



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>

CITY OF LAFAYETTE
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Title:**
LLR06-17 Hill Valley Oaks, 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:**
Julia Koppman Norton, Assistant Planner, (925) 299-3202, jnorton@ci.lafayette.ca.us
- 4. Location:**
Unaddressed parcel at corner of Deer Hill Road & N. Thompson Road and 3600 Deer Hill Road (APN 244-190-028 and 244-190-030)
- 5. Applicant's Name and Address:**
Hill Valley Oaks, LLC, 409 Matthew Court, Pleasanton, CA 94566
- 6. General Plan Land Use Designations:**
Medium Density Single Family Residential (up to 6 dwelling units/acre)
- 7. Zoning:**
R-10 Single-Family Residential District – minimum lot size 10,000 sq. ft.
- 8. Description of Project:**
LLR06-17 Hill Valley Oaks, LLC (Owners), R-10 Zoning: Request for a Lot Line Revision to adjust the property lines between one vacant, unaddressed parcel at the corner of Deer Hill Road and N. Thompson Road (APN 244-190-028) and a parcel at 3600 Deer Hill Road (APN 244-190-030) developed with two single-family residences, resulting in one single-family residence on each parcel. Both properties are in the Hillside Overlay District.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)**
Single family residential to the north, east, and west. BART Parking Lot to the south.
- 10. Other Required Approvals: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**
None

11. Have California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which took effect on July 1, 2015, amends CEQA and adds standards of significance that relate to Native American consultation and certain types of cultural resources. Projects subject to AB 52 are those that file a notice of preparation for an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2015. As of July 1, 2016, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) developed guidelines and the NAHC informed tribes which agencies are in their traditional area. In response to these guidelines, this Section VI, Tribal Cultural Resources, has been added as a stand-alone section to this Initial Study.

AB 52 requires the CEQA lead agency to begin consultation with a California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project if the Tribe requests in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through formal notification of the proposed projects in the area. The consultation is required before the determination of whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or EIR is required. In addition, AB 52 includes time limits for certain responses regarding consultation. AB 52 also adds "tribal cultural resources" (TCR) to the specific cultural resources protected under CEQA.¹ CEQA Section 21084.3 has been added, which states that "public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resources." Information shared by tribes as a result of AB 52 consultation shall be documented in a confidential file, as necessary, and made part of a lead agencies administrative record. In response to AB 52, the City of Lafayette has not received any request from any Tribes in the geographic area with which it is traditionally and culturally affiliated with or otherwise to be notified about projects in the City of Lafayette.

¹ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute, Section 21074.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture & Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Geology & Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population & Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities & Service Systems
- 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 City. 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 (EIR) will be prepared.
- 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

Title

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
<i>The site is located in the Hillside Overlay District; however, no new structures are being built as part of this project and any future development on the site would be required to adhere to the Hillside Regulations to minimize visual impacts from off-site Viewing Evaluation Sites. Therefore, there will be no substantial adverse impact to the scenic vistas as a result of this project. (Source: HOD Map; General Plan Map I-5 Scenic View Corridors; and Site Visit)</i>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
<i>This project seeks to amend the lot line between two parcels creating two parcels that are compliant with the development standards as defined by the zoning regulations, and therefore no damage will occur. The site does not contain any historic building, rock outcropping, or other scenic resource. (Source: Aerial Maps)</i>				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
<i>As previously mentioned, no construction is proposed as part of this project; therefore no degrading of visual character will occur. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<i>As previously mentioned, no construction or physical change to the properties will occur as proposed; therefore no new light sources will affect views. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	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 site is not designated as important farmland as indicated on the local and regional farmland resources map. The applicant proposes to maintain the existing use of the site through this project. (Source: CA State Farmland Map; Contra Costa County Farmland Map; Site Location Map)</i>				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<i>The property is zoned R-10 (Single-Family Residential District) which allows for residential uses such as home occupations, supportive care facilities, and small animal farms and is not zoned for agricultural use. There is no documentation of a contract in place to preserve this land as agricultural land or open space. (Source: City of Lafayette Zoning Map; R-10 zoning regulations)</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 site is not designated as farmland and is not near farmland. The existing area is zoned for and contains residential uses and will remain as such. (Source: Zoning Map; CA / Contra Costa Farmland Maps)</i>				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
<i>The site is not currently zoned for forest land. The current zoning is R-10 and the proposal seeks to change the lot line between two existing residentially zoned parcels. The site is not in a designated national forest or protected forested land and not adjacent to open space. The site is surrounded by existing residential development and the BART Parking Lot. (Source: Zoning Map; R-10 Zoning Regulations; CA Protected Forested Land Map)</i>				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or of conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
<i>The site is not currently zoned for farmland or forest land. The current zoning is R-10 and there is no proposal for rezoning. (Source: Zoning Map; R-10 Zoning Regulations; CA Protected Forested Land Map)</i>				

