

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Expert Tree Service
County File #LP11-2071
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 (925) 674-7801
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
30 Muir Road
Martinez, CA 94553
4. **Project Location:** The subject property is a 4.04-acre parcel located in the Orinda area. The site is addressed as 150 Old Tunnel Road and is located immediately south of the Fish Ranch Road/Old Tunnel Road intersection.
APN: #273-171-036
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Brian Gates
P.O. Box 1256
Orinda, CA 94563
6. **General Plan Designation:** The subject property is located within the Agricultural Lands (AL) General Plan Land Use designation.
7. **Zoning:** The project site is located within the General Agricultural (A-2) zoning district.
8. **Background:** The subject property has a long history of being used as a staging area for various construction companies. During the first boring of the Caldecott Tunnel in the late 1930's, the County used the property as a staging area for its construction equipment during that project. Since that point, the property has changed ownership several times. The current owner acquired the property in 2008; however, the Expert Tree Service has operated at the site since 1987 under different family ownership. The Expert Tree Service collects green materials (e.g., trees) from residential, commercial, as well as, governmental properties and recycles 99% of the incoming material. The recycled material is either sold to contractors for use in new construction projects (timber) or chipped into smaller pieces of wood and sold to a local co-generation energy plant. The facility has now been in operation at the site for approximately 25 years.

The current owner is seeking approval of a land use permit to legalize the operation of the business at the site, as well as, to obtain a variance to the minimum lot size (3.41-acres proposed, 5-acres required minimum). This variance would allow the property owner to proceed with a lot line adjustment. The intent of the lot line adjustment is to locate the entire business on one single property. Currently the parking lot of the Expert Tress Service business has encroached onto the adjacent land owned by the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). As a result, the EBRPD Board of Directors has agreed to a transfer of land with Expert Tree Service. This transfer will grant EBRPD a portion of the undisturbed land owned by Expert Tree Service for the disturbed District's land. The transfer will be executed through the above mentioned lot line adjustment.

There are a total of five employees associated with the Expert Tree Service proposal. The company operates its administrative portion of the business at an office located in the city of

Orinda. The business owner is also present at the 150 Old Tunnel Road facility as needed during business hours, which are 7:30 AM through 4:30 PM, Monday through Friday and on weekends in emergency cases. The site is not open to the general public.

9. Description of Project: As mentioned above, the applicant seeks approval of a land use permit to legalize the existing Expert Tree Service green waste recycling facility. The application includes several variances as follows:

- 3.41-acres proposed, 5-acres required minimum for a lot line adjustment (to be processed administratively),
- dirt/gravel parking lot proposed, paved parking lot required,
- no parking space markings provided, strips required,
- no wheel stops provided, wheel stops required,
- 4-foot side yard proposed, 20-foot side yard required minimum for an existing water tank.

The project does not include any new buildings, grading or tree removal. The site does host several wireless telecommunication facilities on the northwestern portion of the property which are not affected by this application. The business office for the Expert Tree Service company is located off-site within the Orinda area.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding Land Use: The subject property is located just east of the Caldecott tunnel. This area is within the Highway 24 scenic corridor as designated by the 2005-2020 Contra Costa County General Plan. The site is located outside of the Urban Limit Line, and is part of a larger grouping of agricultural properties located near the Alameda/Contra Costa County Line (approximately twelve properties). The majority of land immediately surrounding these agricultural properties is heavily forested and zoned Water Shed (WS).

Existing Site Conditions: The subject property is a 4.04-acre parcel located just east of the Fish Ranch/Old Tunnel Road intersection. The recycling facility is the primary use at the property and occupies approximately 1.5-acres in the central portion of the parcel. There are several wireless telecommunications facilities at the northwestern edge of the site as well. The equipment associated with the wireless providers includes equipment shelters and antennas mounted on support poles.

The following improvements are associated with the Expert Tree Service business and currently exist at the site. Access to the facility is provided by a driveway off of Old Tunnel Road, a large locked metal gate limits vehicular access to the site, dirt and gravel parking areas are located in several different locations on the property and are connected by internal driveways. Six storage containers serve as work and storage space. A water storage tank located at the southeastern edge of the property provides fire suppression. A crane, excavator, trailers (to transport material), a dump-truck and various chippers are permanently located at the property and used to collect and process the incoming green material. The only material stored at the site is firewood that is being seasoned and logs waiting to be shipped. The drainage for the property generally flows in an east to west direction. Thus, there is a large drainage ditch located at the northern portion of the site which effectively bisects the property. Numerous mature trees are scattered about the site.

