

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an assessment of the potentially significant environmental effects from the adoption and implementation of the proposed Montreux Residential Subdivision project. The Executive Summary is intended to provide the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public with a clear, simple, and concise description of the proposed project and its potential significant environmental impacts.

The *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* (Section 15123) requires that a summary be included in an EIR that identifies all major conclusions, identifies each significant effect, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved. These issues include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. All of the requirements of an EIR summary are addressed in the sections below.

PROJECT LOCATION

The majority of the project site is located in Contra Costa County adjacent to the southern city limit of the City of Pittsburg, within the City of Pittsburg Urban Limit Line and within the City's sphere of influence. The project site is approximately 3 miles from downtown Pittsburg. State Route 4 provides regional access to the project site. The approximately 165-acre project site (which includes a 148.3-acre "main project site" and 16.8-acre portion of an "off-site parcel") lies on the west side of Kirker Pass Road approximately 1 mile south of Buchanan Road. The main project site is located outside the City limits while the off-site parcel is located within the City limits. The site is bordered by residential uses to the north and open space to the east, south, and west. The main project site includes Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 089-020-009, -011, -014, and -015. The project would also affect portions of an off-site parcel, APN 089-010-010.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Montreux Residential Subdivision project consists of: (1) a request for rezoning of the main project site from its current pre-zoning designation of HPD (Hillside Planned Development) to RS-6 (Single-Family Residential 6,000 square feet [sf] minimum lots sizes) pre-zoning, which would be consistent with the existing general plan designation of Low Density Residential; (2) a request for approval of a Vesting Tentative Map (Subdivision No. 8279) and preliminary grading plan for 356 single-family homes with lots averaging approximately 7,668 sq. ft. in size; (3) annexation of the main project site into the City of Pittsburg, Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) Service Area (including inclusion into the Central Valley Project), and the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) Service Area; and (4) approval of a Development Agreement vesting the entitlements for an extended term of project approval. Overall, approximately 77 acres of the main project site would be devoted to residential uses and the remaining 71 acres would be set aside for open space. The average residential density on the main project site would be 2.4 units per acre.

The proposed project would also include a partially buried water tank at the top of the hill on the northern boundary of the main project site (Parcel A), a greenwall on the southern approximate 20 percent of the main project site (Parcel B), two stormwater retention basins on the eastern portion of the main project site (Parcels C and D), and a small open space area in the northeastern corner of the main project site (Parcel E). In addition, an off-site stormwater retention basin would be constructed to serve the project and would be located on the off-site parcel to the northwest of the main project site.

PURPOSE AND NEED/OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Section 15124(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that the project description in an EIR include “a statement of the objectives sought by the project,” which should include “the underlying purpose of the project.” The objectives of the project are to:

- provide additional moderate income housing opportunities within the community, consistent with General Plan goals, through development of a high end, high quality single-family detached subdivision with large lots; and
- conserve open space by creating a “greenwall” (defined as open space with no water or sewer services passing through) on the southern 20 percent of the main project site.

TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

To determine which environmental topics should be addressed in the EIR, the City of Pittsburg circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in March 2013 in order to receive input from interested public agencies and private parties. A copy of that NOP is presented in **Appendix 1.0** of this Draft EIR. Based on comments received in response to the NOP, this Draft EIR addresses the following environmental topics in depth:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED/AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This Draft EIR addresses environmental issues associated with the proposed project that are known to the lead agency, or were raised by other public agencies or interested parties during the EIR scoping process. All scoping comments received have been summarized and discussed in **Appendix 1.0** of this Draft EIR. Some of the key known issues to be resolved include the following:

- Consistency of the project with goals and objectives in the City's General Plan governing hillside development;
- Visual alteration to the project site and the project's effects on existing views;
- Consistency of the proposed project with the goals and objectives of plans addressing greenhouse gas emissions;
- The project's impacts on wildlife and wetlands on the project site;
- The ability of the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to serve the project site; and
- The increase in traffic on local roadways near the project site.

ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an environmental impact report describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and reduce the degree of environmental impact. Consistent with this requirement, a reasonable range of alternatives was evaluated that could feasibly avoid or lessen significant environmental impacts

associated with the proposed project. **Chapter 6.0, Alternatives**, provides an analysis of alternatives as compared to the proposed project. Alternatives identified include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No Development.** Under this ‘no development’ alternative, no grading or construction would occur on the project site and the present use of the site for grazing would likely continue until a new development application is submitted and approved.
- **Alternative 2: Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations.** The Pittsburg Zoning Code designates the main project site for Hillside Planned Development (HPD) and the base residential density allowed under the HPD designation is determined in accordance with the average, natural ground slope of the land. The project site has an average slope density of approximately 33 percent across the whole site; therefore, the HPD designation would allow a density of up to 1.2 units per acre, or no more than 178 residential units for the site, which is 50 percent less than the 356 single-family homes under the proposed project.
- **Alternative 3: Reduced Density.** In an attempt to reduce the overall environmental impacts of the proposed project, a reduced density alternative was developed. Under this alternative, density would be limited to 75 percent of the proposed project, or no more than 267 residential units for the site.
- **Alternative 4: Ridgeline Preservation.** This alternative would preserve the ridgeline along the northeast edge of the main project site in order to lessen the impacts to views of the main project site, as seen from Kirker Pass Road. Under this alternative, 25 units currently planned in the northeastern corner of the main project site would be eliminated. Overall, this alternative would construct 331 residential units, or 93 percent of the units planned under the proposed project.

All of the alternatives, except for the No Project/No Development alternative, would still include a partially buried water tank at the top of the hill on the northern boundary of the main project site (Parcel A), a greenwall on the southern approximate 20 percent of the main project site (Parcel B), two stormwater retention basins on the eastern portion of the main project site (Parcels C and D), and a small open space area in the northeast corner of the main project site (Parcel E). Only Alternative 4 would require construction of the off-site stormwater retention basin.

2.8 IMPACT SUMMARY

A detailed discussion regarding potential impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Chapter 5.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation**. A complete summary of all impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**. Also provided in **Table 2.0-1** are mitigation measures that are proposed to avoid or reduce significant project impacts. The table indicates whether implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. It is important to note that **Table 2.0-1** includes not only those impacts and mitigation measures discussed within **Chapter 5.0** of the Draft EIR, but also the impacts and mitigation measures carried forward from the Initial Study contained in **Appendix 1.0**. Based on further

analysis in the Draft EIR, it was discovered that not all mitigation measures originally included in the Initial Study remained applicable to the project and that some of the previously proposed mitigation measures included in the Initial Study needed to be modified or replaced with equally or more effective mitigation measures. All of the impacts and mitigation measures from the Initial Study, including the modified mitigation measures, are presented in the table below (please note some numbering from the Initial Study may have changed). **Table 2.0-2, Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project**, presents the environmental impacts of each alternative to allow the decision makers, agencies, and the public to compare and contrast these alternatives and weigh their relative merits and demerits.

**Table 2.0-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>Chapter 5, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures</i>			
5.1 AESTHETICS			
Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Potentially significant	*Mitigation Measure MM AES-1: The architectural elevations and materials used on the exterior of the residences (including roofing materials, exterior finishing, and trim palette) shall include natural, terrain-neutral colors and prohibit the use of brightly colored terra cotta or red clay roof tiles in order to limit potential visual contrast between the proposed development and the adjacent hillsides as determined acceptable by the Planning Commission through the design review process required by Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC) section 13.50.100. The developer shall include Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions that prohibit or limit roofing color changes by future owners, in accordance with the Planning Commission design review approval.	Less than significant
Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure MM AES-2: The developer shall hydro-seed all disturbed, yet undeveloped, slopes, including those surrounding the proposed off-site detention basin and the earthen berm, in order to encourage growth of new vegetation on the disturbed hillsides.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure MM AES-3a: The developer shall use full cutoff street lights to direct light downward. A “full cutoff” luminaire is defined as a luminaire that allows no direct light emissions above a horizontal plane through the luminaire’s lowest light-emitting part. Mitigation Measure MM AES-3b: The developer shall prepare a photometric plan, which shows the proposed height, location, and intensity of streetlights on-site. The plan shall comply with minimum standards for roadway lighting, and shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planning and Public Works Departments. The City will consider allowing minimum street lighting illumination levels throughout the project site as the proposed subdivision is located on the urban edge in the foreground of the southern hills.	Less than significant

