

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Little Genius Academy
County File#LP12-2006
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Francisco Avila, Project Planner
(925) 674-7801
4. **Project Location:** 2131 – 2151 Olympic Boulevard
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
APN: 184-301-004, 019 & 022
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Inga Rosenthal
2131 – 2151 Olympic Boulevard
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property has a General Plan Land Use designation of Single-Family Residential-Medium Density (SM).
7. **Zoning:** The subject property is zoned Single-Family Residential Zoning District (R-10), minimum parcel sizes of 10,000 square feet.
8. **Background:** The subject daycare facility has been in operation at the site since 1983, and operates on three contiguous parcels. Land use permit modifications have been granted in 1985 and 1997. Those permits allowed the facility to expand from its original 45-child maximum to its current 94 child limit. The facility consists of two residences on separate parcels (converted to classrooms), a third classroom building consisting of 1,415-square-foot, a 332-square-foot office and two smaller buildings which serve as storage.
9. **Description of Project:** As mentioned above, the applicant seeks approval of a land use permit to expand the existing Little Genius Academy. The application includes the following:
- An increase in the maximum allowed children from 94 to 182,
 - Construction of a new 3,200-square-foot preschool building,
 - A tree permit to work within the dripline of three oak trees, removal of three 6-7 inch oak trees and the relocation of one persimmon tree,
 - Construction of a new outdoor playground.

The proposed project also includes variance requests for the following:

- 15 off-street parking spaces proposed, where 17 spaces are required,
- 5-foot side yard setback proposed for parking spaces #1 & #2, 10-foot required minimum,
- 13-foot front yard setback proposed for parking space #4, 20-foot required minimum,
- 0-foot front yard setback proposed for parking space #5, 20-foot required minimum,
- 0-foot setback proposed for parking space #6, 15-foot required minimum,
- No 4-foot wide landscaping strip for the Willow Avenue parking lot, where a 4-foot wide landscaping strip is require.

The proposed hours of the Little Genius Academy will be from 7:00am to 7:00pm, Monday through Friday. The project also includes combining the three subject parcels to create one larger lot. The project does not include any grading or alteration to the drainage pattern of the area. The property owner is also required to annex to the Community Facility District CFD 2010-1 for Countywide Street Light Financing, or equivalent lighting district.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding Land Use: The subject property is located in an area of Walnut Creek with mixed uses (e.g. dental offices, small grocery stores and residential housing). Olympic Boulevard is the main thoroughfare in this area and is directly adjacent to the subject property. Interstate 680 is approximately ½ mile to the north of the site. The City of Walnut Creek boundary line and Kaiser Hospital both are ¾ of a mile to the northeast of the subject property.

Existing Site Conditions: The site consists of three contiguous properties totaling 39,914-square-feet. Assessor's parcel number (APN) 184-301-004 consists of one 1,502-square-foot building built in 1947 and infant playground. That lot fronts Olympic Boulevard and currently has 5 off-street parking spaces and a drive-through driveway which is used as a pick-up and drop-off zone for infants/toddlers. APN 184-301-019 is currently vacant with the exception of several small oak trees. APN 184-301-022 is developed with a 1,887-square-foot building, a 332-square-foot office, a second 1,415-square-foot building and several small sheds used as storage. That parcel fronts Willow Avenue and provides 7 off-street parking spaces and a second drive-through driveway. A solid redwood fence separates the northern portion of the property from vehicular traffic along Olympic Boulevard.

Additionally, as part of County File #LP97-2090, which allowed an expansion of the childcare facility; the property owner was required to submit an Offer of Dedication to the Department of Public Works. The Offer of Dedication has been recorded on the parcel and covers a portion of the Olympic Boulevard frontage, as well as, the entire length of the Willow Avenue frontage. The dedication is intended to provide for sidewalk improvements. However, the property owner and the Department of Public Works have entered into a Deferred Improvement Agreement. When the agreement is "called up", the frontage improvements will be installed at the property owner's expense.

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

- Contra Costa County Building Inspection Division
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
- Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
- East Bay Municipal Utility 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.

