

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Attachment B: INITIAL STUDY

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

This Initial Study Checklist was prepared to identify thresholds within the CEQA Checklist topics that will not be affected by the proposed project. For these topics, the impact conclusion boxes are checked. The remaining thresholds within the CEQA Checklist topics will be addressed in the project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The checklist boxes for these topics are blank, pending analysis and conclusions in the EIR.

I. AESTHETICS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, the project site is bounded by Cull Canyon Road to the east, Twining Vine Winery to the north, Cull Canyon Regional Recreational Area to the west, and residential property to the south. Figure 3-1, Regional Location, shows the location of the project site.

Public views from Cull Canyon Road towards the project site are generally obstructed by existing ground vegetation and trees along the roadway. Within the boundaries of the project site, the area with existing structures is mostly flat and generally bisected by the bridge over Cull Canyon Creek which connects to an internal north – south concrete roadway ending at a large existing concrete building. The project site slopes sharply to the west where it is heavily vegetated and obstructs views extending beyond the site. Existing structures on the 37-acre parcel include a residential home, a

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

barn, a bridge, several wells, a septic system, an outdoor barbeque and spit, and a large concrete building with a slab foundation. Cull Creek also runs through the eastern portion of the parcel.

Structures included as part of the proposed development include twelve- 400 square foot cabins, an 8,500 square foot meeting and dining hall, a 1,025 square foot restroom and shower building, a 2,600 square foot family dwelling, and the existing 1,200 square foot caretaker's unit. As shown on Figures 3-7 through 3-15 in Chapter 3, Project Description, the meeting/dining hall and family dwelling buildings are two stories in height while all the other buildings are one story.

Due to the site's location between a public roadway obstructed by large, existing trees and vegetation and the sloped hills to the west, as well the low one- and two-story building heights, scenic vistas of the adjoining hillsides would not be blocked by construction of the project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- b) Cull Canyon is not a State Scenic Highway. The nearest scenic corridor is located approximately 1.25 miles east along Crow Canyon Road.¹ Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- c) Public views from Cull Canyon Road towards the project site are generally obstructed by vegetation and existing trees along the roadway. The property line extends to the edge of the two-lane roadway comprising Cull Canyon Road with minimal shoulder or bike and pedestrian path between the roadway and property. As described in the Chapter 3, Project Description, the proposed project would include development and facilities appurtenant to periodic recreational camping. The design of the proposed buildings as well as the scale and massing, would be consistent with the adjoining development including one- and two-story homes and supporting buildings. Therefore, there would *no impact*.
- d) As described in Section 3.3.6 of the Project Description, exterior lighting would be provided within the parking lots on the project. Proposed lighting would be designed so that the lights are shielded or directed in such a way that there would be no impact on the adjacent land uses or nearby residences. Therefore, new sources of light installed for the proposed project would have *no impact* on day or nighttime views in the area.

¹Alameda County, 2012, Castro Valley General Plan, https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/CastroValleyGeneralPlan_2012_FINAL.pdf, accessed May 11, 2021.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The project site is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.² Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- e) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

² California Department of Conservation, 2021, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed May 11, 2021.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plan, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- e) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- f) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Would the proposed project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project would be designed to maximize natural lighting, use high-performance glazing, incorporate passive heating and cooling strategies, and employ low-flow fixtures to minimize energy consumption and exceed Title 24 energy requirements. The proposed project would connect to existing electrical utilities and would continue to use one of the two 499-gallon liquid propane tanks currently on-site to serve existing facilities, while upgrading the other existing tank to serve the new multi-use building and shower building.

Construction of the proposed project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions and would result in short-term transportation-related energy use. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases, and electricity would not be required to power most construction equipment. Most of the construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas- or diesel-powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment for interior construction and architectural coatings. Overall, the use of electricity would be temporary and would fluctuate according to the phase of construction. Additionally, it is anticipated that most of the electric-powered construction equipment would be hand tools (e.g., power drills, table saws, compressors) and lighting, which would result in minimal electricity usage during construction activities. It is not anticipated that construction equipment used for the proposed project would be powered by natural gas, and no natural gas demand is anticipated during construction.

Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary. It is anticipated that most of the off-road construction equipment, such as those used during grading, would be gas- or diesel-powered. All construction-equipment would cease upon completion of project construction. Thus, transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Furthermore, to limit wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption, the construction contractors are anticipated to minimize nonessential idling of construction equipment during construction, in accordance with Section 2449 of the California Code

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9. In addition, it is anticipated that the construction equipment would be well maintained and meet the appropriate tier ratings per CALGreen or EPA emissions standards, so that adequate energy efficiency level is achieved.

Operation of the proposed project would create additional energy demands compared to existing conditions and would result in increased transportation energy use. Operational use of energy would include heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems, use of on-site equipment and appliances; and indoor and outdoor lighting. Due to increased population on-site and use of the site, the proposed project would increase energy demand at the site compared to existing conditions. However, because the proposed project would be built to meet the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, it would not result in wasteful or unnecessary natural gas demands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation, and there would be *no impact*.

- b) The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable energy regulations, including, for example, the Building Energy Efficient Standards, and CALGreen, which would contribute to minimizing wasteful energy consumption and promoting renewable energy sources. The proposed project would connect to existing electrical infrastructure and use two liquid propane tanks on-site for additional energy needs. As described under discussion (a), the proposed project would be designed to maximize natural lighting, use high-performance glazing, incorporate passive heating and cooling strategies, and employ low-flow fixtures to minimize energy consumption and exceed Title 24 energy requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and there would be *no impact*.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- e) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- f) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<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 release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<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 material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<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, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project would not involve the routine transport of hazardous waste, thus, no impacts to the public or the environment would occur. Potential impacts during construction of the proposed project could include potential spills associated with the use of fuels and lubricants in construction equipment. These potential impacts would be short-term in nature and would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations, as well as the use of standard equipment operating practices by experienced, trained personnel. Additionally, during the operation phase of the proposed project, common cleaning substances, facility maintenance products, and similar items could be used on the project site. These potentially hazardous materials, however, would not be of a type or occur in sufficient quantities to pose a significant hazard to public health and safety or the environment. Compliance with the applicable laws, regulations, and conditions of approval, would minimize hazards associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) As discussed in Criterion (a) of this section, the operation phase of the proposed project could involve the use of common cleaning substances and facility maintenance products; however, these potentially

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

hazardous substances would not be of a type or occur in sufficient quantities on-site to pose a significant hazard to public health and safety or the environment. The use of these materials would be subject to existing federal and State regulations. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that the risk of accidents and spills are minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials would be *less than significant*.

- c) The project site is not located within 0.25 miles of a school. The closest schools, Proctor Elementary School and Vannoy Elementary School, are located approximately 2 miles and 2.5 miles south of the project site, respectively. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- d) Based on information gathered from a review of the applicable regulatory databases, including EnviroStor and the GeoTracker, to identify known or suspected sources of contamination, it was determined that the project site does not contain any known hazardous materials spills or storage sites.^{3,4} Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- e) The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport to the project site is Oakland International Airport, located 8.5 miles west of the project site in the City of Oakland. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- f) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- g) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

³ Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2021, EnviroStor, <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=map>, accessed August 23, 2021.

⁴ California State Water Resources Control Board, 2021, GeoTracker, <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/>, accessed August 23, 2021.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- e) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project would develop the site with a recreational camping facility. The proposed project would retain the existing roadway patterns and would not introduce any new major roadways or other physical features through existing residential neighborhoods or other communities that would create new barriers. Therefore, the proposed project would not divide any established community there would be *no impact*.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) The California Geological Survey (CGS), formerly the California Division of Mines and Geology, classifies the regional significance of mineral resources in accordance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 and assists in the designation of lands containing significant aggregate resources. CSG’s Mineral Land Classification (MLC) Project provides objective economic-geologic expertise to assist in the protection and development of mineral resources through the land-use planning process. Since its inception in 1978, the MLC Project has completed 97 classification studies covering about 34% of the state.⁵ The SMARA classification for the area encompassing the project area is MRZ-4 on the Special Report 146 Plate 2.10 map.⁶ The MRZ-4 category denotes areas of no known mineral occurrences where geologic information does not rule out either the presence or absence of significant mineral resources. The MRZ-4 classification does not imply that there is little likelihood for the presence of mineral resources, but rather that there is a lack of knowledge regarding mineral occurrences. Further exploration of the area could result in the reclassification of MRZ-4 areas.⁷ No minerals are currently mined within the project site and no known mineral resources occur in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of or access to mineral resources and there would be *no impact*.