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared Initial Study (**Appendix 1.0**), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared Initial Study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure MM AES-3c: The developer shall prepare Codes, Covenants & Restrictions (CC&Rs) that control flood lighting and landscape lighting on the slopes and yards of specific lots to avoid light “trespass” or “spill” and excessive illumination levels.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM AES-3d: The developer shall prepare CC&Rs that prohibit continuous all-night exterior lighting throughout the project.</p>	
<p>Impact AES-4: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to visual character.</p>	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM AES-1 and MM AES-2 .	Less than Significant
<p>Impact AES-5: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to light and glare.</p>	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM AES-3a through MM AES-3d .	Less than significant
5.2 AIR QUALITY			
<p>Impact AQ-1: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact AQ-2: Construction and operation of the proposed project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>*Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2a: The project shall comply with the following basic construction mitigation measures from Table 8-1 in the BAAQMD 2010 <i>CEQA Air Quality Guidelines</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. B. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. C. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. D. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. E. Building pads shall be laid immediately after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. F. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage informing workers of this provision shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. G. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. H. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. 	Significant and unavoidable

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared Initial Study (**Appendix 1.0**), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared Initial Study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2b: The project shall comply with the following additional construction mitigation measures taken from Table 8-2 in the BAAQMD 2010 <i>CEQA Air Quality Guidelines</i> for projects that exceed construction significance thresholds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. All exposed surfaces shall be watered at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent. Moisture content can be verified by lab samples or moisture probe. B. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph. C. Vegetative ground cover (e.g., fast-germinating native grass seed) shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible and watered appropriately until vegetation is established. D. The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing construction activities on the same area at any one time shall be limited. Activities shall be phased to reduce the amount of disturbed surfaces at any one time. E. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site. F. Site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6 to 12 inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch or gravel. G. Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent. H. The idling time of diesel powered construction equipment shall be minimized to no more than 2 minutes. I. The project shall develop a plan to be submitted to the City's Engineering Department, demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available. 	

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>J. Low VOC (i.e., ROG) paint coatings that exceed local requirements (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings) shall be used.</p> <p>K. All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NO_x and PM.</p> <p>L. All contractors shall use equipment that meets CARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines.</p>	
Impact AQ-3: Development of the proposed project would expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM AQ-2a and MM AQ-2b .	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AQ-4: Development of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact AQ-5: Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under the federal and state ambient air quality standard.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM AQ-2a and MM AQ-2b .	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AQ-6: Construction emissions generated by the proposed project in combination with construction emissions from the James Donlon Boulevard Extension Project would be unlikely to result in significant localized cumulative impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
5.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on some candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species due to the loss of potential habitat.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>*Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1a: Prior to approval of any permits for ground disturbing activities, the developer shall secure the services of an HCP/NCCP qualified biologist to prepare a final version of the Planning Survey Report (PSR), along with any related supporting studies, consistent with the requirements of the East Contra Costa County HCP/NCCP necessary to obtain take coverage for the entire project site, as authorized by the City of Pittsburg per PMC section 15.108, and pay all associated mitigation fees for coverage of approximately 123 acres of development/ground disturbance and 0.016 acre of vernal pool invertebrate habitat (exact final acreages to be determined in accordance with the verified wetland delineation to be included in the final PSR) on-site. For any special-status species or habitat identified by the PSR as potentially being present on the project site, avoidance and minimization measures as outlined in the HCP/NCCP shall be implemented during construction of the project. Avoidance and mitigation measures may include (but are not limited to) pre-construction surveys, construction monitoring, tree replacement, and salvaging of plants. Final avoidance and mitigation measures applicable to the project site shall be incorporated as conditions of approval on any ground disturbing permits that are issued for the project.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1b: If construction begins and then is delayed for more than a year, as an interim measure, the developer shall periodically disk the graded areas of the project site to avoid re-colonization by burrowing owls. Upon recommencement of project construction, the developer shall secure the services of an HCP/NCCP qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls prior to recommencement of any ground disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared Initial Study (**Appendix 1.0**), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared Initial Study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>*Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1c: To avoid direct impacts to any other fully protected wildlife species or MBTA-protected species not already addressed under the East Contra Costa County HCP/NCCP, the developer shall either schedule vegetation clearing outside of the avian nesting season (February 1 through August 31), or conduct a survey within 14 days of vegetation removal activities to check for protected species in suitable habitat within 500 feet of the construction site, where access is permitted. If an active nest is located, the need and/or extent of no disturbance buffer(s) around the nest location shall be determined through consultation with CDFW to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site until after the breeding season or after a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged. The extent of no disturbance buffers shall be based on consideration of the anticipated levels of noise or disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and topographic or other barriers. If determined in consultation with the CDFW that construction activities would not affect an active nest, activities may proceed without restriction.</p>	
<p>Impact BIO-2: Implementation of the proposed project could 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.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure MM BIO-2: Prior to approval of any grading permits where waters are to be filled, the developer shall pay all associated wetland mitigation fees as required by the HCP/NCCP for waters of the US and waters of the state (exact final acreages to be determined in accordance with the verified wetland delineation to be included in the final PSR).</p>	Less than significant
<p>Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1a.	Less than significant
<p>Impact BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</p>	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1a.	Less than significant

