CEQA The California Environmental Quality Act

Town of Danville

Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:** SUB22-0003 – SD 9598

2. **Lead agency name and address:** Town of Danville
510 La Gonda Way
Danville, CA 94526

3. **Contact person and phone number:** Fred Korbmacher, (925) 314-3317

4. **Project location:** 2830 Camino Tassajara
Danville, CA 94506

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jeff Schroeder, Ponderosa Homes
5020 Franklin Dr, Suite 200
Pleasanton, CA 94526

6. **Zoning:**
P-1, Planned Unit Development
Single Family Residential

7. **General Plan designation:**
Single Family Low Density 1-3
Units Per Acre

8. **Description of project:** The subdivision of an existing 3.04 acre parcel into nine single family residential lots where there are 37 Town-protected trees on the subject property affected by this proposal.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** Single-family residences are located to the south, east and west and the property abuts Camino Tassajara to the north.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**
    - San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District
    - Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District
    - Contra Costa County Flood Control District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Geology/Soils
☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology / Water Quality
☐	Land Use / Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	X	Noise
☐	Population / Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation/Traffic	X	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.

X 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 | 6/14/2022 Date

Fred Korbmacher | Town of Danville

Printed Name | For

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	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
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	❐	❐	❐	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	❐	❐	X	❐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	❐	❐	X	❐
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	❐	❐	❐	X
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
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	❐	❐	❐	X
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 conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	❐	❐	❐	X
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	❐	❐	❐	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	❐	❐	❐	X
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
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	❐	❐	❐	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	❐	❐	❐	X
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	❐	❐
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	❐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on	❐	❐	X	❐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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	❐	❐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	❐	X	❐	❐
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
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	❐	❐	❐	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	❐	❐	X	❐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	❐	❐	❐	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	❐	❐	X	❐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	❐	❐	❐	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	❐	❐	X	❐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	❐	❐	X	❐
iv) Landslides?	❐	❐	❐	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	❐	❐	X	❐
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	❐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	❐	❐	X	❐
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 waste water?	❐	❐	❐	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	X
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
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
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	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X
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	☐	☐	☐	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
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
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	❒	❒	❒	X
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
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	❒	❒	❒	X
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
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-	❒	❒	X	❒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
site?				
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
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	❒
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	❒	❒	❒	X
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
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	❒	❒	❒	X
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
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	❒	❒	❒	X
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	❒	❒	❒	X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but	❒	❒	❒	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	❐	❐	❐	X
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
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
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	❐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	❐	❐	X	❐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❐	❐	X	❐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	❐	X	❐	❐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
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
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	❐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❐	❐	❐	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	❐	❐	❐	X
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
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:				
Fire protection?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	❒	❒	X	❒
Police protection?	❒	❒	X	❒
Schools?	❒	❒	X	❒
Parks?	❒	❒	X	❒
Other public facilities?	❒	❒	X	❒
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	❒	❒	X	X
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	❒
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	❒
	❒	❒	X	❒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
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 risks?	❐	❐	❐	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	❐	❐	❐	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	❐	❐	❐	X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	❐	❐	❐	X
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	❐	❐	X	❐
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	❐
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	❐	X	❐	❐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	❐	❐	X	❐
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	❐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	❐	❐	X	❐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	❐	❐	X	❐
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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	❐	❐	X	❐
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,	❐	❐	❐	X

use? **No Impact.** The parcel is not classified as prime, unique, or farmland of statewide importance.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the zoning for the site. The site was zoned for agricultural use. It has not been used for agricultural use since the mid-1980s, and is not under a Williamson Act contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the zoning for the site and will not result in the rezoning of forest land.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? **No Impact.** The proposed project will not result in the loss or conversion of forest land.

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? **No Impact.** The site is zoned for residential use, and the proposed development would not result in the conversion of any farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designation for the site. The proposed project would not increase regional population growth or cause changes in vehicular traffic that would affect the implementation of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2010 Clean Air Plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designation for the site. The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project is conditioned to follow the Bay Area Air Quality Management District rules and regulations.