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 Health Services Department
- Contra Costa County Public Works Department
- Moraga-Orinda Contra Costa County Fire Protection 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 - 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? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References:1, 4, 12)	<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? (Reference:1, 4, 12)	<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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant With Mitigation				
<p>a) Figure 5-4 (Scenic Routes Plan) of the County 2005–2020 General Plan indicates that Highway 24 is a County scenic highway. The subject property has steep terrain and is visible to passersby utilizing the westbound traffic lanes. The proposal includes legalizing the recycling activities at the site. Currently, Expert Tree Service charges its customers a fee to remove their unwanted or normally required tree trimmings from their properties. The material is transported by the company’s trucks to the wood material staging area at an elevation of approximately 972-feet. The wooden material is then either re-used by contractors as timber for construction projects or chipped into smaller pieces to be sold to a local co-generation plant. The trucks associated with this process are parked in several areas of the property. As mentioned above, one area is at an elevation of 972-feet and the other is at an elevation of 1002 to 1006-feet. However, there is another higher parking and storage area that is more visually prominent at an elevation of 1005-1014 feet. It is at this area where the machinery associated with this proposal is most visible to the surrounding area. Thus, the following mitigation measure is intended to reduce the potential visual impacts associated with parking or storing of residual materials in that location.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Mitigation for revised parking and storage plan:</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">AES-1: The property owner shall be limited to parking of vehicles and storing of equipment up to the 1006-foot level of the property. The graded area above the 1006-foot elevation level at the southern edge of the property shall not be utilized for parking or storage. If the owner chooses to pursue this area as a storage or parking site, the property owner shall submit a landscape screening plan for the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator which will completely screen the equipment/vehicles from view from the surrounding area.</p> <p>As previously mentioned in Surrounding Land Use and Settings section above, the recycling facility currently utilizes several cargo containers as storage and office space. Additionally, there is a wooden/steel shop that has been constructed at the western portion of the site. These structures are located at an elevation of 971-feet; however, sufficient vegetative screening exists in that area to camouflage the majority of the structures from view of the public. Staff has determined, that portion of the project is not expected to negatively impact the scenic corridor, thus, does not merit additional landscaping mitigation.</p> <p>To reiterate, the primary concern with regards to aesthetics is due to the fact the existing</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>parking lot, staging of vehicles and other materials are very visible at their current high elevation. With the above mitigation measure, the potential impacts to the aesthetics of the area will be reduced to less than significant levels.</p> <p>b) The subject property is located within an area of the County that is hilly with extreme topographical variation. The subject property has historically been used for staging of construction equipment, thus, the already graded areas are devoid of trees, rock outcroppings or historical buildings. There is no new development proposed to occur within the subject property as a result of this application. Thus, there will be no damage to any natural resources in the immediate area.</p> <p>c-d)As previously mentioned, the County does not support the parking of vehicles or storing of materials above the 1006-foot elevation level without appropriate vegetative screening. With respect to lighting, the facility has operated at the site for approximately 25 years with approximately four overhead lights. Thus, the lighting required is currently established and has not been determined to be a nuisance. Additionally, the hours of operation and type of activity being conducted at the site do not require exceedingly tall or overly bright lighting. Thus, the project is expected to have a less than significant effect with respect to lighting.</p>				
<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>				
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? (References: 1, 3, 5, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (References: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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))? (References: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (References: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<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
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) Pursuant to the 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map maintained by the California Department of Conservation, the subject property is considered as Urban and Built-up land. Thus, the project will not be removing prime agricultural lands from the County or State of California.</p> <p>b) The subject property is located within a General Agricultural (A-2) zoning district. The A-2 zoning district allows the establishment of recycling facilities with the approval of a land use permit. There is also no evidence in the record indicating that the subject property is encumbered with a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>c-d) The legalization of the existing recycling facility is allowable with a land use permit. Additionally, no trees are proposed to be removed as part of the project. Therefore, there is no potential for conflict with any existing zoning for forest land or timberland. It should also be noted that the facility recycles wood products, potentially reducing the demand for wood and its attendant market pressure to clear forest and timber land.</p> <p>e) The subject property is located within a larger grouping of agricultural properties. However, the County's agricultural core zoning district is located nearly 50 miles to the east of the site. The proposed lot line adjustment which is necessary to locate the entire business on one parcel will not result in any loss to agricultural resources. As stated previously in this report, the subject property has been used as a recycling facility for nearly 25 years. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the conversion of prime farmland to a non-agricultural use.</p>				
3. AIR QUALITY – <i>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.</i>				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Reference: 1, 4, 7, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Reference: 1, 7, 13)	<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)? (Reference: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Reference: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Reference: 1, 4, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-c) The proposed project consists of the legalization of an existing recycling facility (greenwaste) which has been in operation at the subject property for approximately 25 years. The project will allow the property owner to essentially locate the entire business on one single property. Currently, a minor portion of the facility's parking space is encroaching on land owned by the</p>				