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared initial study (Appendix 1.0(a)), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared initial study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact BIO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Impact BIO-6: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to biological resources, including special-status plant and wildlife species.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1a through MM BIO-1c and Mitigation Measure MM BIO-2 .	Less than significant
5.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could expose people or structures to risks associated with seismic-related ground failure, including landslides.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1: Once the construction documents are developed, the developer shall prepare a design-level geotechnical report to provide site-specific geotechnical recommendations for the main project site and off-site detention basin. For the main project site, the design-level geotechnical report shall	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Detailed site-specific grading plans and recommendations to reduce the risk of landslides, including partial landslide debris removal and buttressing with engineered fill or complete landslide debris removal and replacement of engineered fill. These measures shall be prepared during review of the final 40-scale grading plans. (2) Recommendations with respect to excavatability of bedrock, and appropriate treatment of oversized-rock fragments; (3) Site-specific recommendations for moisture conditioning and compaction of fills to reduce potential fill settlements; (4) Site-specific recommendations for the construction of stable cut and fill slopes; and (5) Site-specific recommendations for slope stabilization where appropriate. <p>For the off-site basin, the design-level geotechnical report shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Specific design recommendation for remedial grading including, the removal and replacement of landslide debris, keyways, and sub-drains. These measures shall be prepared during review of the final 40-scale grading plans; (2) Site-specific geotechnical recommendations for site preparation grading and compaction of engineered fills; and (3) Corrective grading plans depicting the location and dimensions of required slope buttresses keyways and sub-drains. <p>All of the recommendations of the design-level geotechnical report shall be implemented in conjunction with the preparation of the project site and construction of the residences and the off-site detention basin.</p>	
<p>Impact GEO-2: The proposed project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM AES-2.	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact GEO-3: The proposed project could 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-site landslides or slope failure.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 . Mitigation Measure MM GEO-3: All deleterious material shall be segregated from existing fill prior to use as engineered fill. The developer shall obtain approval from City Engineer prior to reusing any existing fill on the project site as engineered fill.	Less than significant
Impact GEO-4: The proposed project could be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life and property.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1 . *Mitigation Measure MM GEO-4: Non-expansive granular soil fill shall be placed under structures at depths ranging from at least 1 to 2 feet, for building pads and the immediate perimeter areas, and beneath flatwork and paved areas. Final locations, depths, and dimensions of the non-expansive fill placement shall be determined in accordance with the recommendations in the design-level geotechnical report, as reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Non-expansive soils shall also be kept moist by watering for several days before placement of concrete in order to avoid having to remoisturize clayey soils (which would involve excavation, moisture conditions, and recompaction).	Less than significant
Impact GEO-5: The proposed project along with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to geologic risks.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
5.5 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
Impact GHG-1: The proposed development would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared Initial Study (**Appendix 1.0**), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared Initial Study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact GHG-2: The development would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>Impact GHG-3: The proposed development would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>5.6 PUBLIC SERVICES</p>			
<p>Impact PS-1: The proposed project would be located outside the 1.5-mile response radius of an existing or planned fire station and would not meet the response time guideline of six minutes 90 percent of the time.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1a: The developer shall pay a Fire Facility Impact Fee in the sum of \$591.00 per single-family unit.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1b: The developer shall complete and submit for approval to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District a fire protection plan for the proposed project, prior to approval of the first final map. The fire protection plan shall include details for a fuel modification zone around the subdivision and detail for the organization that will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the fuel modification zone.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1c: All homes shall have not less than a Class "A" fire-rated roof assembly.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1d: Only fire resistant exterior building materials shall be used.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1e: In deed disclosures, the developer shall notify all property owners/buyers that the site is currently outside the 1.5-mile fire department response radius specified by the General Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1f: The developer shall provide a minimum fire flow on site of 1500 gallons per minute (GPM). Required flow must be delivered from not more than one hydrant flowing for a duration of 120 minutes, while maintaining 20-pounds residual pressure in the main.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM PS-1g: Flammable or combustible liquid storage tanks used for fueling grading equipment, shall not be located on the site without first obtaining necessary approvals and permits from the Fire District.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact PS-2: Future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch could require new or physically altered fire facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable, as the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has indicated that no new facilities would need to be constructed in order to serve the proposed project.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
5.7 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
<p>Impact TRA-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system under Baseline plus Project conditions with and without the James Donlon Boulevard Extension and under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
<p>Impact TRA-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
<p>Impact TRA-3: Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>*Mitigation Measure MM TRA-1: The developer shall construct a sidewalk along the west side of Kirker Pass Road, or some other alternative pedestrian access route, connecting the project site to the nearest existing sidewalk to the north. The sidewalk or alternative pedestrian route shall be constructed prior to occupancy of the first units constructed on the project site.</p>	Less than significant

