



**Town of Danville  
Environmental Checklist Form**

1. **Project Title:** Danville 2014-2022 Housing Element
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Town of Danville  
510 La Gonda Way  
Danville, CA 94526
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Kevin J. Gailey, Chief of Planning  
(925) 314-3305  
[kgailey@danville.ca.gov](mailto:kgailey@danville.ca.gov)
4. **Project Location:** The project encompasses all land within the Town of Danville (approximately 11,600 acres) and an additional 325+/- acres in unincorporated Contra Costa County located within the Danville Sphere of Influence. Danville is located in the San Ramon Valley, approximately 30 miles east of San Francisco and 40 miles northeast of San Jose.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Town of Danville  
510 La Gonda Way  
Danville, CA 94526
6. **General Plan Designation:** Various
7. **Zoning:** Various
8. **Description of Project:** The Project consists of an update to Danville Housing Element as required by State Government Code Section 65580-65589.8. The document is available at [www.danville.ca.gov/housingelement](http://www.danville.ca.gov/housingelement).  
The purpose of the Housing Element is to document the projected housing needs within the community and to set forth policies and programs that promote the development of diverse housing types and ensure affordability of housing Town-wide. The proposed project for environmental review is the adoption of the Danville 2014-2022 Housing Element, which includes the following:
  - Introduction (Section I)
  - Housing Needs Assessment (Section II)

- Housing Constraints (Section III)
- Housing Resources (Section IV)
- Housing Accomplishments (Section V)
- Housing Plans (Section VI)
- Appendices

The Housing Element is consistent with the Town’s 2030 General Plan and satisfies all state regulations and California Department of Housing and Community Development.

## 9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

### *Surrounding Land Uses*

North: Danville is bordered on the north by the unincorporated communities of Alamo and Blackhawk. Predominant land uses in these communities are low-density single family residential, rural residential, open space, and commercial districts.

South: The Town is bounded on the south by the city of San Ramon and unincorporated Contra Costa County (“County”). Predominant uses to the south include residential development at varying densities, retail commercial uses, and office parks in San Ramon; and open space and single family residential development in the County. Some of the unincorporated area to the south is in agricultural use. A large area to the southeast (i.e., Dougherty Valley) is currently being developed with a range of housing types.

East: Unincorporated Contra Costa County lies to the east. The predominant uses are agriculture, open space, and rural residential development.

West: Land to the west of the Town lies within the city of San Ramon and unincorporated Contra Costa County. Some land to the west has been acquired by the East Bay Regional Park District and is part of the Las Trampas Regional Wilderness, where the terrain is generally hill and rugged, with areas of dense woodland.

### *Existing Setting*

On December 15, 2009, the Danville Town Council approved General Plan Amendment request GPA 2009-01, approving an update to the Housing Element of the 2010 General Plan, the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element. The State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) certified the Housing Element on December 21, 2010.

It was established through analysis contained within the Danville 2007-2014 Housing Element that the Town had a RHNA “shortfall” for the 2007-2014 planning period. The 2007-2014 Housing Element established that Danville needed to fill a shortfall of

multifamily land with minimum development densities adequate to accommodate the needs of 187 extremely low and very low income households and to fill a shortfall of multifamily land with minimum development densities adequate to accommodate the needs of 34 low income households. In response to the identified RHNA shortfall, by way of the Town's adoption of the 2030 General Plan in March 2013, the Town designated 8.75 acres to a newly established Residential - Multifamily - High (25-30 units per acre) land use designation and designated an additional 2.0 acres to the Residential - Multifamily - High/Medium (20-25 units per acre) land use designation. The High/Medium land use designation was recalibrated by the adoption of the 2030 Plan from an 18 units per acre minimum density to a 20 units per acre minimum density to meet HCD's requirements to qualify as land suitable to accommodate the needs of low income households.

Both sites affected by these actions (i.e., the Borel/EBRPD site and the Danville Office Partners, LLC site) were subsequently rezoned by Town-initiated rezoning actions to establish the right to develop at the cited densities as an at-right land use a requisite step in addressing Danville's RHNA shortfall for the 2007-2014 planning period. These two sites (10.75 net acres in aggregate area) remain available for development as of the adoption of the 2014-2022 Housing Element and constitute the majority of the land needed to meet the very low income and low income components of the 2014-2022 RHNA.

The next housing element planning period covers the period of 2014 to 2022. As assigned by the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Town's housing allocation for this upcoming planning period is 557 dwelling units. To ensure that the Danville 2014-2022 Housing Element qualifies for an "expedited review" by HCD, the Town adopted a series of zoning text amendments in 2014 which included provisions for reasonable accommodation, emergency shelters, supportive and transitional housing, condominium conversion, as well as updates to the second dwelling unit ordinance, inclusionary housing ordinance, and density bonus ordinance.

**10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May be Required:**

The Project and environmental review will be adopted and approved by the Danville Town Council. Following Town approval, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will be asked to certify the Town's Housing Element.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- (6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a

previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- (7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- (8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- (9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - (a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - (b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**Issues:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Aesthetics Setting:** Danville is located in the San Ramon Valley and transected by a series of northwest-southeast trending valleys and ridgelines. As such, the Town’s Planning Area contains a number of aesthetic and visual resources that include views of the Mount Diablo, Las Trampas Regional Wilderness, and other notable view sheds.