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25"

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>East Bay Regional Park District. Nevertheless, the site is not used for manufacturing products that requires significant amounts of emissions. However, the project would be considered to have a significant effect on the environment if its operation or construction would generate emissions in excess of thresholds established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Guidelines (BAAQMD 2011). More specifically, the project would result in a significant air quality impact if it would cause a net increase in pollutant emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), or respirable particulate matter (PM-10). With that understanding, it is not expected that the operation of the existing recycling facility would exceed emissions at the site, above that of the threshold limits.</p> <p>According to figure 3-3 of the California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines, Light Industrial activities which incorporate 72-acres and/or 1,249 employees could potentially exceed the listed criteria pollutant thresholds. This proposal incorporates less than 5-acres and a total of 5 employees which is significantly less than the generally accepted threshold limits. Additionally, the facility is generates 6-12 truck trips a day to and from the facility (pick-up and drop-off); therefore, it is expected that the proposed project will have less than significant impacts to air quality as a result of its operation.</p> <p>c-d)The proposal does not include any compostable materials that may generate objectionable odors, nor does the processing of the green material cause the release of odors as a result of the use of machinery (e.g. chippers) at levels detectable off-site. The site is located in a sparsely populated area of the County with the nearest residential development being approximately, ½-mile up-wind of the project site. Thus, given the materials being processed and nature of the operation, the proposal is not expected to create odors on the scale that merit mitigation.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? (References: 1, 4, 8, 9, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 4, 8, 9, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 3, 12)	<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) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (References:1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) The site is located within the Siesta Valley Significant Ecological Area as identified in the Contra Costa County General Plan. However, there are no proposed changes or physical disturbances to the site as a result of this project. Additionally, there are no new uses proposed other than what has been conducted at the site for the past 25 years.</p> <p>b-f)The existing recycling facility is located within an agricultural property. The legalization of the operation does not involve direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of an existing wetland. The proposed activities have no potential for impacting fish or other aquatic wildlife since there are no bodies of water on or near the subject property. Thus, there is a minimal potential for disturbing habitat, corridors for migratory wildlife, or the use of a wildlife nursery. The proposed project will occur in previously disturbed areas of the parcel, thus there is no conflict with the County's Tree Protection and Preservation ordinance.</p> <p>The subject property is not located within the inventory area for the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Program/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with provisions of the ECCC HCP/NCCP.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Reference: 1, 4, 12)	<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? (References: 1, 4, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (References: 1, 4, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Reference: 1, 4, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a) The subject property is directly east of the Caldecott Tunnel which is recorded as being a historical structure. However, according to the record, the subject site was used as a staging area during the construction of that historical site. Thus, no negative impacts to the historical impacts are anticipated as a result of the continued use of the subject property as a recycling facility. Nevertheless, this project does not include any expansion other than what currently exists at the site.</p> <p>b-d)The business has been established at the property for approximately 25 years within the</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>disturbed area of the site. Due to the site's prior ground disturbance, there is minimal potential for disturbance of any archaeological, paleontological, or geological resources that may not be discovered. Additionally, 100-percent of the site has undergone two separate archeological surveys which determined the property is devoid of cultural artifacts of significance, thus there is a very low potential that the legalization of the existing facility would result in a disturbance of any undiscovered human remains.</p>				
6. 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. (References: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (References: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides? (References: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation				
a) The San Francisco Bay Area is a region of high seismic activity where strong seismic shaking could occur in the event of a moderate or severe earthquake. The project site is neither located along a known earthquake fault nor within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. Nevertheless, the project is required to comply with the California Uniform Building Code for design and construction to mitigate the affects of seismic shaking. The County General Plan identifies the area as having low potential for liquefaction.				
b) The proposed project consists of the legalization of a recycling facility. No portion of the proposed use or its operational phase will create significant impacts to the amount of rainfall, slope, vegetation, wind patterns, or path of a natural watercourse at the site. Therefore, the proposed project has minimal potential for causing substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.				
c) Figure 10-1 (generalized Geology of Contra Costa County) of the Contra Costa County General				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Plan (2005 – 2020) identifies the subject property as being located within a Tertiary Formation. This geologic unit is characterized as being associated with hard marine sandstone and shale overlain by soft non-marine units. The structures and equipment associated with the proposed project currently exist at the site; however, they do require building permits to remain in their present locations. Thus, it is expected that the permitting of these structures will cause minimal ground disturbance, and should not cause any significant impacts that would lead to soil instability.</p> <p>d) Staff is unaware of any specific soils studies done at the subject site to determine the existence of expansive soils. For each un-permitted structure, the County Building Inspection Division will require that the proposed buildings be engineered according to building code standards. The engineering of the proposed structures pursuant to the applicable building code will ensure that any risks to life or property are reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>e) No sanitary services are proposed or allowed at the subject property, due to the fact that the site is within a protected water shed area. However, the application submittals associated with the project refer to a toilet located at the property. According to the property owner, he has voluntarily capped this septic system. Nevertheless, the project proponent must comply with all pertinent regulations as set forth by the County Department of Health Services in order to cap the septic system legally. Thus, the following mitigation is intended to ensure that the referenced septic system has been decommissioned according to acceptable standards.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Mitigation for Decommissioning of Septic System on the Subject Property:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">GEO-1: Within 60-days of the approval date of this permit, the property owner shall submit evidence for the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator that the capping of the septic system at the subject property has been accomplished in accord with all applicable codes and regulations administered by the County Environmental Health Department.</p>				