* Mitigation was originally included in the previously prepared initial study (**Appendix 1.0**), and was carried forward with additional analysis in the Draft EIR. Please note that the final text and numbering of the mitigation measure may have changed from the previously prepared initial study.

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact TRA-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable future development, would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system under Cumulative (2035) plus Project conditions with or without the James Donlon Boulevard Extension.</p>	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable
Appendix 1.0 NOP/Initial Study			
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact CUL-1: Grading or trenching activities in the area of the demolished ranch complex (in the eastern portion of the site) could disturb or destroy remnants of the potential historic site and potential buried historic deposits which may have been buried by the demolition of the ranch.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall retain a professional cultural resources consultant to monitor grading and/or trenching activities in the area of the demolished ranch complex (as referenced in the July, 2000 Holman & Associates study) to identify any possible historic deposits which may have been buried there during the demolition of the ranch. In the event that any archeological deposits are identified, work shall be stopped within 50 feet of any discovery until it has been evaluated for potential significance as defined by the <i>State CEQA guidelines</i>. If evaluative testing concludes that the archeological deposits are significant, a plan for mitigation of impacts shall be submitted to the City of Pittsburg for approval before any further earthmoving activities recommence in the area of discovery.</p>	Less than significant
<p>Impact CUL-2: Any ground disturbing activities performed for the proposed project could possibly disturb or destroy previously unidentified archaeological resources.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: In the event that unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction, all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The City shall contact a qualified archaeologist to provide direction for handling of the find, and shall implement a plan for survey and subsurface investigation as needed at the direction of the archaeologist to define the deposit and to assess the remainder of the site within the project area to determine whether the resource is significant and would be affected by the project. A written report of the results of investigations shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and filed with the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System.</p>	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact CUL-3: Any ground disturbing activities performed for the proposed project could possibly disturb or destroy previously unknown burial locations for human remains.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: In the event of a discovery on-site of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity shall halt immediately and the area of the find shall be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the City shall notify the County Coroner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the City shall ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance.</p> <p>If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the City shall comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).</p> <p>If human remains cannot be left in place, the City shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinterment. The City shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the City shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from projects within City boundaries are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p>			
<p>Impact HAZ-1: Previous ranching operations may have resulted in contamination from fuel and maintenance chemicals in the area of the former ranch complex. Construction of the proposed residential subdivision could expose construction workers and future residents to possible contamination.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, soil and groundwater sampling shall be conducted in the area of historic development at the former ranch complex in the southeastern portion of the site in order to verify that any soil contamination concentrations are below residential action levels. In the event that soil contamination concentrations exceed the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) action levels for residential uses, the developer shall work with the DTSC to prepare a risk assessment and implement any DTSC required remedial actions, continuing until the DTSC verifies that concentrations meet the remediation standard established for the site and a No Further Action letter (or equivalent approval) is issued by the DTSC.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact HAZ-2: Although located between 600 and 1,270 feet away from the project area, the natural gas and multi-purpose petroleum pipelines carry hazardous materials including natural gas and other petroleum products such as diesel, jet fuel, and/or gasoline. Upset conditions involving leakage or rupture of these pipelines are not reasonably foreseeable in the area; however, due to the nature of the materials being transported, any leakage or rupture that may occur could cause significant impacts.