¼ or more of a tree’s roots have been disturbed. Water shall be slowly applied to a minimum depth of 12 inches for the full outer half of the canopy/dripline area. The area immediately adjacent to a tree trunk shall not be watered. Watering shall occur once a month during the dry season (May through September). Trees near asphalt shall be supplied with additional water because asphalt paving absorbs heat which in turn raises nearby soil temperature and increases*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*moisture loss.*

*l. All grading shall be designed to drain water away from the base of the trees to avoid creating areas of ponding within the dripline. The natural drainage across the site shall be retained as much as possible.*

*m. If it is necessary to pave beneath the dripline the maximum allowable cut or fill shall be six inches for paving within the dripline. In addition, paving modifications including gap graded gravel, pier and grade beam footings, steel reinforcement, or aeration breaks in the paving may be required.*

*n. If equipment access is absolutely necessary beneath the dripline of a tree, a mulch layer (4-12 inches, depending upon the weight of the equipment) of tree chips or cocoa hulls shall be placed over the area that would be affected prior to allowing the equipment to cross. Work shall be scheduled so that the equipment is only required to cross the root zone once to enter and once to exit. The mulch shall be left on the site since removal may cause damage to surface feeder roots.*

*o. Under each circumstance where an arborist is required to supervise or observe construction, the arborist may require additional mitigation measures or halt construction if necessary to protect the subject trees.*

*p. Trees which are excessively damaged due to inadequate protection or negligence by the contractor shall be replaced at the project sponsor's expense. Replacement shall be determined in the same manner as mitigation plantings.*

*Supporting Source: 54, 55*

--	--	--	--	--

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The Project site contains no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified by the City of Lafayette or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

*Supporting Source: 54, 55.*

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The Project site contains no springs, seeps, ponds, marshes, wetlands or riparian vegetation. Supporting Source: 54, 55.*

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 native wildlife nursery sites.		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*There are no watercourses on site capable of supporting migratory fish. According to the Monk & Associates report, minor wildlife movement corridors used primarily resident mammals and birds occur on the Project site. In order to maintain local wildlife corridor functions of the Project site, mitigation measures are warranted to avoid potential impacts on wildlife corridor habitat.*

*See mitigation measures listed in IV.a      Supporting Source: 54, 55*

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

*While protected trees are proposed for removal, Lafayette Municipal Code has a tree permit process that allows tree removal for reasonable economic enjoyment of private property, subject to findings and conditions, such as replacement plantings. The project proposes to plant replacement trees and meets the findings for tree removal, and is therefore not in conflict with the tree preservation policy. See also mitigation measure for trees listed in IV.a.*

*Supporting Source: 15, 54, 55*

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*There are no adopted or approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to this project.*

*Supporting Source: 13, 43.*

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*There are no historical resources on the subject undeveloped site.*

*Supporting Source: 43*

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*There are no known archaeological resources on the project site.*

*If a deposit of prehistoric or historical archaeological material(s) is encountered during project activities, the City Planning Services Division shall be contacted immediately and all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be redirected. A qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find(s) and make recommendations. It is recommended that any adverse impacts to such deposits be avoided by project activities. If impacts on such deposits cannot be avoided, they shall be evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the California Register (i.e., it shall be determined whether they qualify as historical or unique archaeological resources under CEQA). If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, they shall be avoided, if feasible; if avoidance is not feasible, the adverse effects shall be mitigated. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, thorough recording on Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 (DPR 523) and/or data recovery excavation. If data recovery excavation is selected, the excavation must be guided by a data recovery plan prepared and adopted prior to beginning the recovery work, and a report of findings shall be submitted to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). (CCR Title 14(3) §15126.4(b)(3)(C))*

*Supporting Source: 43, 46*

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*There are no known unique geologic features on the project site.*

*Supporting Source: 43*

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*Although the potential of encountering human remains at this site is low, if human remains are encountered, work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease and the County Coroner notified immediately, pursuant to Section 5070.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. At the same time, an archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation and the City Planning Services Division shall be notified. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.*

*Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results of the analysis, and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the project sponsor, the City of Lafayette and the Northwest Information Center (NWIC).*