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)? **No Impact.** The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designation for the site, and residential development has been anticipated.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? **No Impact.** The proposed project itself does not represent a sensitive receptor and there are no existing or planned sensitive receptors within the immediate project vicinity. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designation for the site, and residential development has been anticipated.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? **No Impact.** The proposed development is a residential development project, consistent with surrounding residential uses. This type of residential development will not result in the creation of objectionable odors which are not typical for the area.

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? **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The property consists of an existing single-family residence and undeveloped landscaped land. Historical records indicate that the property has been used for agricultural since approximately 1939 to the mid-1980s. The development of the property will be consistent with the surrounding properties. The project is not projected to impact special-status species.

All raptors and other nesting migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and their eggs and young are protected under California Fish and Game Codes. A nesting survey would be conducted prior to commencing with construction work if this work would commence between February 1st and August 31st. If a nest is found, a buffer around the tree with the nest will be installed, which would be identified by a qualified biologist.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** No riparian or other sensitive communities have been identified on-site. The project would develop a site with an existing single-family residence and landscaped area.

(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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would develop a site with an

existing single-family residence and landscaped area. All stormwater/surface runoff should be directed into the Town's storm drain system.

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? **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would develop a site with an existing single-family residence and landscaped area. All stormwater/surface runoff should be directed into the Town's storm drain system.

All raptors and other nesting migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and their eggs and young are protected under California Fish and Game Codes. A nesting survey would be conducted prior to commencing with construction work if this work would commence between February 1st and August 31st. If a nest is found, a buffer around the tree with the nest will be installed, which would be identified by a qualified biologist.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Of the 98 trees surveyed on the site, 74 are to be removed. Of the 74 trees, 31 trees are protected under the Town's Tree Preservation Ordinance. The developer will be required to mitigate the loss of those trees by payment of an off-site mitigation fee.

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? **No Impact.** There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan associated with this property.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? **No Impact.** The site and existing buildings on site do not meet criteria as a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? **Less than Significant Impact.** There has been no identification of the existence, or probable likelihood, of an archaeological resource on this site. Standard Conditions of Approval require that, in the event that subsurface archeological remains are discovered during any construction or pre-construction activities on the site, all land alteration work within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, the Town Planning Division notified, and a professional

archeologist, certified by the Society of California Archeology and/or the Society of Professional Archeology, shall be notified. Site work in this area shall not occur until the archeologist has had an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and to outline appropriate mitigation measures if they are deemed necessary. If prehistoric archaeological deposits are discovered during development of the site, local Native American organizations shall be consulted and involved in making resource management decisions.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? **No Impact.** The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by ENGEO Incorporated did not find any paleontological resource or unique geological features on site.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? **Less than Significant Impact.** In the event that human remains are discovered during grading or site development, all work shall be halted in the vicinity of the find, the applicant shall notify the county coroner and comply with all state law requirements, including Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code section 5097.98, to ensure proper disposition of the human remains or suspected human remains, including those identified to be Native American remains.

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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. **No Impact.** The site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? **Less than Significant Impact.** The site is not located near active faults. Given the project's requirement to comply with California Building Code related to seismic activity, this impact is considered less than significant requirement to comply with California Building Code related to seismic activity, this impact is considered less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the Geotechnical report prepared by ENGEO Incorporated, there is a low potential for liquefaction, and it was not identified as a potential concern. Based on Laboratory results, the fines content is too high to enable the liquefaction effects to manifest. Given the

project's requirement to comply with California Building Code related to seismic activity, this impact is considered less than significant.

iv) Landslides? **No Impact.** No evidence of landslide characteristics have been observed on the site or in the area in the past

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? **Less than Significant Impact.** There is potential for some soil erosion caused by both wind and water during the construction phase of the project. Compliance with standard Town practices regarding erosion prevention makes this impact less than significant.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The site is nearly flat. According to the Geotechnical report prepared by ENGEO Incorporated, the soils at the site consist of clayey soil, silt sand, and gravel, with no indications of slope instability observed.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? **Less than Significant Impact.** The site contains interbedded clayey soil, as is typical of most of the soils within Contra Costa County and the greater San Francisco Bay Area. Compliance with recommendations of the final soils report regarding foundation design would make this impact less than significant.