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
<i>The proposal is to adjust the lot line between two parcels, which will not result in obstruction of the applicable air quality plans. No construction is proposed as part of this project. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
<i>As noted above, the project will not affect air quality. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
<i>No construction is proposed as part of the project and therefore the project will not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
<i>The proposed project is only a lot line adjustment and no development application has been submitted. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
<i>The proposed project seeks to change the lot line between two parcels and will not result in any objectionable odors. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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
<i>The project will have no adverse effect on any special status species. The project is located in an existing urbanized area and designated in the General Plan as medium-density residential. (Source: General Plan Map 1-1 Land Use)</i>				
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
<i>As there is no creek on the site and therefore no riparian corridor, the project exercises full avoidance of impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
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
<i>The project site is not in the vicinity of a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 and therefore will not have any impact on such sites. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
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
<i>As no physical change to the land is proposed, therefore, the project exercises full avoidance of impacts to the movements of wildlife. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The project will not be in conflict with any local policies or tree removal ordinances as no tree removal is proposed. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
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
<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/)</i>				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X
<i>Since the proposed project is a lot line adjustment, the project does not affect any of the registered landmarks (Source: City Council Landmark Resolutions #1976-36, #1978-33, and #1983-85)</i>				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
<i>The proposed project does not include construction of any structures or any excavation on the site and therefore, there will be no substantial adverse impact to the archaeological resources. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<i>Since there is no construction, excavation, or grading proposed as part of this project, there will be no destruction of paleontological resources as part of the project. (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>				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X

The site is not a known cemetery or location of human remains. Since no excavation or grading is proposed as part of this project, there will be no disturbance caused to any human remains on the site. (Source: General Plan Goal LU-22; State CEQA Guidelines Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5)

VI. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native American tribe. 				X

In response to AB 52, the City of Lafayette has not received any request from any Tribes in the geographic area with which it is traditionally and culturally affiliated with or otherwise to be notified about projects in the City of Lafayette. (Source: Lafayette General Plan; General Plan Goal LU-22)

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential sub-			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: i) Strong seismic ground shaking? ii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iii) Landslides, mudslides or other similar hazards?				
<i>The parcel is located within the vicinity of the Miller Creek fault, Moraga fault, Southampton fault, Hayward fault zone, Franklin fault, and Chabot fault. However, no known faults are mapped on the site. Approximately half of the site has virtually no liquefaction potential, and the other half is designated as “probably absent” liquefaction potential based on maps included in the City’s General Plan. The General Plan Landslide Map shows this is an area of known slides with high susceptibility to sliding. The project site is located in the hillside area and contains steep slopes. However, as no construction or physical changes to the land are proposed as part of this project, there will be no landslide impacts to the project. (Source: ENGEO Incorporated Geotechnical Report USGS; General Plan Map VI-1 & VI-2)</i>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
<i>As no construction or physical changes to the land are proposed, there will be no increase in soil erosion due to the project. (Source: Site Plan)</i>				
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
<i>As no construction or physical changes to the land are proposed, no soil will become unstable as a result of the project. (Source: Site Plan)</i>				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
<i>As no construction or physical changes to the land are proposed, no substantial risks to life or property will be created due to this project. (Source: Site Plan)</i>				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<i>The project site is within CCCSD’s service area and sanitary sewer service is available. (Source: Central Sanitary District).</i>				

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X
<i>As no construction or change in land use is proposed, the project will not generate greenhouse gases. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
<i>As no construction or grading is proposed, the project emissions will not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds for significance. (Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District)</i>				

