



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

CITY OF LAFAYETTE
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Project Title:**
HDP33-16 Zephyr LLC
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Lafayette, 3675 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 210, Lafayette, CA 94549
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Jean Eisberg, Contract Planner, (415) 841-3539, jeisberg@lovelafayette.org
- 4. Project Location:**
1288 Rose Lane, APN 245-070-015
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
Scott Smigielski, 3800 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 200, Lafayette, CA 94549
- 6. General Plan Designation:**
Low Density Single-Family Residential – 2 dwelling units/acre
- 7. Zoning:**
R-20 Single-family Residential District-20
R-40 Single-family Residential District-40
Hillside Overlay District
- 8. Description of the Project:**
Construction of a 13,800-sq. ft. two-story single-family residence (including garage, covered patio, and accessory building) on a vacant 10.9-acre parcel.
- 9. Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)*
North: Undeveloped open space
East: Undeveloped open space
South: Rose Lane, single family residences
West: Undeveloped open space
- 10. Other public agencies whose approvals are required:** *(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)*
CCC Building Inspection, EBMUD, CCC Fire Protection District, CCC Sanitary District. There are no impacts and therefore no requirements to secure permits from USACE, CDFW, RWQCB, or USFWS.

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"/> Agricultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" 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"/> Utility / 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

Date

Printed Name

City of Lafayette
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take into account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operation impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

To comply with Provision C.3.m. of Lafayette’s NPDES permit, water quality effects of projects must be evaluated. When completing section IV.b., Biological Resources, and section VIII, a through f, Hydrology and Water Quality, the following points should be considered.

- Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, will it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?
 - Will the proposed project cause degradation of beneficial uses?
 - Would the proposed project result in increased erosion in the watershed?
 - Would the proposed project result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?
 - Would the proposed project create a significant adverse environmental impact to drainage patterns?
 - Would the proposed project result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash).
 - Would the project result in significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction?
 - Will the project impact aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat?
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a

“less Than Significant Impact”. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses”, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, and effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
<i>The 10.9 acre parcel is located in the Hillside Overlay District; however the building site is located away from the site's slopes within a relatively level area that is lower in elevation. As such, the project will not be visible from the Viewing Evaluation sites when viewed from lower in elevation, nor will it block scenic view corridors called out in the General Plan. (Source: HOD Map; Site Survey; General Plan Map I-5 Scenic View Corridors; Site Photographs)</i>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<i>Highway 24 is a state scenic highway. The site is over .75 miles to the highway and has significant topography, vegetation and other structures separating the project from the highway. The proposal will not substantially damage the natural beauty of the scenic highway. (Source: State Scenic Highway Map http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm; Aerial Maps; Site Plan)</i>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
<i>The existing site is an undeveloped lot. The proposal maintains the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood with the development of a single-family residence and landscaping. The building site maintains a similar pattern of development with the area by siting the residence within the level area of the site and maintaining the scenic hills beyond as natural open space. (Source: Photos of existing site and plans of proposed project; GP Goal LU-7/Policy LU-71.1).</i>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
<i>The project would introduce new lighting as the site is currently vacant; however shielded light fixtures, including sconces and recessed cans would minimize nighttime glare. As a condition of project approval, the project is required to prepare for staff review and approval a photometric diagram to ensure that there are no light spillover impacts that would affect creek habitat. (Source: Project plans)</i>				
II. AGRICULTURE 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?				X
<i>The site is not designated as important farmland. (Source: CA State Farmland Map; Contra Costa County Farmland Map)</i>				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				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
<i>The property is zoned R-20 and R-40 residential and is not zoned for agricultural use. (Source: City of Lafayette Zoning Map & R-20 and R-40 zoning regulations)</i>				
c) 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 site is not designated as farmland and is not near farmland. The existing area is residential and will remain as such. (Source: Zoning Map; CA and Contra Costa Farmland Maps)</i>				
III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
<i>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. The proposed single-family dwelling unit (du) is below the BAAQMD operational criteria pollutant screening size thresholds and therefore would not be considered by BAAQMD to be a substantial emitter of criteria air pollutants and impacts would be considered less than significant. (Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District)</i>				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
<i>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. (Source: BAAQMD)</i>				
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	
<i>The Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold. (Source: BAAQMD)</i>				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
<i>Sensitive receptors include school children and seniors. The project is located in a single-family residential area away from any schools or senior housing.</i>				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<i>The Project is below the operational criteria pollutant screening size threshold and the operation screening greenhouse gas (GHG) screening size threshold. (Source: BAAQMD)</i>				