*Supporting Source: 43, 46*

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:**

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
--	--	--	--	--

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
<p><i>The subject site is not located on a known fault line.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 56, 13, <a href="http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/ap/pdf/WALNUT_CREEK.PDF">http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/ap/pdf/WALNUT_CREEK.PDF</a></i></p>				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p><i>The site is located within the Bay Area which in general is subject to earthquakes and seismic ground shaking. There is potential for loss and injury due to this fact; however the site is not located directly on a fault line and the Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department has specific and strict standards for structural safety as it relates to earthquakes.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Source: 13, 25</i></p>				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
<p><i>A site specific geotechnical report indicates that the site contains sandy clay soils, silty clay and sandstone bedrock suitable for the proposed development. Soils from site excavations are noted as suitable for fill.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 56</i></p>				
iv) Landslides?				X
<p><i>The geotechnical report from Jensen Van Lienden indicates there is no evidence of previous landslides and no indication of slope instability within or near the proposed building area on the site, and that the site is suitable for the proposed development. The majority of the 13.66 acre site would remain undeveloped.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 56</i></p>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
<p><i>The geotechnical report from Jensen Van Lienden Associates indicates that the existing cut slopes have experienced shallow sloughing failures from time to time, likely during severe storms, and provides a recommendation for wall design criteria. During construction standard erosion control measures will be required for grading activities, particularly in the rainy season.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Source: 56</i></p>				

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*Mitigation Measures:*

1. *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project sponsor shall submit a grading plan to the Engineering Services Manager for review and approval. The plan shall demonstrate that the project would implement all recommendations of the geotechnical engineer, Jensen Van Lienden Associates, as contained in the Geotechnical Report dated January 11, 2013, for the project site. During mass grading and road improvement work, the project geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist, or their representative, shall conduct performance plan review, observations, and testing to ensure compliance with the approved grading plan.*
2. *Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project sponsor shall prepare and submit a detailed erosion control plan (ECP) and narrative to the City Engineer for review and approval. The purpose of the ECP shall be to mitigate erosion and sedimentation impacts during construction. At a minimum, the ECP and written narrative shall include the following:*
  - a. *A proposed schedule of grading activities, monitoring, and infrastructure milestones in chronological format;*
  - b. *Identification of critical areas of high erosion potential and/or unstable slopes;*
  - c. *Contour and spot elevations indicating runoff patterns before and after grading;*
  - d. *Identification or erosion control measures on slopes, lots and streets. Measures shall be based on recommendations contained in the "Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual" published by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB);*
  - e. *Soil stabilization techniques such as short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets and hydroseeding should be utilized; and*
  - f. *Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment, and the cleaning of these drainage structures of debris and sediment.*

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?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

*See VI.b Results of borings indicate the site is underlain by rock, comprised primarily of strong sandstone with minor amounts of conglomerate.*  
*Supporting source: 56*

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The geotechnical report from Jensen Van Lienden indicates there is no evidence of expansive soils and the site is suitable for the proposed development.*  
*Supporting source: 56*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*Sewers are available for the purpose of wastewater disposal thus the soil does not need to support a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system.*

*Supporting source: Central Sanitary District Response to Referral received 8/1/2013*

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.** Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

*The proposed project is below the applicable screening criteria shown in Table 3-1 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's adopted CEQA Guidelines and would not exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance for projects.*

*Supporting Source: 4*

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases.*

*Supporting Source: 4*

**VIII. 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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The proposed project is an infill residential project. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development.*

*Supporting Source: 43*

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The proposed project is an infill residential project. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development.*

*Supporting Source: 43*



Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
<p><i>The proposed project is an infill residential project. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Source: 43</i></p>				
d) Be located on a site that 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?				
<p><i>This site is not known to be included on any list of hazardous materials sites.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Source:43</i></p>				
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 for people residing or working in the project areas?				X
<p><i>The site is not within an airport land use plan or airport vicinity.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Source:43</i></p>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p><i>Not applicable.</i></p>				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
<p><i>The Lafayette Emergency Operations Plan identifies the city's emergency planning, organizational, and response policies and procedures. The Plan also includes a hazard analysis and probability matrix. Potential natural hazards include dam failure, earthquake, wildland fire, floods, storms, and landslides. Although the Project site is susceptible to wildland fire, the proposed project is not expected to substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City's Emergency Operations Plan. Supporting Source: 11.</i></p>				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The proposed project would be an infill residential project, surrounded by existing single family neighborhoods. The project would meet all requirements of the Fire Protection District including fire abatement measures, such as the on-site water tank and road improvements.*