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 waste water? **No impact.** This project has an existing waste water disposal system with no proposed alteration. No soil instability has been identified.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would allow the construction of nine new single-family residences in an existing residential neighborhood. The project would use existing roads and connect to existing utility infrastructure, making it consistent with the Town of Danville's 2030 General Plan Policy 34.02.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? **No Impact.** The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed project is in a residential area, similar to the surrounding area. The proposed project is an infill nine lot residential project. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development. Household petroleum containers used to refuel yard maintenance equipment and propane tanks were observed on the property which will be removed as part of the site clearing stage prior to any grading activity.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed project is in a residential area, similar to the surrounding area. The proposed project is an infill nine lot residential project. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is in a residential area, similar to the surrounding area. Hazardous materials which are not consistent with typical residential areas are not expected to be associated with this development. The proposed project is an infill nine lot residential project located approximately .28 miles from Sycamore Valley Elementary School. No evidence of existing underground storage tanks was observed. An above-ground pressurized tank located next to a groundwater well was observed which will be removed as part of the site clearing stage prior to any grading activity.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? **No Impact.** This site is not known to be included on any list of hazardous materials sites.

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? **No Impact.** The subject site is not within an airport zone or part of any airport plan.

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? **No Impact.** There is no private airplane strip within the project vicinity.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? **No Impact.** There is not a specific

emergency response plan for this area. The project will meet all requirements of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed project is located within a residential neighborhood. The project will meet all requirements of the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District including fire abatement measures.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? **No Impact.** Compliance with the Town's stormwater run-off requirements will ensure no water quality standards are violated. The integrated management practices (IMPs) proposed for the treatment areas will be consistent with the recommendations of the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. The proposed project will conform to the Town's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Ord. No. 2004-06) and all applicable construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the site. A project Operations Maintenance Plan and Agreement will also be developed and recorded for this site.

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)? **No Impact.** The project would be served by the East Bay Municipal Utility District for water and no new wells would be created.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** Compliance with the Town's Erosion Control Ordinance (Section 19-4.2) requirements will limit any erosion or siltation downstream. Significant grading will not take place that would alter drainage patterns. The proposed project will conform to the Town's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Ord. No. 2004-06) and all applicable construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the site.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed project will conform to the Town's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (Ord. No. 2004-06) and all applicable construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the site.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The applicant provided a hydrology study which indicates that stormwater drainage will not substantially increase. The additional run-off will not exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage facilities. The project will be required to comply with all stormwater quality requirements. The project proposes self-retaining pervious areas and a bio-retention basin. Calculations were computed on the Contra Costa Clean Water Program's IMP calculator to determine C3 compliance.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? **No Impact.** Stormwater and surface water runoff will be directed into the Town's storm drain system. Straw wattles and crushed rocks will encircle all storm inlets during the construction process. Self-treating and self-retaining drainage area Is proposed on site.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed nine lot residential project is not located within a Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? **No Impact.** No structures will be built within the 100-year flood plain, as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? **No Impact.** No structures will be built within the 100-year flood plain, as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps. There are no dams or levees in the vicinity of the site.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? **No Impact.** The site is not near any large body of water, so the risk of damage due to a seiche, tsunami or mudslide is very low.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project?

a) Physically divide an established community? **No Impact.** The proposed project is a residential, consistent with existing surrounding developments.

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? **No Impact.** The proposed project is a residential development, consistent with existing surrounding developments.

The proposed project complies with existing general plan zoning and ordinances.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? **No Impact.** There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan related to this property.