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		

No, the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species. The Project as designed will avoid wetlands, waters, trees, and other possible habitat areas for species status species (e.g., coastal sage scrub). To ensure that the Project avoids and mitigates all potentially significant impacts to these species, pre-construction surveys would be conducted by a qualified biologist, and appropriate avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented, as specified in the mitigation measures below. (Source: Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013; Supplemental Reports, February 2014 and November 10, 2016)

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: *Conduct a pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified biologist within 500 ft. of the Project area no more than 7 days prior to the initiation of construction if work is occurring between February 1 and August 31 (nesting season) to determine the presence of raptor or migratory bird nests. If bird nests are discovered during this survey, or at any time during construction, an adequate setback shall be established around the nest location and vegetation removal and construction activities shall be restricted within this no-disturbance zone until the qualified arborist has confirmed that any young birds have fledged and are able to function outside the nest location. The no-disturbance zone setback shall be based on input received from the qualified biologist and as approved by the City, and may vary depending on species and sensitivity to disturbance. The zone shall be fenced with temporary orange construction fencing.*

No nest trees shall be removed during the nesting season. The site shall be resurveyed to confirm that no new nests have been established if vegetation removal has not been completed or if construction has been delayed or curtailed for more than 7 days during the nesting season.

A report of findings shall be prepared by the qualified arborist and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to initiation of construction within the no-disturbance zone during nesting season either confirming the absence of any active bird nests, or that young are within the zone and construction can proceed.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: *Conduct a pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified biologist within 200 ft. of the work area where culverts (such as the storm drain under Rose Lane) or trees would be disturbed (such as retained trees adjacent to the construction activities) no more than 48 hours prior to the initiation of construction or ground disturbing activity for a period of more than 2 hours to determine the presence of special-status bats and bat habitat. If any habitat features identified in the pre-construction survey will be altered or disturbed by project activities, a phased disturbance strategy should be employed. Non-habitat trees or structural features should be removed 1 day prior to removal of or disturbance to bat habitat features.*

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: *To ensure that potential construction impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:*

- a. *conduct pre-construction surveys prior to groundbreaking activities by a qualified biologist to clear the work site of any special-status wildlife;*
- b. *ensure that no Alameda whipsnake suitable habitat (coastal sage scrub) areas are subject to construction disturbance;*
- c. *install and maintain contractor and buried wildlife exclusion fencing which is setback from the limits of grading;*
- d. *cover up any holes or trenches greater than 6-inches at the construction site with plywood or similar non-heat conductive materials and ramp larger trenches that cannot be readily covered at end of each work day to allow escape of any animals;*

<p>e. remove food wastes daily to avoid attracting predators</p> <p>f. minimize erosion and water quality impacts with best management practices, do not use monofilament plastic for erosion control;</p> <p>g. conduct contractor pre-construction training; and</p> <p>h. comply with all applicable state and federal laws, including the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts and report to the appropriate wildlife agencies any encounters with special-status protected wildlife. Cease any construction activities until such time that the site is considered to be clear of special-status wildlife.</p>					
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
<p><i>The proposed project exercises full avoidance of impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. (Source: Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013; Supplemental Reports, February 2014 and November 10, 2016)</i></p>					
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	
<p><i>The 10.9-acre property contains potentially jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. and State. The proposed project and development site avoid any direct or indirect impacts to the creek and other drainages on the property, including the riparian canopy. Authorization or permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) are therefore not required. (Source: Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013; Supplemental Reports, February 2014 and November 10, 2016)</i></p>					
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	
<p><i>Given the location of the proposed residence, and its adjacency to residential development and Rose Lane, it is unlikely the project would interfere substantially with the movement and/or nurseries of native species. The riparian corridors of the 10.9-acre site are avoided and wildlife connectivity to open space to the north is unhindered by the project. (Source: Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013; Supplemental Reports, February 2014 and November 10, 2016)</i></p>					
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	