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Developer shall provide suitable disclosures in writing to all prospective homebuyers to notify them of the presence of both the natural gas pipeline and the petroleum product pipeline. Such notices shall include information on the pipeline locations and materials transported; safety guidance, including the importance of observing pipeline location notices and restrictions on subsurface work or other activities within the pipeline easement; and information on the City’s emergency response plan and procedures. A requirement for provision of such notices to future buyers shall be included in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for the proposed development.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-3: The proposed project would introduce residential dwellings within the urban-wildland interface and increase the potential to expose residents and houses to wildland fire risks. The proposed layout of the Vesting Tentative Map would also obstruct access to existing fire trail systems (Fire Trail 85-2).</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3.1: The developer shall disclose in writing to all prospective homebuyers on perimeter lots, the Natural Hazards Disclosure Statement (NHDS) for wildland fire. The developer shall also provide public education information, including the requirements of Public Resources Code 4291 and Contra Costa County Fire Protection District Defensible Space Standards, reduced fuel zones, and weed abatement requirements.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3.2: In accordance with Public Resources Code, Section 4291, all residential units adjacent to open slopes shall be required to maintain a 100-foot defensible-space setback to the residential structure with fire resistant landscaping for areas adjacent to open slopes. If this setback area extends beyond the individual property lines, yet within the project boundaries, then maintenance of the fire setback areas shall become the responsibility of the applicable property owner associated with the area in question or the Geologic Hazard Abatement District (GHAD).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3.3: Prior to approval of the Vesting Tentative Map, the City shall ensure that the developer has provided access to open space areas or to the existing fire trails systems (Fire Trail 85-2) equivalent to the existing access and adequate to allow emergency access to all open space on the project site and to any adjacent open space that is currently accessed primarily from the project site. These access roadways shall be a minimum of 16 feet in width in order to accommodate Fire Protection District equipment and personnel. The proposed access plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Protection District prior to approval of the first Final Map.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
<p>Impact LUP-1: While the project design does include approximately 43.4 acres of open space designated land located along the southern boundary of the site, the land is not proposed for permanent conservation, as required by General Plan Policy 2-P-73 (and the May 3, 2006, MOU) which could be considered a conflict with General Plan Policy 2-P-73.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure LUP-1: The developer shall ensure the southern portion of the project site, currently designated as Open Space (approximately 43.4 acres), is permanently preserved as a greenbelt buffer, in accordance with Policy 2-P-73, through the recordation of a deed restriction or some other appropriate mechanism, prior to the acceptance of the last Final Map for the site (should it be broken into phases).</p>	Less than significant
NOISE			
<p>Impact NOI-1: Exposure of future residents sited closest to Kirker Pass Road to noise levels in excess of exterior noise levels considered acceptable for residential uses would be inconsistent with the intent of the Pittsburg General Plan, Noise Element.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1: A 6-foot noise barrier shall be installed along the rear and side property lines of Lots 1, 2, 207 and 208. Design of the noise barrier shall coordinate with adjacent fencing and shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Division at the time the design review application is filed for the residential units.</p>	Less than significant
<p>Impact NOI-2: Construction activity (i.e., grading) would occur as close as 250 feet from noise-sensitive single-family residential land uses situated to the north of the project site. At this distance, and assuming uninterrupted line of sight, temporary noise from construction equipment on the project site could range from 68 to 73 dB(A), which would exceed the City's exterior noise standard of 60 dB(A) Ldn for single-family residences.</p>	Potentially significant	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: The project developer shall prepare construction specifications that will become part of contractor documents and which could be enforced by the City of Pittsburg Building Division on an as needed basis. The construction specifications will require the contractor to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit construction activities to the hours between 7:00 AM and 5:30 PM on weekdays and between 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Saturdays and Sundays. No construction shall take place on locally observed holidays. • Locate fixed construction equipment such as compressors and generators as far as feasibly possible from sensitive receptors (i.e., existing houses). Shroud or shield all impact tools, and muffle or shield all intake and exhaust ports on power construction equipment. 	Less than significant