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Reference: 1, 7, 13)	<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? (Reference: 1, 7, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-b) As stated throughout this report, the existing recycling facility will require several smaller pieces of machinery and approximately 6-12 vehicular trips a day to operate. There are no chemical processes or activities taking place at the site that would generate GHG emissions at a scale that would impact the environment. According to the County's inventory, emissions from energy consumed by the proposed project would not exceed the annual emissions threshold for compliance. A project of this scope does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and would have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – <i>Would the project:</i>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Reference: 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? (Reference: 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? (Reference: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. (Reference: 1, 10)	<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? (Reference: 3, 11)	<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? (Reference: 3, 11)	<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? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
a) The facility requires the storage of less than 50 gallons of gasoline on-site for chainsaws and various small pieces of machinery. The majority of gasoline consumption related to this facility is attributed to the business's vehicles transporting green waste to and from the site. Thus, there is no need to store diesel or gasoline in quantities that would warrant additional regulation. Additionally, there are no construction-related manufacturing and/or chemical processing activities that take place at the project site. Therefore, there is no need for the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from the facility.				
b) The subject recycling facility is only used for the receiving and processing of green waste. As stated in subsection "a" above, no substantial amounts of hazardous materials are used, stored, or routinely transported to the subject property. Based on the activities that take place at the property and the lack of routine activities that involve hazardous materials, there is no evidence in the record to suggest that the continued operation of the business would result in a significant hazard due to the accidental release of hazardous materials.				
c) There are no significant amounts of hazardous materials that will be used or stored at the project site. Additionally, there is no school located within one-quarter mile of the subject				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
property.				
d) Pursuant to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the subject property is not a hazardous materials site.				
e-f) The subject property is not located within the safety zone of any airport in the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, thus, the project is not expected to place the employees of the recycling facility or an airport in a hazardous situation.				
g) The existing recycling facility is located completely out of the public right-of-way. Therefore, the continued operation of the business will not interfere with any roadways/waterways that may be part of an emergency response or evacuation plan. Additionally, the proposed project will not consist of the alteration or removal of any existing structures or mediums of communication that may be part of an existing emergency response or evacuation plan.				
h) There is no evidence in the record to suggest that the facility poses a significant wildfire risk. The proposed project does not consist of changes to the location, or manner in which the existing facility is operated. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the continued use of the recycling facility will create a significant risk for wildfire.				
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Reference: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (Reference: 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? (References: 1)	<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? (References: 1)	<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? (Reference: 1)	<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
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (References: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<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? (References: 1, 3, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Reference: 1, 3, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation				
<p>a) The recycling facility is used for the receiving and processing of green waste. There are no construction related or manufacturing activities taking place at the site that would directly impact, nor produce any waste or byproduct that would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Nevertheless, the site is within a designated water shed and to ensure that neither the existing capped septic system or business activities degrade the water quality of the area, the following mitigation has been added:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HYD -1: Within 60 days of the approval of this land use permit request, the property owner shall provide written proof for the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator that the Expert Tree Service has successfully registered with the Environmental Health Department.</p> <p>b) The subject business has existed at the site for approximately 25 years, and there is no evidence to indicate that the operation of the facility has depleted groundwater supplies or impeded recharge. Since the proposed project will not alter the manner in which the facility is operated, there is no potential for the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with recharge.</p> <p>c-e)The proposed facility is located entirely within the previously disturbed area of the property. The shop, storage containers and parking lot will comprise of less than 10,000-square-feet of impervious surface. A Storm Water Control Plan (SWCP) will not be required due to that fact. Any alterations to the existing drainage pattern caused by the proposed project will also require the review and approval of the County Building Inspection Division prior to construction.</p> <p>f) As mentioned above, the subject property is within the San Pablo Creek Water Shed area. Therefore, no septic systems are allowed to be installed or operated within this area. Thus, the following mitigation is intended to ensure that the continued operation of the Expert Tree Service company does not negatively affect the quality of the water run-off that feeds the San Pablo Creek Water Shed.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HYD -2: No septic systems shall be allowed within the subject property. At the discretion of the County Environmental Health Department, a portable toilet may be allowed. Within 60-days from the effective approval date of this project, the applicant shall provide evidence for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator that all required permits have been obtained from the County</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Environmental Health Department.				
g-j)The proposed facility does not consist of the removal or modification of any existing levee or dam, and all structures will be located on a portion of the property which is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.				