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

Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

Francisco Avila – Project Planner
Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) According to Figure 9-1 (Scenic Ridges and Waterways) of the County General Plan, there are no ridgeways that exist in the vicinity of the property. Figure 5-4 (Scenic Route) of the County General Plan identifies Interstate 680 as a scenic route, however, that route is over a ½ mile from the site. Thus, the site cannot be seen from Interstate 680 due to that distance and numerous developments. Except for the several new parking spaces and a new building at the rear of the property, there will be virtually no indication of the expansion to passersby. Therefore, any potential impacts to scenic vistas in the area would be minimal.</p> <p>b) The residences on the property were built in the 1940’s, with various improvements completed over time. At the time of staff’s site visit (2012), the site appeared well maintained and was neatly kept. The proposed project includes work within the drip line of three (3) oak trees. If the project is approved, the applicant will be required to post a bond that would be used to purchase and plant replacements for the protected tree in the event that it is significantly damaged by construction activity. With the bond in place, the potential impact would be considered less-than-significant. Therefore, the project does not propose to damage scenic resources. In addition, the site does not contain any rock outcropping or officially designated historic buildings.</p> <p>c) The neighborhood is primarily residential, with mixed commercial uses along Olympic Boulevard. As previously mentioned, the applicant does not propose to alter the visual appearance of the site along the public right-of-way. The continued use of the site as a childcare and preschool facility would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site. Therefore, implementation of the project would be less-than-significant.</p> <p>d) The project does not involve lighting for the parking areas on-site. However, if the applicant would like to install lighting for the parking area in the future, the applicant would need to comply with the design and layout requirements for the off-street parking ordinance and the R-10 Zoning District. The proposed project would not create new source of substantial light or glare due to the nature of the project. The site is located within a residential and developed neighborhood which does not require substantial new sources of light.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: <i>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 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.</i></p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>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? (Sources: 2, 5)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 2, 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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))? (Sources: 2, 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Involve or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Sources: 2, 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? (Sources: 2, 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u> No Impact</p>				
<p>a) According to the 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map maintained by the California Department of Conservation, the project area is identified as “Urban and Built-Up Land”. In addition, Figure 8-2 (Important Agricultural Lands) of the 2005-2020 County General Plan, the site is not located within an Important Agricultural Area. The property is designated for residential uses, including the proposed uses that are allowed with the approval of a land use permit. The proposed project will not convert the site from an agricultural, to a non-agricultural use.</p> <p>b) The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential Zoning District (R-10). The site is not zoned for agricultural use; therefore, there is no potential for conflict with an existing Williamson Act contract or an agricultural zoning district.</p> <p>c-e) The subject property is zoned for residential uses. No portion of the property is located within a zoning district that is intended to support or promote the establishment of forest land or timberland. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any existing zoning for forest land or timberland. Due to the nature of the proposed project and the location of the property, there will be no contribution to the loss or conversion of forest land and the project would not result in conversion of farmland.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)? (Sources: 1, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 4, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-c) Management of air quality in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is the responsibility of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD is responsible for bringing and/or maintaining air quality in the Basin within federal and state air quality standards. Specifically, the BAAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the basin and to develop and implement attainment strategies to ensure that future emissions would be within federal and state standards. The San Francisco Bay Area Basin is currently designated as an “attainment” area for carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and is designated as “non-attainment-unclassified” for federal ozone (O₃), and particulate matter (PM-10). Under the state standards, the region also has “attainment” status for CO, SO₂, NO₂, but is “non-attainment” for the state PM-10 (particulate material) standard. In reference to fine-particulate matter (PM-2.5), the bay area is also “non-attainment-classified.”</p> <p>Nevertheless, the project will generate mobile source emissions by motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. According to the application submittal, the project would generate approximately 150 – 180 new trips per day. According to figure 3-3 of the California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines, these new trips would not exceed the BAAQMD significance standards for mobile source emissions. Additionally, the subject new building will be a purchased pre-manufactured unit. Thus, the scale of construction activities associated with this project does not merit mitigation.</p> <p>d) The BAAQMD defines exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants and risk of accidental releases of acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) as potential adverse environmental impacts. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, and residential areas with children, and convalescent facilities. The surrounding area consists of residential homes, various commercial uses, where people may be present. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed project, it is anticipated that sensitive receptors would not be exposed to significant pollutant concentrations.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>e) The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. Potential odor impacts are based on a list of specific types of facilities, such as wastewater treatment plants, landfills, refineries, etc. Improperly maintained wastewater treatment facilities could result in some occasional objectionable odors. Another example would be the case of a failed leach field. The proposed project is to expand a childcare facility and preschool, along with the construction of a 3,200-square-foot preschool building, installation of a playground, and parking improvements. Based on the nature of the project, objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people would not result from establishing the uses and minor construction activities.</p>				
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i></p>				
<p>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? (Sources: 1, 2)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 2, 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 2)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 2)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Source: 4)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact</p>				
<p>a) According to Figure 8-1 (Significant Ecological Areas and Selected Locations of Protected Wildlife and Plants Species Areas) of the County General Plan, the project site is not located within a significant ecological area. The project involves adding one new building, parking improvements and installation of a playground to a site that has been completely disturbed. Due to the location of the site and the size of the improvements, the project represents a very small risk of substantially affecting sensitive or special status species.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>b-c) The project site is within a developed residential area, adjacent to a mixed use commercial corridor along Olympic Boulevard. The project is to expand the existing preschool/childcare facility at the site. Thus, the project area is not located within, nor will it affect a riparian habitat or federally protected wetlands.</p> <p>d) There are no natural watercourses near the project area. The proposed improvements are minimal and as previously stated; the project area is within a developed residential area. Therefore, the potential for native resident or migratory wildlife corridors existing in the area of the proposed improvements is extremely low.</p> <p>e) Chapter 816-6 (Tree Protection and Preservation) of the County ordinance provides for the preservation of certain trees within the County, and controls tree removal while allowing for property development. The proposed project includes a request to work within the drip line of one (3) oak trees and to remove three other oak trees of less than 7-inches in diameter. Additionally, one persimmon tree will need to be relocated to allow for the construction of the new preschool building. In accordance with the County's Tree Ordinance, if the project is approved, the applicant will be required to post a bond that would be used to purchase and plant replacements for the protected trees in the event that they are significantly damaged by construction activity. With the bond in place, the potential impact would be considered less-than-significant.</p> <p>f) The project site is not included in the inventory area for the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan. Thus, the project has little to no potential in conflicting with any provisions of that plan.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) According to County records, the existing residences were constructed in the 1940's. Improvements to the property have been completed over the years, thus the likelihood that new undiscovered historical resources will be discovered is low.</p> <p>b-d) The proposed improvements include the construction of a new preschool building, installation of a playground, and parking improvements. According to Figure 9-2 (Archaeological Sensitivity Map) of the Contra Costa County General Plan, the site is largely urbanized and highly developed, thus resulting in a low potential that the project will unearth new archaeological finds.</p> <p>While archaeological or paleontological resources are not apparent in the project area, there remains the slight possibility that undiscovered resources could be present and could be uncovered during construction. However, if granted, a condition would be included in the land use permit approval, stating that all earth work will be temporarily stopped should any archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains be discovered. Additionally, the permit would include a condition so that ongoing earthwork at the site of any discovery would be prohibited until the resources have been evaluated by a certified professional.</p>				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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. (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-i) The nearest faults considered active by the California Geological Survey (formerly California Division of Mines & Geology) is the Concord fault, which is mapped approximately three and a half miles northeast of the site. No faults are mapped through the site and the risk of fault rupture is minimal.</p> <p>a-ii) According to Figure 10-4 (Estimated Seismic Ground Response) of the 2005-2020 County General Plan, the site consists of Hard Bedrock and is located in an area rated “lowest damage susceptibility.” Nevertheless, the risk of structural damage from ground shaking is regulated by the building codes and County Grading Ordinance. The applicant is required to comply with the requirements of the Building Inspection Division for the proposed installation of the playground equipment, new building, and any future construction.</p> <p>a-iii) According to Figure 10-5 (Estimated Liquefaction Potential) of the County General Plan, the site is located within a “generally moderate to low” liquefaction potential. The project includes the installation of playground equipment, new preschool building, and parking improvements. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>a-iv) According to Figure 10-6 Geological (Landslide) Hazards, the project site area is not located within an area identified with landslide deposit, reclaimed areas, or filled reclaimed areas. The site is relatively flat and, therefore there is no potential for a landslide.</p> <p>b-d) The soil in the area is defined as Hard Bedrock (Pre-Pliocene formations). There is no substantial grading or excavation proposed as part of the project. Additionally, the proposed construction of improvements would occur in an area that has previously been disturbed. Thus, the project is not located within an area where soil is unstable or expansive in nature. Additionally, implementation of the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p> <p>e) No septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. The site is currently served by public wastewater facilities operated by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District.</p>				