<p><i>The project has been designed to minimize impacts to the existing riparian vegetation. Two protected trees are proposed for removal outside of the riparian area: one 4" to 6" diameter multi-branch California Buckeye, located within the landslide debris bench, and one 33" diameter California Walnut, located within the proposed driveway. The applicant is required to mitigate this tree removal, pursuant to the Tree Protection Ordinance. In addition, the certified arborist will be onsite during any encroachment within the dripline of protected trees to minimize root impact, as recommended by the Arborist Report and required by project conditions of approval (Source: Chapter 6 – Tree Protection Ordinance; Project Plans; Arborist Report, July 2016; Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013; Supplemental Reports, February 2014 and November 10, 2016)</i></p>					
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
<p><i>There are no adopted or approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to this project. The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan does not include the project area. (Source: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/; http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/hcp/; http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/cd/water/HCP/documents/CCC_Ordinance.pdf)</i></p>					
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
<p><i>The project does not affect any of the registered landmarks (Source: City Council Landmark Resolutions # 36-76, 33-78 and 85-83)</i></p>					
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
<p><i>There are no known archeological resources at this subject site. Consistent with General Plan and State requirements, 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)) (Source: General Plan Program LU-22.1.5, LU-22.1.6 and LU-22.1.7; State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University)</i></p>					
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p><i>There are no known resources at the site. (Source: Photos of Existing Development; General Plan page I-33; General Plan Program LU-22.1.5, LU-22.1.6 and LU-22.1.7)</i></p>					
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

The site is not a known cemetery or location of human remains. Consistent with General Plan and State requirements, 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). (Source: General Plan Goal LU-22; State CEQA Guidelines Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5; State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University)

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:

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
---	--	--	--	---

The parcel is not located within a currently designated State of California Earthquake Fault Zone and no known faults are mapped on the site. (Source: ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report, USGS)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

The nearest active earthquake faults are the Mt. Diablo Thrust fault (5.2 miles) and the Green Valley Connected fault (6.6 miles). Other active faults range from ~7 miles to 28 miles from the site, which are capable of producing significant ground shaking at the site. However compliance with the 2010 California Building Code requirements should mitigate potential shaking effects. (Source: 2010 California Building Code as amended by Contra Costa County; General Plan Map VI-3 Earthquake Hazards)

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The area proposed for development is within a potentially liquefiable zone based on the Seismic Hazards Zone map by USGS. In addition, ENGEO evaluated the liquefaction potential of subsurface soils from borings. Liquefaction induced settlements could be expected in the structure footprint unless mitigation measure are implemented. As a condition of project approval, the project is required to comply with the recommendations outlined in the ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report, supplement, dated received October 11, 2016. (Source: General Plan Map V-1 Liquefaction Potential; ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report)

iv) Landslides?			X	
-----------------	--	--	---	--

<p><i>The site includes 15 mapped landslides, including east and west of the floor valley adjacent to the proposed building footprint. Most of these are considered dormant based on topographic expression. To reduce the potential impacts, the geotechnical report recommends improvements be setback at last 50 ft. from the toes of the mapped landslide areas. This distance can be reduced if mitigation measures are implemented. As a condition of project approval, the project is required to comply with the recommendations outlined in the ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report, supplement, dated received October 11, 2016. (Source: ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report; Project Plans)</i></p>				
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X
<p>Surficial soils within the area of the proposed building site appear to have low expansion potential. (Source: ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report)</p>				
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
<p><i>There is potential for lateral spreading and liquefaction. However as a condition of project approval, the project is required to comply with the recommendations outlined in the ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report, supplement, dated received October 11, 2016, which would sufficiently reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant levels. (Source: ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report)</i></p>				
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the 2010 California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?			X
<p><i>The area of the proposed building footprint appears to have low expansion potential; however in the southern portion of the site and within areas of existing fill, expansion is moderate to high based on laboratory test results and in accordance to 2010 CBC. The geotechnical report recommends greatly restricting the amount of surface water infiltration near structures, pavements, flatwork, and slabs-on-grade. As a condition of project approval, the project is required to comply with the recommendations outlined in the ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report, supplement, dated received October 11, 2016. (Source: Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department).</i></p>				
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
<p><i>The project site is within CCCSD's service area and sanitary sewer service is available adjacent to the project site. The sewer system in the vicinity is adequate for the additional wastewater which could be generated by the proposed project. (Source: Central Sanitary District).</i></p>				
<p>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</p>				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X
<p><i>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 CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance for projects. The proposal will be consistent with the goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions stated in the general plan by allowing and encouraging infill development in an established neighborhood. (Source: General Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District)</i></p>				