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
<i>The subject property is a legal lot of record that is zoned for residential use. There is no proposed grading or dirt excavation from the site as part of this project. Since the uses are staying the same and no construction, grading, or demolition is proposed, there will be no transport of hazardous materials to and from this site as a result of this 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The subject properties are zoned for residential use. Currently, one is developed with two single-family residences and the other is vacant, and this application seeks to revise the lot line to have each of the existing single-family residences on an individual parcel. No development is proposed as part of this application. Therefore, there is no reasonable foreseeable upset or cause for accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. (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>No construction is proposed as part of this application and as such no hazardous emissions, substances, or waste will be emitted within one-quarter mile of any existing or proposed schools. (Source: Project Description)</i>				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, 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 area?				X
<i>The site is not located near an airport. (Source: Aerial Maps)</i>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>No physical changes are proposed as a result of this project, and as such it will not block entrance or exit to the City or to an emergency evacuation route. (Source: Safety Element of the General Plan pg. VI-14; Emergency Operations Plan)</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 project site is within a very high fire severity zone per the Contra Costa County Fire Department and Cal Fire's maps. However, given that this project involves no physical change to the environment, there is no increased risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. (Source: Areal Maps)</i>				

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
<i>The project will not violate water quality standards as no construction is proposed. (Source: Site Plans)</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 significant lowering of the local groundwater table level?				X
<i>The property is currently served by the East Bay Municipal Utility District and this project does not impact groundwater supplies as no new construction is proposed through this application. (Source: East Bay MUD Service Area; Site 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>There are no physical changes proposed through this project and as such there will be no impact on drainage patterns. (Source: Site Plans)</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>There are no physical changes proposed through this project and as such there will be no impact on drainage patterns. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?				X
<i>There is no proposed construction as part of this project and as such it will not create runoff. (Source: Site Plans)</i>				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
<i>There is no proposed construction as part of this project and as such there are no potential actions due to this project that would degrade water quality. (Source: Site Plans)</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 partially within a 100-year flood hazard area, but no new housing is proposed as part of this project. (Source: General Plan Map VI-4; 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 partially within a 100-year flood hazard area, but no new structures and no additions or alterations to the land are proposed as part of this project and as such there will be no impact on flood flows. (Source: General Plan Map VI-4; 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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The site is partially within a 100-year flood hazard area, but no construction or other alterations to the land are proposed as part of this project and as such the project will not expose people or structures to significant risk. (Source: General Plan Map VI-4; 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>				

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
<i>No construction is proposed, the project is not a road, freeway, wall, or other element that would physically divide the community. (Source: 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>While the average slope of the two parcels in question is greater than 20%, the project does not include creating any new parcels but rather shifts the lot line between two existing parcels. Therefore, although the average slope of the two parcels is 30%, the project is compliant with all aspects of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The subject area is designated as medium-density residential and R-10 zoning where single-family housing is a permitted and expected use and no changes are proposed. (Source: R-10 Zoning Regulations; General Plan Map I-3)</i>				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community 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. The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan does not include the project area. (Source: General Plan Map III-I; http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/department/cd/water/HCP/documents/CCC_Ordinance.pdf)</i>				

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_96-03)</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 General Plan; Specific Plan; ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_96-03)</i>				

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 parcels in the area. No additional noise will be created given that no construction is proposed. (Source: Site Plans; Noise Ordinance)</i>				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X
<i>As no construction is proposed, no additional noise will be created. (Source: Site Plans; Noise Ordinance)</i>				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<i>As no construction is proposed, no additional noise will be created. (Source: Site Plans; Noise Ordinance)</i>				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>As no construction is proposed, no additional noise will be created. (Source: Site Plans; Noise Ordinance)</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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<i>The project is not located within the vicinity of an airport. (Source: Location Maps)</i>				
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?				X
<i>The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. (Source: Location Maps)</i>				

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 proposed project is changing the lot line between two parcels that are currently zoned for residential use. No changes are proposed to the use at this time. Therefore, the lot line is not a growth-inducing project. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<i>The project site encompasses two existing single-family residences. This application solely proposes to shift a lot line. The number of residences will not change. As such, no housing will be displaced. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>As stated above, the project site encompasses two existing single-family residences. This application solely proposes to shift a lot line. The number of people able to be housed on the site will remain the same. No replacement housing will be needed as a result of this project. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services including, fire and police protection, schools, parks and libraries?				X
<i>The site encompasses two existing single-family residences which are currently served by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, Lafayette Police Department, Lafayette School District, Lafayette parks, and other public facilities. This project proposes to maintain the existing two single-family residences, with no proposed changes to their size or quantity. Therefore, given that the design, infrastructure needs, and use will remain the same, the project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with governmental facilities and infrastructure. (Source: Context Map)</i>				