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board approved thresholds of significance for land development projects and plans (i.e., General Plans and Climate Action Plans). The BAAQMD’s proposal is a reflection of a California statewide mandate (AB 32) to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in year 2020 to the 1990 level. As a part of the GHG threshold criteria and based upon BAAQMD modeling, it was determined that various land uses, which may exceed a “screening size level,” would likely have GHG emissions that the BAAQMD deems significant.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to expand a childcare facility of up to 182 children within four buildings, totaling approximately 8,004-square-feet. In addition, the applicant is required to increase the number of off-street parking spaces. Based on the size of the facility, the project would not generate GHG emissions beyond the thresholds of significance based on BAAQMD’s threshold criteria.</p> <p>b) The project does not conflict with adopted policies pertaining to GHG emissions, and will not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for reducing emissions. The size of the facility for the proposed uses does not exceed beyond the threshold of significance.</p>				
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Source: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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. (Source: 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 4, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? (Source: 2, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-c) The project site is within a 1 mile radius of two schools; however, the proposed project will not require the use, routine transport, emission, or storage of hazardous materials, as it involves a childcare and preschool facility. The proposed use of the site for a childcare and preschool facility, as well as, the construction period for the project would not emit hazardous emissions or result in the storage of acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste.</p> <p>d) Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substance Site list maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the subject property is not identified as a hazardous materials site.</p> <p>e-f) The subject property is not located within an area covered by the Contra Costa Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Additionally, the subject property is not located within the vicinity of a known private airstrip or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport to the subject property is Buchanan Field Airport in Concord, which is approximately seven miles north of the property. Due to the subject property’s substantial distance from the existing airports within the County, the subject property will not create a safety hazard in relation to air traffic.</p> <p>g) The proposed project is to expand the childcare and preschool facility. The project proponent will add a new emergency access on the northeast corner of the site, however, there is no proposal to physically alter existing roadways or waterways that may be part of an existing emergency response or evacuation plan. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed and commented on the project. The agency comments submitted to the County indicate that proposed access to the property will be sufficient to meet applicable codes. Additionally, the proposed project does not include alterations to an existing communications network that may be used to communicate with people in the County in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>h) According to Figure 10-10 (Fire Hazard Areas) of the County’s 2005-2020 General Plan, the site is located within a “local responsibility area.” The surrounding area is a developed area consisting of a freeway, residential homes, a hospital, retail business, school and properties that lie within the City of Walnut Creek. There are no wildlands within the area of the project. Further, the project does not consist of development of structures that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 4, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: 4, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 2, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) Currently, there are three significant buildings on-site. All three buildings are currently used for the childcare and preschool facility. The project involves adding one building for a total of four. The site is currently serviced by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. The County's request for agency comments were sent to the District; however, no comments were provided by the District. The District controls and maintains the local public sewer in compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB).</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Implementation of the project may potentially increase the wastewater discharge from the restrooms due to the proposed uses. However, the increase would be a slight increase, thus the project has a low potential to result in a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p>				
<p>b) The subject property is located within the service area of and currently obtains water services from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The proposed improvements will not be utilizing wells or other methods that directly pull water from groundwater supplies. The applicant is required to comply with the Water District's requirements. Therefore, the proposed project will have no substantial impact on the water table, groundwater supplies, or groundwater recharge.</p>				