a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission on greenhouse gases?			X	
<i>The project emissions do not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds for significance. (Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District)</i>					
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
<i>The use will be residential in nature. No use, transport, or disposal of hazardous waste is proposed as part of the project. (Source: Project Description; Contra Costa Environmental Health Department)</i>					
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
<i>The use is single family residence. Thus, hazards from toxic chemicals or byproducts from processing as might occur with an industrial use will not be present. (Source: Project Description; Activity Classification)</i>					
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
<i>The project will not create hazardous emissions or waste other than those normally associated with construction of a single family residence. (Source: Aerial Maps; Project Description)</i>					
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?				X
<i>The site is not located on a documented hazardous materials site. (Source: CA Department of Toxic Substance Control - Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List)</i>					
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
<i>The site is not located near an airport. (Source: Aerial Maps)</i>					
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
<i>The site is not located near a private airstrip. (Source: Aerial Maps)</i>					
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

<i>The project is a single family residence in a developed area and will not block entrance or exit to the City. Emergency evacuation routes must remain in passable conditions at all times. (Source: Safety Element of the General Plan pg. VI-14)</i>					
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	
<i>The site contains open space and is adjacent to open space. The applicant will be required to install fire sprinklers to limit the spreading of fire during the fire department response time. Additionally, the owners are required to follow fire district standards on weed abatement to minimize fire hazards. (Source: Aerial Maps; Site Visit; Contra Costa Fire Protection District)</i>					
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
<i>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 applicant will be required to treat and handle stormwater on-site to the greatest extent feasible. 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. (Source: Standard Conditions of Approval with Stormwater Conditions; Stormwater Pollution Prevention Ordinance)</i>					
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
<i>The project is not taking new groundwater as it will be served by existing supply of water from the East Bay Municipal Utility District. (Source: East Bay MUD Service Area; Aerial Maps; Project Plans).</i>					
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	
<i>The project proposes a drainage plan that follows existing drainage patterns. (Source: Project Plans; Aerial Maps).</i>					
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	

<i>Drainage from the Property and storm water from the Project site will be detained and treated for water quality, and then directed off the site while fully avoiding jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. and State, thereby obviating the requirement for wetland permitting or discharge requirements. (Source: Project Plans; Aerial Maps; Biological Resources Analysis, December 2013 and Supplemental Report, February 2014).</i>				
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	
<i>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. (Source: Standard Conditions of Approval; Project Plans; Application Forms)</i> Mitigation HYD-1: <i>Prepare and implement a Stormwater Control Plan using Low Impact Design (LID) to control both construction-related erosion and sedimentation and project-related non-point discharge into waters or wetlands on site. All exposed soils within the work area shall be stabilized immediately following the completion of earthmoving activities to prevent erosion into the stream channel. Erosion control LIDs, such as silt fences, straw hay bales, gravel or rock lined ditches, water check bars, and broadcasted straw shall be used. Erosion control LIDs shall be monitored during and after each storm event for effectiveness. Modifications, repairs and improvements to erosion control LIDs shall be made as needed to protect water quality. At no time shall silt laden runoff be allowed to enter the stream or directed to where it may enter the stream.</i>				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X	
<i>The project is a single family residence and is not anticipated to 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. (Source: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Ordinance; Standard Conditions of Approval; C.3 Stormwater Guidelines)</i>				
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
<i>The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)</i>				
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
<i>The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)</i>				
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
<i>The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Source: City GIS Maps; FEMA Maps)</i>				
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X
<i>The area does not contain threat of seiche, tsunami or mudflow due to location, weather patterns and geography. (Source: Location Maps)</i>				