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? (References: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<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? (Reference: 1, 3, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>SUMMARY:</u> Less Than Significant With Mitigation</p> <p>a) The recycling facility has operated at the subject site for approximately 25 years, and is operating within the already disturbed area of the site. The surrounding properties are all agricultural in nature. Additionally, no public sanitary services are present at the site or surrounding area. Thus, this project has very little potential for dividing a community now or in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>b) The subject property is located within the A-2 General Agricultural zoning district and Agricultural Land General Plan land use designation. Recycling facilities are permitted within the General Agricultural zoning district with the approval of a land use permit. Additionally, the project is supported by the 2005-2020 County General Plan, Solid Waste Management Goal, 7-AH which states: “To divert (waste) as much as feasible from landfills through recovery and recycling”. However, the facility’s footprint (parking) has encroached onto the parcel to the south. Therefore, the property owner and East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD - owners of the southern parcel) have entered into an agreement which if executed will result in a minor lot line adjustment between the two parcels. According to the lot line adjustment exhibits (lot line adjustment to be processed administratively); the owner of 150 Old Tunnel Road will exchange 27,180-square-feet of disturbed land for 54,570-square-feet of land in its natural state. That undisturbed land is covered by mature trees and will be incorporated into the Sibley Volcanic Regional Preserve which is owned by EBRPD. As mentioned in Section 9 above, this application includes a variance to the required minimum lot size (3.41-acres proposed, 5-acres minimum). This variance request is being supported by staff due to the fact; the preservation of undisturbed land is viewed as a benefit to the County as a whole.</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant is requesting several variances to the requirements of the off-street parking ordinance as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dirt/gravel parking lot proposed, paved parking lot required, 				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no parking space markings provided, strips required, • no wheel stops provided, wheel stops required, <p>County staff is supporting the requested off-street parking variances due to the lack of public accessibility to the site and the nature of the business (wood recycling). There are no activities proposed on site which would require an impervious surface to protect water quality. The site is within the San Pablo Creek watershed, thus allowing the historical drainage patterns to persist will not divert rainwater run-off from that watershed system.</p> <p>The applicant is also requesting a 4-foot side yard proposed, where a 20-foot side yard is required for an existing water tank. County staff is not supporting this variance as the required findings are not able to be met. The water storage tank can be relocated to an area outside of the required side yard setback and remain at an elevation which allows for sufficient functionality (gravity activated).</p> <p>c) The subject property is not located within the inventory area for the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Program/Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with provisions of the ECCC HCP/NCCP.</p>				
11. 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? (Reference:1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (Reference: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
a-b)According to Figure 8-4 (Mineral resources) of the Contra Costa County General Plan, the subject property is not located within an area identified as a significant mineral resource area. Additionally, staff is unaware of any prior studies done at the subject property that indicates the presence of mineral resources at the subject property.				
12. NOISE – Would the project:				
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? (Reference: 1, 4)	<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 ground borne noise levels? (Reference: 1, 4)	<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? (Reference: 1)	<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
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Reference: 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? (References: 3, 4, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (References: 3, 4, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-b) The recycling facility will continue to use the equipment present at the site. There will be no additional pieces of equipment used at the site as a result of this application. The existing equipment may generate ground borne vibration and noise; however, the general noise levels are not expected to exceed those permitted by the County General Plan. Additionally, the primary noise source in the area is Highway 24, which is within 100-feet of the subject site. Thus, the noise related to this project is less than significant given its environmental setting.</p> <p>c-d) The facility has existed at the subject property for approximately 25 years. The proposed project only consists of granting a land use permit to legalize the continued operation of the facility at the site. Additionally, the hours of operation will remain the same as a result of this project. Therefore, the permitting of the facility will not significantly increase ambient noise levels at the site.</p> <p>e-f) The subject property is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, no impacts are expected with respect to excessive noise levels.</p>				
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
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)? (Reference: 1, 3)	<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? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<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? (Reference: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: No Impact				
<p>a-c) The proposed project consists of legalizing an existing recycling facility on an agricultural property. The project will increase the reliability (capacity) of this type of service in the area, but this project is not of a type or capacity that would induce substantial population growth in the area. The facility does not require the displacement of people or housing in any manner, and thus will not require the construction of replacement housing.</p>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? (References: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities? (Reference: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
<p>a-e) The proposed project consists of permitting the continued operation of a recycling facility. There is no proposal to alter the manner in which the facility is operated. Therefore, there is no element of the project that will alter existing, or create a demand for expanded or new public service facilities and infrastructure. Furthermore, the applicant must meet the requirements of the Moraga-Orinda Fire Protection District and has already installed a water storage tank at the site. The capacity of that tank will be evaluated by the Fire Department to ensure it is sufficient to fight any potential fire that may occur at the site. Thus, no mitigations are required to compensate for the proposed project with respect to public services.</p>				
15. 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? (Resource: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Resource: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: No Impact				
<p>a-b)The County General Plan bases the need for parks and other recreational facilities on the number of people that live within the County. The proposed project consists of granting a land use permit for the continued use of an existing recycling facility. There is no proposal to alter the location or manner in which the existing business is operated; and thus there is no potential for impacting any existing recreational facilities. Additionally, the proposed project will not induce a population increase within the County, which could potentially require the need for new or expanded recreational facilities. In fact the proposed land swap with the EBRPD is viewed as a beneficial impact. The District will benefit by trading the disturbed portion of its property with the facility's undisturbed land.</p>				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – <i>Would the project:</i>				