*Supporting source: 28*

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project will create runoff; however standard conditions of approval require best management practices as required by the C.3 Guidelines and the Lafayette Stormwater Pollution Prevention Ordinance to reduce potential for stormwater pollution as well as ensuring waste is stored in such a manner as to not create water quality issues. The project will also require review, approval and permits from several other agencies related to water and water quality including Contra Costa Sanitary District, Contra Costa Health Department, SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and East Bay Municipal Utility District.*

*Supporting source: 15, 20*

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*Groundwater supplies will not be impacted by the project. Neither the project site nor the City of Lafayette are located over any significant groundwater basin as identified by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

*Supporting source: 36*

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The project proposes a drainage plan that follows existing drainage patterns.*

*Supporting source: 45*

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The project proposes a drainage plan that follows existing drainage patterns. By requiring that drainage be handled using best management practices, flooding will not occur as a result of the project.*  
*Supporting source: 20, 45*

e) 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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*This project is required to go through review and a process to evaluate and mitigate the potential impacts of stormwater runoff which were likely not done with the previous development created in the 1930's – 1970's. The project will not create runoff over capacity and will require methods such as pervious paving or directing roof runoff to vegetated areas to avoid polluted runoff. A C.3 Stormwater Plan is required as a standard condition of approval prior to issuance of a grading or building permit.*  
*Supporting source: 15, 20*

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project is residential and will not create hazardous or chemical discharge as a result of the use. Wastewater will be handled through existing established practices which do not degrade water quality.*  
*Supporting source: 15, 20*

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)*

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)*

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The site is not located within the flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)*

j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The area does not contain threat of seiche, tsunami or mudflow due to location, weather patterns and geography. (Source: Location Maps)*

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*Not applicable. The subject property is an existing residentially zoned lot.*

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The subject property is an existing residentially zoned lot and the use is consistent with the General Plan. Supporting source: 13*

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project does not conflict with any applicable conservation plan.*

**XI. 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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*There are no known mineral resources within Lafayette. Supporting Source: 43.*

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*There are no mineral resource recovery sites within Lafayette. Supporting Source: 43.*

**XII. NOISE - Would the project result in:**

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*Noise levels are expected to be similar to other single family residential uses. Supporting Source: 13*

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project is an infill residential project, consistent with existing surrounding developments. The noise level is not expected to exceed the existing noise level in the area, or substantially increase the ambient noise level. Supporting source: 13*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<p><i>The project is an infill residential project, consistent with existing surrounding developments. The noise level is not expected to exceed the existing noise level in the area, or substantially increase the ambient noise level.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 13</i></p>				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
<p><i>Noise levels would temporarily be increased due to noise associated with the construction of the project. The noise impact will be less than significant given required standard conditions of approval which define and limit hours of construction.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 16</i></p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of an airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p><i>The subject site is not located within an area including an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 43</i></p>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
<p><i>Supporting Source: The subject site is not located within an area including an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 43</i></p>				
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?				X
<p><i>The proposed development is an infill project which is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning for the area.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 13</i></p>				

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The development will not displace any housing in the area. The project will result in one new home.  
Supporting Source: 13*

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The development will not displace any people. The project will result in one new home.  
Supporting Source: 13*

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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?				X
---------------------	--	--	--	---

*The site is currently served by the Contra Costa Fire Protection District. The applicant will be required to install on-site improvements but no new fire station would need to be created or altered as a result of this project.*

b) Police protection?				X
-----------------------	--	--	--	---

*The existing area is served by the Lafayette Police Department. No new facilities will be required as a result of the project.*

c) Schools?			X	
-------------	--	--	---	--

*No new school facility will need to be constructed as a result; the school district charges impact fees for new homes to account for additional children .*

d) Parks?			X	
-----------	--	--	---	--

*An increase in use of parks can be anticipated as a result of new residential dwelling units. This has already been planned for and will be mitigated through parkland and park facilities fees which help pay for maintenance of existing facilities and development of new facilities. Because there are no new planned facilities, the potential impacts cannot be evaluated; however any new park facility created will require its own environmental evaluation. (Source: Chapter 6-16 Dedication of Parkland and Park Facilities and Payment of Fees for Park Trail and Recreation Purposes)*

e) Other public facilities?				X
-----------------------------	--	--	--	---

*No other public facilities have been identified in which this project would result in a significant adverse negative impact. All services providers of public water, sewer and fire protection have responded that the property can be served.  
Supporting source: 28, 30, 36*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**XV. RECREATION**

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

*The project may increase the use of some parks, but will not substantially deteriorate them. Additionally, park facilities fees will be collected for the project which helps to maintain the parks and mitigate any impacts. (Source: Chapter 6-16 Dedication of Parkland and Park Facilities and Payment of Fees for Park Trail and Recreation Purposes; Project Plans; Project Description)*