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? **No Impact.** There are no known mineral resources on this site.

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? **No Impact.** There are no known mineral resources on the site.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a residential development, consistent with existing surrounding developments. Noise levels would temporarily be increased due to noise associated with the construction of the residences. The noise impact will be less than significant given required standard conditions of approval which define and limit hours of construction.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a residential development, consistent with existing surrounding developments. The groundborne level is not expected to exceed the existing noise level in the area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a residential, 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.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Noise levels would temporarily be increased due to noise associated with the construction of the project. The noise impact will be less than significant given required standard conditions of approval which define and limit hours of construction.

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? **No Impact.** The subject site is not located within an area including an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport.

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? **No Impact.** The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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)? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a residential project, consist with the surrounding area. The project was anticipated as part of the Town's 2030 General Plan.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.** The development will not displace any housing in the area, but will create an additional eight net new housing units.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.** The development will not displace any housing in the area.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:

a) 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:

i) Fire Protection? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be served by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District, as indicated in correspondence with the District. The project will be designed to meet all of the requirements of the District.

ii) Police Protection? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be served by the Danville Police Department, which is on contract from the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department.

iii) Schools? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed residential units may increase the number of students attending the schools in the neighborhood. To compensate for this demand, a school impact fee of will be paid by the applicant for

each unit to the San Ramon Valley Unified School District.

iv) Parks? **Less than Significant.** The proposed residential units may have an increase in park facility use. The applicant will be required to pay the Town's Park Land in Lieu fee to off-set future purchase or development of park facilities.

v) Other Public Facilities? **Less than Significant.** No other public facilities have been identified in which this project would result in a significant adverse negative impact.

XV. RECREATION: Would the project result in:

a) a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed residential project will not cause for an increase in regional parks or other park facility use significant enough to cause substantial physical deterioration.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project does not include the development of new recreational facilities. The applicant will be required to pay the Town's Park Land in Lieu fee to off-set future purchase or development of park facilities.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The area's streets, land use planning and zoning were planned and in place to accommodate future residential development on this site. Traffic will increase by the rate associated with eight net new housing units.

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? **Less than Significant Impact**. The Transportation Division reviewed the project and did not determine peak hour trips to be significant enough to conflict with any congestion management programs. The applicant is required to pay the Town's Traffic Improvement Program Fee, The County's Regional and Sub-

Regional, and the Tri-Valley Transportation Fees for future traffic related improvements within the Town of Danville, Contra Costa and the Tri-Valley area.

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 risks? **No Impact.** The project has no potential to have an effect on air traffic in the area.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? **No Impact.** The proposed access drive meets all of the Town's design standards and is not proposing any potentially hazardous design features.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? **No Impact.** The project was reviewed by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District and will meet all access requirements.

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? **No Impact.** The project does not conflict with any transportation plans.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will be required to comply with all stormwater quality requirements. A Stormwater Control Plan has been submitted and will be followed.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The development is within the Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District boundaries and will be served by the District. Appropriate mitigation fees will be collected by the District.

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? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project will be required to comply with all stormwater quality requirements. The project proposes self-retaining pervious areas and a bio-retention basin. Calculations were computed on the Contra Costa Clean Water Program's IMP calculator to determine C3 compliance.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utilities District. The district has indicated that they will serve the project. Appropriate mitigation fees will be collected by the District.

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? **Less than Significant Impact.** The development is within the Contra Costa County Central Sanitary District boundaries, and will be served by the District. Appropriate mitigation fees will be collected by the District.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? **Less than Significant Impact.** The area's solid waste provider has indicated that they will serve the project.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? **Less than Significant Impact.** The development will be required to comply with all federal, state, and local statutes regarding solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Would the project:

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 prehistory? **Less than Significant Impact.** There is no evidence that the project will degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a wildlife species, or reduce the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? **No Impact.** The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? **No Impact.** The project has no potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.