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
<i>The project is an infill single-family residence in a single-family residential neighborhood. The project is not a road, freeway, wall or other element that would physically divide the community. (Source: Project Plans; Project Description; Aerial Maps)</i>					
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
<i>The project will not conflict with the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance as the subject area is designated as R-20 and R-40 Single Family Residential, where housing is allowed. (Source: R-20 and R-40 Zoning Regulations; Lafayette Zoning Map)</i>					
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
<i>There are no adopted or approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to this project. The project is not located within a scenic easement. It is located within the Hillside Overlay District, which is a general location of environmentally sensitive land according to General Plan Policy OS-4.5. The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan does not include the project area. (Source: General Plan Map III-I Hillside Overlay Area; http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/; http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/hcp/; http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/cd/water/HCP/documents/CCC_Ordinance.pdf)</i>					
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
<i>There are no known mineral resources on the site. (Source: Lafayette 2002 General Plan)</i>					
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
<i>There are no known mineral recovery sites described in the General Plan or local Specific Plans. (Source: Lafayette 2002 General Plan; Specific Plans)</i>					
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	
<i>Noise levels are expected to be similar to other residences in the area. There is separation between the nearby residences given the size of the parcel, which will minimize potential impacts. Temporary noise impacts associated with construction are mitigated through the standard hours of construction. (Project plans; Noise Ordinance; Standard Conditions of Approval)</i>					

b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
<i>Temporary groundborne vibrations typically associated with residential construction and site grading will occur during the construction phase of the project. The City regulates the days and hours of construction to minimize disturbances to the surrounding area. (Source: Standard Conditions of Approval)</i>					
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
<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. (Source: Noise Ordinance; Noise Element of the 2002 General Plan.)</i>					
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
<i>A temporary noise increase will occur during the construction phase of the project. The City regulates the days and hours of construction to minimize disturbances to the surrounding area. (Source: Standard Conditions of Approval)</i>					
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
<i>The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. (Source: Location Maps)</i>					
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:					
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 roads or other infrastructure)?				X
<i>The development will increase the housing by one dwelling unit and population by one family. The project is adequately served by existing services and infrastructure. (Source: 2011 General Plan House Element; 2000-2015 Population Projections)</i>					
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<i>The proposed development is of a vacant lot and does not displace any existing housing units. (Source: Contra Costa County Assessor Records; Site Visit; Project Plans)</i>					
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<i>The proposed development does not displace any existing housing units or residents. (Source: Contra Costa County Assessor Records; Site Visit; Project Plans)</i>					

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
<i>The site is currently served by the Contra Costa Fire Protection District. The applicant will be required to install fire protection sprinklers as part of this project. (Source: Aerial Maps; Contra Costa Fire Protection District)</i>				
b) Police protection?				X
<i>The existing area is served by the Lafayette Police Department. No new facilities will be required as a result of the project. The State standard service ratio is 1 officer per 1,000 people. The City currently is functioning below that standard at about 0.7 officers per 1,000 people. (Source: Former Lafayette Police Chief Mike Hubbard; Aerial Maps)</i>				
c) Schools?				X
<i>The project is a single family residence. Existing public school will not be adversely impacted and no new school facility will need to be constructed. (Source: Project Description)</i>				
d) Parks?				X
<i>The project may increase the use of some parks, but will not substantially deteriorate them. The project will add one dwelling unit to the residential neighborhood, who are likely to take advantage of the close proximity to the Happy Valley Field and Briones Regional Park. (Aerial Photos; Planner's Knowledge; Project Plans; Project Description)</i>				
e) Other public facilities?				X
<i>The project is served by existing services, public facilities, and infrastructure. (Source: Context Map)</i>				
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
<i>The project may increase the use of some parks, but will not substantially deteriorate them. The users are single family who are likely to take advantage of the close proximity to the Happy Valley Field and Briones Regional Park. (Aerial Photos; Planner's Knowledge; Project Plans; Project Description)</i>				
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
<i>The project does not include and will not require the expansion of recreational facilities. The existing trail on the property will not be impacted by the development and proposed vegetation will mitigate views of the new development. (Project Description)</i>				
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
<i>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. (Source: General Plan)</i>					
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
<i>Not applicable. One home's peak hour trips would not exceed thresholds for level of service standards for nearby intersections. (Source: General Plan)</i>					
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
<i>The project is not near an airport and nothing proposed should interfere with existing air traffic patterns. (Source: Site Location; Project Description)</i>					
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e. g. farm equipment)?				X
<i>The project is a single family residence at the end of an existing cul-de-sac. There will not be any changes to the road or any incompatible uses (Source: project plans)</i>					
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<i>The project will conform with Fire District requirements for emergency access. (Source: Project Plans; Fire Protection District Correspondence)</i>					
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
<i>The project is located at the end of a cul-de-sac without bus service and does not cause conflicts with bus turnouts. Bicycle racks are not required for the project. The project does not disrupt any alternative transportation. (Source: Project Plans; Context Map)</i>					