Environmental Topic and Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
<p>Impact UTL-1: The project site is within the CCWD SOI; however, it is not currently within the CCWD Service Area boundary and therefore the site does not have entitlements for CVP water supply by the CCWD.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure UTL-1: The developer shall provide all necessary documentation required by the CCWD for its application for inclusion of the project site in the CVP. No grading or building permits shall be issued until the project site has been annexed into the CCWD service area and the developer provides the City with a “Will Serve” letter from the CCWD verifying that the project site has been included in the CVP.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**Table 2.0-2
Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alt. 1 -No Project/No Development Alternative	Alt. 2 –Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative	Alt. 3 – Reduced Density Alternative	Alt. 4 –Ridgeline Preservation Alternative
5.1 Aesthetics					
Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings.	SU	N	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)
Impact AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact AES-4: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to visual character.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact AES-5: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to light and glare.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
5.2 Air Quality					
Impact AQ-1: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact AQ-2: Construction and operation of the proposed project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	SU	N	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)
Impact AQ-3: Development of the proposed project would expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	SU	N	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alt. 1 -No Project/No Development Alternative	Alt. 2 –Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative	Alt. 3 – Reduced Density Alternative	Alt. 4 –Ridgeline Preservation Alternative
Impact AQ-4: Development of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact AQ-5: Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under the federal and state ambient air quality standard.	SU	N	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)
Impact AQ-6: Construction emissions generated by the proposed project in combination with construction emissions from the James Donlon Boulevard Extension Project would be unlikely to result in significant localized cumulative impacts.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
5.3 Biological Resources					
Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on some candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species due to the loss of potential habitat.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact BIO-2: Implementation of the proposed project could 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.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alt. 1 -No Project/No Development Alternative	Alt. 2 –Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative	Alt. 3 – Reduced Density Alternative	Alt. 4 –Ridgeline Preservation Alternative
Impact BIO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact BIO-6: The proposed project could combine with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch to result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to biological resources, including special-status plant and wildlife species.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
5.4 Geology And Soils					
Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could expose people or structures to risks associated with seismic-related ground failure, including landslides.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact GEO-2: The proposed project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact GEO-3: The proposed project could 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-site landslides or slope failure.	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact GEO-4: The proposed project could be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life and property	LSM	N	LSM (-)	LSM (-)	LSM (-)
Impact GEO-5: The proposed project along with other existing and future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to geologic risks.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
5.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
Impact GHG-1: The proposed development would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact GHG-2: The development would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alt. 1 -No Project/No Development Alternative	Alt. 2 –Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative	Alt. 3 – Reduced Density Alternative	Alt. 4 –Ridgeline Preservation Alternative
Impact GHG-3: The proposed development would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment.	LS	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
5.6 Public Services					
Impact PS-1: The proposed project would be located outside the 1.5-mile response radius of an existing or planned fire station and would not meet the response time guideline of 6 minutes 90 percent of the time.	SU	N	SU (-)	SU (-)	SU (-)
Impact PS-2: Future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch could require new or physically altered fire facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable, as the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has indicated that no new facilities would need to be constructed in order to serve the proposed project.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
5.7 Transportation And Traffic					
Impact TRA-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system under Baseline plus Project conditions with and without the James Donlon Boulevard Extension and under Existing plus Project conditions.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact TRA-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)
Impact TRA-3: Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	LSM	N	LSM (=)	LSM (=)	LSM (=)

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alt. 1 -No Project/No Development Alternative	Alt. 2 –Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative	Alt. 3 – Reduced Density Alternative	Alt. 4 –Ridgeline Preservation Alternative
Impact TRA-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable future development, would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system under Cumulative (2035) plus Project conditions with or without the James Donlon Boulevard Extension.	LS	N	LS (-)	LS (-)	LS (-)

Notes: N = No impact; LS=Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; LSM = Less than significant impact after mitigation; SU = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; (+/-) = impact is more severe or less severe than project impact after mitigation; and (=) = impact is similar to project impact after mitigation.