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*New or expanded recreational facilities will not be required as a result of this project alone. New facilities are created when there is a need. Each new facility will go through its own environmental review. (Source: Chapter 6-16 Dedication of Parkland and Park Facilities and Payment of Fees for Park Trail and Recreation Purposes; Project Plans; Project Description)*

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

*The area's streets, land use planning and zoning were planned and in place to accommodate the City's ultimate build-out, including infill development. School traffic accounts for some of the additional traffic in the neighborhood.  
Supporting source: 13, 21*

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*Not applicable. One home's peak hour trips would not exceed thresholds for level of service standards for nearby intersections.  
Supporting source: 43*

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risk?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*Not applicable.*

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e. g. farm equipment)?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*Not applicable.*

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project proposes widening and road improvements to meet Fire District requirements.  
Supporting source: 28, 45*

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*Not applicable.*

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
---	--	--	--	---

*The project does not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the SF Regional Water Quality Control Board. The sewage and waste water will be collected and treated by the Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District which serves Lafayette. No wastewater will be discharged onsite. The City of Lafayette Municipal Code prohibits the discharge of any substances other than stormwater into storm drains and creeks. Stormwater that is washed from streets and parking lots contains pollutants that must be controlled. The amount of sediment and other pollutants entering the drainage network can be minimized by implementation of control measures and Best Management Practices. (Source: Referral Comments from Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District; SF Regional Water Quality Control Board; Lafayette Municipal Code Chapter 5-4)*

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
--	--	--	--	---

*The site served by the Contra Costa County Central Sanitary system and additional treatment facilities will not be required. (Source: Referral Comments from Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District)*



Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p><i>New developments are subject to C.3 Stormwater requirements, including on-site facilities and connecting to existing off-site facilities. The requirements are more stringent than for those developments that occurred in past decades. Expansion of existing facilities must occur by standard regulations in place, but would not cause significant environmental effects.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 26</i></p>				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? In making this determination, the City shall consider whether the project is subject to the water supply assessment requirements of Water Code Section 10910, et. seq. (SB 610), and the requirements of Government Code Section 664737 (SB 221).				X
<p><i>The project is part of an existing area served by East Bay Municipal Utility District.</i></p> <p><i>Supporting source: 36</i></p>				
e) 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?				X
<p><i>The Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District has provided feedback indicating they have no comments. The property can connect to the sewer system and the District has indicated the project would not overload their capacity. (Source: Referral Comments from Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District)</i></p>				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
<p><i>Lafayette is served by Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority and Keller landfill has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development. Additionally, the new California Green Building Code requires non-residential development (the retail component of this project) to provide recycling facilities to help reduce the amount of waste that goes to the landfill. (Source: Solid Waste Authority Service Area Map <a href="http://www.wastediversion.org/app_pages/view/243">http://www.wastediversion.org/app_pages/view/243</a>; 2010 Cal Green Building Code Non-Residential Requirements)</i></p>				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The City contracts with Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority which requires Allied Waste Services to be in compliance with federal, state and local regulations as demonstrated in their agreement found on the Solid Waste Authority website. The City's General Plan Policy OS-9.3 indicates compliance with State and Federal requirements regarding solid waste reduction. A Waste Management Plan will require 50% of construction debris to be diverted from the landfill. The project will be required to have recycling and garbage enclosures and the Solid Waste Authority offers compost bins as well. (Source: Standard Conditions of Approval; 2002 General Plan; <http://www.wastediversion.org/files/managed/Document/743/AWS%20final%20-%20PDF.pdf>)*

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a) Does the project have the potential to 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a threatened, rare or endangered species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
<i>All of these potential impacts have suggested mitigations that are or will be incorporated into the project. The mitigations discussed herein will reduce the impact to a less than significant level. The proposal will not degrade the quality of the environment, cause wildlife population to drop, threaten plant or animal communities, reduce the number of threatened species, or eliminate important historical resources. The details of possible impacts and mitigations are described in the entirety of this document. (Source: Initial Study; Project Plans; Project Description; Site Visit; Technical Reports)</i>				
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				X
<i>The project construction and operation will follow best management practices and employ mitigation measures to avoid environmental impact. There is no evidence that the project will be a disadvantage to long-term environmental goals.</i>				
c) 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)?				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Potentially Significant Impacts	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The project has the potential to add to cumulative impacts related to:*