<p>c- d) The applicant is required to collect and convey all stormwater entering and/or originating on this property, without diversion and within an adequate storm drainage system, to an adequate natural water course having definable bed and banks, or to an existing adequate public storm drainage system which conveys the storm waters to an adequate natural watercourse, in accordance with Division 914 of the Ordinance Code. The applicant will tie into the existing drainage on-site and comply with the requirements mentioned above.</p>				
<p>e) The project involves parking area improvements, construction of a new 3,200-square-foot classroom, and installation of playground equipment; were minimal impervious surface is proposed. In compliance with Provision C.3 of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and the County's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014), the total new (or replaced) impervious surfacing proposed with this project will not exceed 10,000 square feet. Therefore, a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) submittal is not required. The project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</p>				
<p>f) The site is a developed area and the proposed uses will be located within the existing/proposed buildings. Additionally, the applicant is required to comply with all rules, regulations, and procedures of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Thus, the County has concluded that implementation of the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</p>				
<p>g-h) The site is located within Flood Zone B as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). There are three existing buildings on site and no housing is proposed as part of the project. The request for Agency Comments was sent to the Floodplain Technician of the Public Works Department, the response submitted by the technician indicated no comments.</p>				
<p>i) The site is not located near a levee or dam. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</p>				
<p>j) The project site is an inland site well removed from coastal areas that would be inundated by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community? (Source:1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) The site is currently zoned for residential uses. The proposed project to expand the existing childcare facility to a maximum of 182 children does not propose to divide an established community. In fact, the use is typical and/or needed within residential communities.</p> <p>b) The subject property has a General Plan Land Use designation of Single-Family Residential-Medium Density (SM) as determined by the County General Plan (2005-2020). Primary uses for the SM General Plan Land Use designation includes detached single-family homes and accessory structures. Secondary uses include home occupations, small residential care and childcare facilities, churches and places of worship, secondary dwelling units, and other uses and structures incidental to the primary uses. Therefore, the proposed project does not conflict with the applicable land use provisions of the County General Plan.</p> <p>The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential Zoning District (R-10), which allows for a home occupation, hospitals, churches and religious institutions and parochial and private schools, including nursery schools with the approval of a land use permit. The proposed uses of the site for a childcare and preschool facility are allowed, with the approval of a land use permit. The proposed new building would require work within the drip line of three (3) oak trees. As previously stated in the Biological Resources Section of this report, Chapter 816-6 (Tree Protection and Preservation) of the County Ordinance provides for the preservation of certain trees within the County. In accordance with the Ordinance, if the project is approved, then the applicant will be required to post a bond that would be used to purchase and plant replacements for the protected tree in the event that it is significantly damaged by construction activity. With the bond in place, the potential impact would be considered less-than-significant.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant is requesting approval of several variances to add three new parking spaces at the subject site for a total of fifteen. However, spaces #1, #2, #5 & #6 will encroach in the required yard setbacks. Staff has determined that the variance requests are justifiable as the siting of the existing improvements on the property limit the design and location of additional parking spaces. Thus, the addition of the three parking spaces is viewed by staff as an overall benefit. Additionally, the proposal does not include a 4-foot wide landscaping strip at the Willow Avenue parking lot, where one is required. Staff also supports this variance request due to space limitations at the site.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) The subject property is not located in the designated area covered by the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP).				
11. MINERAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (Source: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> No Impact				
a-b) Pursuant to Figure 8-4 (Mineral Resources Areas) of the County General Plan, the subject site is not located within an identified significant mineral resource area.				
12. NOISE – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
a-b) The proposed project and the daily operations are not the type of improvements and uses where the exposure of persons to excessive noise or ground borne vibration is generated. This development and operation use will not result in any long-term exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Contra Costa County General Plan or the County Code or applicable standards of other agencies.				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c) The proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise level due to the childcare and preschool services provided. The primary source of noise at the project site and surrounding area is vehicular traffic from Olympic Boulevard. Noise activity that will be generated by the children’s playground will be minimal. The playground will be placed at the rear of the proposed building and it will be limited to the hours of 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>d) Short-term noise levels would occur during the installation of the playground equipment, parking improvements and construction of the new preschool building. The project has the potential to expose some nearby residents to construction-related noise, as would be the case when routine construction is undertaken on other properties within the area. The County considers the impact of noise to be less-than-significant because the construction period is temporary. If approved, a condition will be included in the permit requiring standard measures that include restricting construction hours, and heavy equipment usage to certain hours.</p> <p>e-f) The subject property is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within two miles of any airport or known private airstrip.</p>				