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in general policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. (Resources: 1, 3, 4)	<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. (Resource: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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? (Resources: 1, 3, 4, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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)? (Resource: 1, 3, 4, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Resource: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternate transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Resources: 1, 3, 4, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUMMARY: Less Than Significant Impact				
a-f) The proposed project consists of granting a land use permit for the continued use of an existing recycling facility. There is no proposal to alter the location or manner in which the facility is currently being operated. Approximately 6-12 truck trips per day are anticipated as a result of the recycling activities. However, that relatively low amount of vehicles trips does not merit mitigation. Thus, there will be minimal impacts to traffic, roadways, congestion management, air traffic, emergency access, or public transportation within the County or specific area. Additionally, as mentioned above the facility will utilize several dirt parking lots and internal driveways. Due to the size of the property, staff does not anticipate any conflicts with the proposed parking plan or internal circulation of the property.				
17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Resource: 1, 12)	<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? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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? (Resource: 1)	<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
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Resource: 1)	<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? (Resource: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Resource: 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? (Resource: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
SUMMARY: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation				
<p>a-b)The existing facility is not allowed to install wastewater services due to the property being within a protected watershed area. As stated previously in this study, the office which serves this operation is located in Downtown Orinda. Workers receive their assignments and use the facilities at that location prior to picking up the necessary equipment at the 150 Old Tunnel Road site and proceeding with their days assignments. Therefore, given that employees do not spend an appreciable amount of time at the subject location, there is no need for wastewater services at this location.</p> <p>c-e) There is no proposal to alter the location or method of operation for the business at the site. Therefore, there will be no element of the proposed project that will increase the demand for stormwater drainage facilities, water supplies, or wastewater treatment services at the site.</p> <p>f) The existing recycling facility reduces the overall amount of waste that is taken to local landfills. The proposed project is intended to legalize the business which has operated at the site for approximately 25 years. Therefore, the capacity of the local landfills will benefit from the existing and proposed project.</p> <p>g) As mentioned in the Hydrology Section of this document, the property owner has indicated that he has voluntarily capped an existing septic system at the subject property. However, the capping of that septic system is regulated by the Department of Environmental Health. Thus, to ensure that no impacts to the hydrology of the area, the following mitigations are added to the project:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">UTI – 1: Within 60-days from the effective date of the land use permit, the property owner shall submit evidence for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator that the capping of the existing septic system has been done in accord with the regulations as administered by the Environmental Health Department.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">UTI – 2: No septic systems shall be allowed within the subject property. At the discretion of the Department of the Environmental Health Department, a portable toilet may be allowed. Within 60-days from the effective approval date of this project, the applicant shall provide evidence for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator, that all required permits have been obtained from the Environmental Health Department.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUMMARY: Less Than Significant With Mitigation