- Green House Gas Emissions (GHGs) are likely to be a cumulative impact associated with this project. Given that the GHGs do not exceed the BAAQMD threshold for significance the project is helping to further the goal of GHG reduction. It is understood that the project cannot achieve zero emissions, so as long as it does not exceed the BAAQMD allocation for this type of development, it is contributing to the overall reduction goals.*
- Stormwater pollution could be a cumulative impact; however because the project is directing runoff as required through on-site treatment areas before releasing to a downstream facility, this project is not adding to the cumulative problem.*

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

*All projects have impacts. The project has the potential to expose people and structures to: exhaust emissions and noise from construction equipment; dust from disturbed soil; erosion from exposed grading operations. The project will not have substantial adverse effects on human beings through the mitigation measures discussed herein and contained within standard conditions of approval.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST SUPPORTING SOURCES

1. Acalanes School District
2. Aerial Photographs
3. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projections
4. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010/1999 Clean Air Plan
5. California Air Resources Board
6. California Department of Transportation, District 4
7. California Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List
8. Caltrans Highway Design Manual
9. Caltrans Traffic Manual
10. Central Contra Costa County Sanitary District
11. City of Lafayette Emergency Operations Plan
12. City of Lafayette Engineering Division
13. City of Lafayette General Plan
14. City of Lafayette Grading Ordinance
15. City of Lafayette Municipal Code
16. City of Lafayette Noise Ordinance
17. City of Lafayette Parks and Recreation Department
18. City of Lafayette Planning and Building Services Division
19. City of Lafayette Police Department
20. City of Lafayette Standard Specifications
21. City of Lafayette Transportation Division
22. City of Lafayette Tree Protection Ordinance
23. City of Lafayette Zoning Map
24. City of Lafayette Zoning Ordinance
25. Contra Costa County
26. Contra Costa County Clean Water Program/Stormwater Management Plan
27. Contra Costa County Congestion Management Plan
28. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, correspondence dated 8/20/2013
29. Contra Costa County Flood Control District
30. Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority
31. Contra Costa Important Farmland 2010
32. Contra Costa Water District
33. Database for Lafayette General Plan, dated May 1992
34. Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Database Maps and Reports
35. [Intentionally left blank]
36. East Bay Municipal Utility District, dated 8/6/2013
37. Experience with Other Projects of this Size and Nature

38. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Program
39. Field Inspection / Investigation
40. Final EIR for Lafayette General Plan Revision, dated July 2002
41. Lafayette School District
42. Lamorinda Building Inspection Office
43. Planner's Knowledge of Area
44. Project Description / Application Information
45. Project Plans, dated 2/21/2014
46. State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University
47. State of California, Special Studies Zones (Revised Official Map)
48. Uniform Building Codes and Appendices (as adopted by the City)
49. USDA-SCS, "Soils of Contra Costa County"
50. Utility and Service Providers
51. InsideOut Design (City of Lafayette landscape consultant)
52. C.E. DeLeuw, Jr., Traffic Engineer
53. Arborist Report, Professional Tree Care Company, dated 10/28/2013
54. Monk & Associates, Biological Resource Analysis, 1240 Monticello Road, dated 1/24/2013.
55. Monk & Associates, Special-Status Plant Survey Report, dated 7/11/2013
56. Jensen Van Lienden Associates, Geotechnical reports, dated 10/25/2013, 1/10/2013, and 12/3/2010
57. Staff Photo Analysis – off-site views, dated Jul 2012
58. Staff analysis for exhaust emissions - Urbemis

NOTES: Not all sources identified in this list may be applicable to the subject project; refer to environmental checklist for reference.

Supporting Sources are available under separate cover and/or available for review in the Planning Services Division.

Table 1

Construction Emissions <sup>a</sup>	Exhaust Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
On-site for house, driveways, etc.	2.92	21.61	15.16	.01	3.58	1.43
Off-site for access road						
Total Project Maximum Daily Emission						
Significance Threshold	54	54	None	None	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
ROG = reactive organic gases      NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides      CO = carbon monoxide      SO <sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter Source: Appendix A: URBEMIS output Source of thresholds: Bay Area Air Quality Management District.						

<sup>a</sup> From all construction activities: mass grading and excavation, building, painting, paving, and fine grading. Emissions were calculated for a three-year construction timeframe. Exhaust emissions are “worst case” for any one year and include emissions related to fugitive dust, mobile sources (construction equipment, vendors, and workers) and off-gassing (paving and painting).