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

The use of the two properties will remain the same, with the same capacity. The number of residences will not change as a result of this project. The neighborhood and regional parks in this area were created with an understanding of the number of people and single-family residentially zoned parcels and as such are equipped to handle the necessary number of users. Given that the number of users of the parks will not be altered as a result of this project not changing the zoning, use, or existing structures, there will be no increase or impact on existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities and as such no deterioration of those facilities will occur. (Source: Context Map)

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

The project does not include and will not require the expansion of recreational facilities. (Source: Project description)

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 to accommodate the City's ultimate build-out. Therefore, the transportation infrastructure was created to account for the existing two single-family residences that will remain untouched as part of this project. (Source: General Plan; Project Description)</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. (Source: General Plan)</i>				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	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 result in substantial safety risks?				X
<i>The project is not near an airport and will not 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>There are no changes proposed to the road and as such there will be no increase in traffic hazards. (Source: Project Plan)</i>				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<i>There is no construction, roadwork, grading, or demolition proposed as part of this project. As such, there are no proposed changes to emergency access as part of this project. (Source: Project Plans)</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 does not disrupt any alternative transportation as no changes to the use, access, or structures are proposed. (Source: Project Plans; Context Map)</i>				

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
<i>This project maintains the existing two single-family residences on the two parcels in question and does not propose any alteration to the existing structures or land. As such, there will be no impact on wastewater and therefore no impact on wastewater treatment requirements as a result of this project. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
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
<i>No new construction or additions are proposed as part of this project. As such, the use and capacity will stay the same and the project will not require new wastewater treatment facilities. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
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
<i>The project simply involves shifting a lot line between two existing parcels. No development or alteration of land is proposed as part of this project. Therefore, the project will not require new or expanded storm water drainage facilities as the use and capacity will remain the same. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
<i>The two existing single-family residences on the parcel are proposed to remain, with no additions or alterations proposed. As such, the use and capacity will remain the same and no additional water supplies are needed. (Source: EBMUD Service Area Map https://www.ebmud.com/about-ebmud/our-story/service-area-map)</i>				
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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Given that the number and size of structures will remain the same as a result of this project, there is no projected additional demand for wastewater treatment. (Source: Project Description)</i>				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
<i>Lafayette is served by Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority and Keller landfill has sufficient capacity to serve any proposed development. However, there will be no physical changes to the site as a result of this project and there is therefore no need for landfill capacity. (Source: Solid Waste Authority Service Area Map http://www.wastediversion.org/app_pages/view/243)</i>				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<i>No waste will be produced as no construction is proposed. (Source: Project Description)</i>				
h) Result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electric service demands requiring new energy supply facilities and distribution infrastructure or capacity enhancing alternations to existing facilities?				X
<i>No changes are proposed to the site or the existing structures as a result of this project. As such, the project will result in no increase in natural gas and electric service demands. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				

1. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>This project does not include any physical changes to the site or surrounding environment. No trees or landscaping will be removed as part of this project, no grading will occur, and no construction or demolition will occur with this application. There are no creeks on this site. Therefore, the project 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 no physical changes to the land are proposed. (Source: Project Plans)</i>				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
<i>As no physical changes to the site are proposed as part of this project, there will be no individual and therefore no cumulatively considerable impacts. (Source: Project Description)</i>				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
<i>As no physical changes to the site are proposed as part of this project, the project will not have substantial adverse effects on human beings. (Source: Project Description)</i>				

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST SUPPORTING SOURCES

1. Acalanes School District
2. Aerial Photographs
3. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projections 2005
4. Bay Area Air Quality Management District
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, correspondence dated
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
29. Contra Costa County Flood Control District
30. Contra Costa County Solid Waste Authority
31. Contra Costa Important Farmland 2000
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. Earlier Analysis
36. East Bay Municipal Utility District, correspondence dated
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
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), correspondence dated
52. Charles DeLeuw (City of Lafayette traffic consultant), correspondence dated
53. Arborist Report
54. Biological Resources Report
55. Archaeological Reconnaissance
56. Geologic Report
57. Traffic Analysis

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.