- a) The proposed project consists of granting a land use permit for the legalization of the recycling facility at the subject site. Although potentially significant impacts have been identified in several areas, the adoption and implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will reduce those potential impacts to less than significant levels.
- b) At the time this initial study was drafted, there were no concurrent project proposals for the subject property that would have a cumulative considerable impact in connection with this recycling facility. There may be additional development proposed on the subject property at a future time. However, any subsequent development of the subject property would be subject to review under the guidelines of CEQA.
- c) The proposed facility will eliminate green waste from entering local landfills. As of the date of this initial study, staff is unaware of any studies or other reports that have been issued that indicate an unavoidable hazard to humans is created by the type of activities being conducted at the site. However, due to the fact that the site is located within a protected water shed, there is a potential to have an impact on geology, hydrology and utilities. The already identified mitigations within those areas will ensure the project will have a less than significant impact on the environment.

REFERENCES

- 1) Project Plans and Application
- 2) Contra Costa County Ordinance (Title 8)
- 3) Contra Costa County Geographic Information Systems Data Layers
- 4) Contra Costa County General Plan (2005 - 2020)
- 5) 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map (website)
<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/con08.pdf>
- 6) California Public Resources Code (website)
<http://law.justia.com/codes/california/2005/prc.html>
- 7) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines
- 8) California Department of Fish & Game (website)
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/>
- 9) United States Fish and Wildlife Service (website)
<http://www.fws.gov/>
- 10) Hazardous Waste and Materials Site List (Cortese List)
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
- 11) Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (December 13, 2000)
- 12) Agency Comments
- 13) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (May 2011). <http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/ceqa/index.htm>

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) County Parcel Page
- 2) Printout of Subject Property and Surrounding Zoning Districts
- 3) Printout of Subject Property and Surrounding General Plan Designations
- 4) Aerial View of Subject Property and Vicinity
- 5) Project Plans