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> No Impact				
<p>a) The proposed project is to expand a childcare and preschool facility. The proposed project does not involve the construction of new residences or businesses, and would not extend offsite infrastructure (roads, utility line, etc.). Thus, implementation of the project would neither directly nor indirectly induce population growth.</p> <p>b-c) The proposed project does not involve the demolition or conversion of existing housing units. Construction of replacement housing would not be necessary, and people would neither be temporarily nor permanently displaced as a result of the project</p>				
14. PUBLIC SERVICES – <i>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:</i>				
a) Fire Protection? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection? (Source: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (Source: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks? (Source: 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) The site is currently served by the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. The District has reviewed the project and provided their comments indicating that the applicant shall comply with the requirements of the 2010 California Fire Code and 2010 California Building Code. There is no substantial increase to the need for fire protection services. Therefore, there is a less-than-significant impact to the need for fire protection services</p> <p>b) The County General Plan’s standard regarding the amount of police protection required within the County is related to the respective population. The County Sheriff’s Department currently provides service to the site, and the proposed project would not substantially increase the need for police services. Therefore, there is a less-than-significant impact to the need for police services.</p> <p>c) Impacts to schools are usually caused by increases in population. Expansion of the childcare and preschool facility is not expected to induce population growth. Therefore, construction of new or expanded school facilities would not be required.</p> <p>d) The County General Plan requires that three acres of neighborhood parks be available for every 1,000 members of the population. The proposed project will not result in an increase in the County population. Thus, there will be no impact on the demand for parks within the County as a result of the project.</p> <p>e) Impact to other public facilities, such as hospitals and libraries are usually caused by increases in population. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to induce population growth. Therefore, no impacts to hospitals, libraries or other public facilities are anticipated.</p>				
15. RECREATION				
<p>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? (Source: 1)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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? (Source: 1)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: No Impact				
<p>a) Increased use of parks and other recreational facilities typically results from general population growth over time and from development of specific projects that increase the number of people in the immediate vicinity of such facilities. An example of the latter would be construction of an office building, where the resulting influx of office workers would be expected to contribute to the gradual decline or deterioration of a nearby park or other recreational facility.</p> <p>The area consists of several parks and recreational facilities and, as explained in Section XIII above, implementation of the proposed project would not induce population growth, meaning neither parks nor other recreational facilities would be impacted.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) The project is to establish a childcare use and a preschool facility, which would not necessitate the expansion of recreational facilities.				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1, 14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1, 2, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) The Growth Management Element of the County General Plan Policy 4-c requires traffic impact analysis for any project which is estimated to generate 100 or more AM or PM peak-hour trips based upon the trip generation rates as presented in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 6th Edition, 1997, or the most current published edition. The proposed project would not generate 100 or more peak hour trips (38 trips maximum anticipated) and therefore, a traffic impact report would not be required. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Study, dated June 14, 2012. The study reflects the total vehicle trips on a hourly basis for the days of April 24 through April 26, 2012. The study shows that vehicle trips are well distributed throughout the morning and early evening hours (less than 20 trips per hour), with a few trips scattered throughout the remainder of the day. Thus, to reiterate, the proposed project will not</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>generate 100 or more peak hour trips. The total new trips associated with this project are anticipated to be well distributed throughout the morning and evening hours and max out at approximately 38 trips an hour for the hours between 7:00 and 9:00 am. The remainder of the business day is anticipated to be less than 20 trips an hour.</p> <p>b) The Contra Costa County Transportation Authority implements the County’s Growth Management Program (GMP). The GMP requires that each jurisdiction prepare a traffic impact analysis for any project that generates 100 or more peak hour vehicle trips. Again, the proposed project would not generate 100 or more peak hour vehicle trips. Therefore, a traffic impact report would not be required.