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
<p><i>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: SF Regional Water Quality Control Board; Lafayette Municipal Code Chapter 5-4)</i></p>					
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
<p><i>The site will be connected to 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)</i></p>					
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>The project will be subject to the City's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Regulations which requires stormwater control measures and Best Management Practices. (Source: Lafayette Municipal Code Chapter 5-4; Public Works Department)</i></p>					
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
<p><i>The project will be served by East Bay Municipal Utility District. No expanded entitlements will be required (Source: EBMUD Service Area Map https://www.ebmud.com/about-ebmud/our-story/service-area-map)</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 project will be served by the Contra Costa 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. (Source: Solid Waste Authority Service Area Map http://www.wastediversion.org/app_pages/view/243)</i></p>					
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

The City contracts with Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority which requires Allied Waste Serves 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 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
--	--	--	--	---

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 as it is an infill project replacing existing residential and commercial development not located in a sensitive resource area. 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)

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				X
--	--	--	--	---

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.

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
--	--	--	--	---

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 required to direct runoff as through on-site treatment areas before releasing to a downstream facility, this project is not adding to the cumulative problem.*

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

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. Arborist Report prepared by HortScience, dated received July 22, 2016
4. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projections 2005
5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District
6. Biological Resources Analysis prepared by Maryless Guinon LLC Olberding Environmental, Inc., dated December 4, 2013 and Supplemental Reports, dated February 25, 2014 and November 10, 2016
7. California Air Resources Board
8. California Building Code (2010) and Appendices (as adopted by the City)
9. California Department of Transportation, District 4
10. California Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List
11. Caltrans Highway Design Manual
12. Caltrans Traffic Manual
13. Central Contra Costa County Sanitary District, correspondence dated
14. City of Lafayette Emergency Operations Plan
15. City of Lafayette Engineering Division
16. City of Lafayette General Plan
17. City of Lafayette Grading Ordinance
18. City of Lafayette Municipal Code
19. City of Lafayette Noise Ordinance
20. City of Lafayette Parks and Recreation Department
21. City of Lafayette Planning and Building Department
22. City of Lafayette Police Department
23. City of Lafayette Standard Specifications
24. City of Lafayette Transportation Division
25. City of Lafayette Tree Protection Ordinance
26. City of Lafayette Zoning Map
27. City of Lafayette Zoning Ordinance
28. Contra Costa County
29. Contra Costa County Clean Water Program/Stormwater Management Plan
30. Contra Costa County Congestion Management Plan
31. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, correspondence dated May 20, 2014
32. Contra Costa County Flood Control District
33. Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority
34. Contra Costa Important Farmland 2000

35. Contra Costa Water District
36. Database for Lafayette General Plan, dated May 1992
37. Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Database Maps and Reports
38. East Bay Municipal Utility District
39. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Program
40. Field Inspection / Investigation
41. Geotechnical Report prepared by ENGEO Incorporated, dated March 5, 2013 and Supplementary report, received October 11, 2016
42. Lafayette School District
43. Lamorinda Building Inspection Office
44. Project Description / Application Information
45. Project Plans, received November 10, 2016
46. State Archaeological Clearinghouse, Sonoma State University
47. State of California, Special Studies Zones (Revised Official Map)
48. USDA-SCS, "Soils of Contra Costa County"
49. United States Geologic Survey (USGS) 2008 National Seismic Hazard Maps Fault Parameters
50. Utility and Service Providers

NOTE: 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.