⁵ California Geologic Survey (CGS), 2017, Mineral Resources and Mineral Hazards Mapping Program, California Department of Conservation, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/>, accessed August 10, 2021.

⁶ California Department of Conservation, 1983, Special Report 146 Plate 2.10, <https://filerequest.conservation.ca.gov/>, accessed August 24, 2021.

⁷ California Department of Conservation, 2003, Mineral Land Classification of Granite Construction Inc.’s Handley Ranch Site, Monterey County, California, for Construction Aggregate Resources, https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Special-Reports/SR_180-MLC-Report.pdf, accessed August 24, 2021.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

- b) The project site has not been classified or nominated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, according to the CGS Generalized Aggregate Resource Classification Map.⁸ Therefore, no impact would result.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

⁸ California Department of Conservation, 1983, Special Report 146 Plate 2.10, <https://filerequest.conservation.ca.gov/>, accessed August 24, 2021.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XIII. NOISE

Would the proposed project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project, a recreation camping facility, would not involve new housing or employment centers; thus, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Furthermore, the proposed project does not have a long-term new housing component and would only be used intermittently by groups in a recreational capacity. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.
- b) The existing caretaker home would remain on-site, and no additional long-term housing is proposed as part of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of a public services impact analysis is to examine the impacts associated with physical improvements to public service facilities required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Public service facilities need improvements (i.e., construction, renovation or expansion) as demand for service increases. Increased demand is typically driven by increases in population. The proposed project would have a significant environmental impact if it would exceed the ability of public service providers to adequately serve residents, thereby requiring construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. As discussed above in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the proposed project would not result in a net increase of residents at the project site or elsewhere in the region because it does not propose housing and is not a major regional employer. Nevertheless, due to the location of the proposed project, within a rural area and a Wildfire Urban Interface, fire and police services are addressed in more detail within the EIR.

a) i) Fire Protection: This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

b) ii) Police Protection: This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

a) iii) Schools:

No schools exist within two miles of the project area. No changes would occur that would affect existing schools or require additional schools or school personnel. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

iv) Parks:

The proposed project consists of recreational camping facility that would serve disadvantaged youth throughout the region. All proposed visitor activities would occur on-site and would not involve the use of public parks. Although the multi-use trail on the western portion of the project site would ultimately lead to the Juan Bautista De Anza Trail, the connection is not intended to increase use of the regional trail because all activities are limited to the boundaries of the camping site. Other nearby parks include Deerview Park, Greenridge Park, the Columbia Trail, and the Cull Canyon Regional Recreation Area. These parks are located more than 0.5 miles away from the project site and would not be visited or used by visitors to the proposed project. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to parks.

v) Libraries:

The proposed project is more than two miles away from the nearest libraries. Due to the nature of the proposed project, a recreational camping facility with no increase in permanent residents, student visitors to the camping facility would not use regional libraries. Therefore, there would be *no impact* to libraries.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XVI. RECREATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a), b) Increased demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities is typically driven by increases in population. The proposed project, a recreational camping facility, would not result in a net increase of permanent residents at the project site or elsewhere in the region because it does not include permanent housing. Furthermore, all activities during the operation of the recreational camping facility would be restricted to the facility itself and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the deterioration of existing facilities nor require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. Accordingly, there would be *no impact* with respect to parks and recreation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency will consider the significance to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1), defines a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (defined as historical resource, archaeological resource, or tribal cultural resource) involves the “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical would be materially impaired.”

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) The closest wastewater treatment provider is the Castro Valley Sanitation District (CVSD) in Castro Valley. The project is outside the service area boundaries of the CVSD which end before the Cull Canyon Regional Recreation area. Therefore, there is *no impact*.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- e) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- b) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- c) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.
- d) This threshold will be assessed within the full project EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any necessary mitigation measures will be included in the project EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) This finding will be addressed within the full project EIR.
- b) This finding will be addressed within the full project EIR.
- c) This finding will be addressed within the full project EIR.

Organizations and Persons Consulted

This Initial Study was prepared by the following consultants and individuals:

LEAD AGENCY

Alameda County

Sonia Urzua, Senior Planner

REPORT PREPARERS

LEAD CONSULTANT

PlaceWorks

Steve Noack, Principal, Principal-in-Charge

Allison Dagg, Associate, Project Manager