</p> <p>One of the key components in the Authority's Growth Management Program is the requirement that local jurisdictions engage in cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning. And one of the key components of this cooperative planning is the preparation of Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance. The Action Plans are intended to reduce cumulative regional traffic impacts of forecast development. As part of the Action Plan, each Regional Transportation Planning Committee identifies a system of Regional Routes, that is, those freeways and arterials that provide the main connections among Contra Costa's communities and to the surrounding region. The site is not identified as being located within a route of regional significance. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.</p> <p>c) No airports are located within the immediate vicinity. Implementation of the project would not impact the operations of any air traffic patterns</p> <p>d) One large drive through driveway currently exists along Olympic Boulevard and the other drive through driveway is accessed via Willow Avenue, which features a stop sign. There are no proposed increased hazards due to a design feature, as the ingress and egress to the property is established. Additionally, comments received from the Public Works Department do not indicate concerns with the existing driveways or traffic circulation.</p> <p>e) The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and provided the County with a letter indicating that the project proponent must provide uninterrupted fire access to within 150-feet of all exterior walls of the proposed building. As a result of those comments, the project applicant has revised the development plans to comply with the applicable fire regulations. Thus, a third emergency access driveway has been added to the project. Consequently, there are no elements of the proposed project that will result in inadequate emergency access.</p> <p>f) There is no potential for the proposed project to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed improvements would be limited to the site itself and would not alter the local infrastructure in a way that could hinder future establishment of public transportation. Clearly, there is nothing in the project’s design that would prevent the use of bicycles or other alternative modes of transportation.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) There are currently restroom facilities on-site. The proposed building will also have adequate restroom facilities within it. Sanitary services to the site are provided by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. The proposed project will not result in the need for an additional wastewater treatment system.</p> <p>b) As proposed, the project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.</p> <p>c) In compliance with Provision C.3 of the National Pollutant discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and the County's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (§1014), the total new (or replaced) impervious surfacing proposed with this project will not exceed 10,000-square-feet. Therefore, a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) submittal was not required. The project will not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of the existing facilities.</p> <p>d) The site is located within the service area of and currently receives water services from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The site is currently served by EBMUD. Therefore, no new water or expanded entitlements required for the project.</p> <p>e) The Central Contra County Sanitary District is the local wastewater service provider for the site. No comments were received from the District. Therefore, it appears that the District has adequate capacity to serve the site.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>f) The site is served by landfill facilities within Contra Costa County that comply with applicable codes and regulations related to solid waste disposal. The proposed project may result in a minimal increase in solid waste production due to the childcare and preschool services provided. The increased solid waste disposal demand can be accommodated by the existing landfill that services the site. Therefore, implementation of the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>g) Implementation of the proposed project would slightly increase the quantity of solid waste produced on-site. The property owner is required to dispose of solid waste generated from normal business use to comply with federal, state, and local regulations.</p>				
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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.)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) As explained throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment. The proposed project is to expand a childcare and preschool facility, with minimal construction and improvements. Based on the evidence in the record, the staff finds that the project would substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.</p> <p>b) The site is developed and the site is located with a residential area. The proposed project is to expand the preschool capacity by constructing a proposed 3,200-square-foot classroom and playground. The County has determined that no cumulatively considerable environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>c) The proposed project is to expand a childcare and preschool located at the subject site. Nothing in the record indicates that the project has the potential to cause substantial adverse effect on humans.</p>				

SOURCES

- 1) Project Application submitted on January 27, 2012, Revised Plans dated June 15, 2012, and site visit
- 2) Contra Costa County General Plan
- 3) Contra Costa County Ordinance (Titles 8 & 9)
- 4) Accela Program (Geographic Information Systems)
- 5) 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf>
- 6) Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines
http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_June%202010.ashx
- 7) California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control: Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
- 8) Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility (ALUC) Plan December 2000
- 9) Project Comments from Building Inspection Division dated February 7, 2012
- 10) Project Comments from Contra Costa County Fire Protection District dated February 16, 2012
- 11) Project Comments from Public Works Department – Flood Plain Technician dated February 16, 2012
- 12) Project Comments from East Bay Municipal Utility District dated February 15, 2012
- 13) Project Comments from Public Works Department dated February 21, 2012
- 14) Contra Costa Transportation Authority Website <http://ccta.net/EN/main/planning.html>