**Aesthetics Impact Discussion:**

I.(a). *No Impact:* Scenic vistas identified in the 2030 General Plan are largely limited to the scenic hillsides and major ridgelines. All identified housing sites are confined to previously developed and/ or underdeveloped sites located within an urbanized area.

The Housing Element is a policy document that does not introduce new policies that would impact scenic vistas. All housing sites are located in an area that would not block a scenic vista. Therefore, there are no impacts to scenic vistas in Danville.

- I.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Town of Danville has one State Designated Scenic Highway, Interstate 680. The designated scenic portion of Interstate 680 begins at the Highway 24 junction in Walnut Creek (Contra Costa County) south to Mission Boulevard in Fremont (Alameda County). Danville does not have any designated scenic local roadways. Further, the Housing Element is a policy document that does not introduce new policies that would damage scenic resources. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas would be insignificant.
- I.(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* All sites identified as part of the Housing Element are generally confined to already developed or underdeveloped areas and are not expected to depart significantly from the existing conditions in terms of scale and/or character. The Housing Element is a policy document that does not introduce new policies that would degrade the visual character of the surrounding environment. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts related to visual resources are expected to remain at levels below significance.
- I.(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* Development of housing sites may potentially create new sources of light and glare. However, site specific CEQA review and site-specific design review would be performed at the time that development applications are received. Further, the potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, any impacts resulting from the Housing Element would be insignificant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(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"/>	X
(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Agricultural Resources Setting:** The Town’s Planning Area does not have any designated Prime Farmland. Danville’s areas of agricultural land are mostly characterized by dry-land grazing with some large ranch-style homes. Most of the dry-land grazing areas are either under East Bay Regional Park District control or are open space remainder areas under homeowners association ownership that are leased for grazing.

II.(a). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Borel Property (refer to Housing Sites G-2 and G-3 of Table 29), an inactive walnut orchard, is one of the very last cultivated agricultural areas in Danville. It is designated as Unique Farmland (0.15 percent) and surrounded by urbanized uses. The property is bordered by I-680 to the west, residential to the north, Camino Ramon and commercial development to the east, and Fostoria Way and commercial and office development to the south. The property is under a Williamson Act Contract, although a notice of Non-Renewal was filed in February 2012.

The Borel Property has been identified for commercial and residential uses since approval of a General Plan Amendment in the 1980s. The 2030 General Plan designates the northern seven acres as a mixture of medium and high/medium multifamily residential land use and the remainder of the property would retain its commercial designation reflected in the prior 2010 General Plan. The property has also been subsequently rezoned in late 2013 to be consistent with the 2030 General Plan. The environmental analysis of designating the property as multifamily residential and commercial has been evaluated by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

II.(b)-(e). *No Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document that does not propose any changes to agricultural lands including the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance to a nonagricultural use, nor would the project conflict with any agricultural zoning or Williamson Act Contracts. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, no impacts associated with agricultural lands or forestlands are expected.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY:</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Air Quality Setting:** Danville is located within the eastern portion San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) and therefore subject to the ambient air quality standards (AAQS) established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and those adopted by the California Resources Board (CARB), and the U.S Environmental Protection Agency. Air quality within the Bay Area Air Basin is determined by natural, geographical, and meteorological conditions, as well as human activities including construction and development, operation of vehicles, and industry and manufacturing.

The BAAQMD is responsible for planning, implementing, and enforcing air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin, including the Town of Danville. The BAAQMD operates monitoring stations, with the closest station located in Concord at 2975 Treat Boulevard, where it records pollutant concentration levels for carbon monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), and Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The BAAQMD Compliance and Enforcement Division routinely conducts inspections and audits of potential polluting sites to ensure compliance with applicable federal, state, and BAAQMD regulations.

The Bay Area Air Basin is designated as non-attainment for both the one-hour and eight-hour state and national ozone standards; 0.09 parts per million (ppm) and 0.070 ppm, respectively. The Basin is also in non-attainment for the PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> state standards, which require an annual arithmetic mean (AAM) of less than 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>10</sub> and less than 12 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. In addition, the Bay Area Air Basin is designated as non-attainment for the national 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard. All other national ambient air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin are in attainment.

The 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP), adopted by the BAAQMD in September 2010, served to update the 2005 Bay Area Ozone plan in accordance with the requirements of California Clean Air Act. The Bay Area CAP incorporated updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, new meteorological episodes and air quality modeling tools and serves as the framework for SFAAB to achieve attainment of the California AAQS.

- III.(a). *No Impact:* The BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2010 CAP in September 2010 to comply with state air quality planning requirements set forth in the California Health & Safety Code. The Housing Element is consistent with the existing CAP and none of its proposed changes would conflict with the implementation of the CAP. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, no impacts related to a Regional Air Quality Plan are expected.
  
- III.(b)-(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element identifies housing sites on vacant and/or underdeveloped lands. Development of those sites would generate pollutant emissions through both stationary and mobile-point sources. However, as the Housing Element is a policy document and no emission calculations have been conducted. All future residential development proposed would be reviewed in accordance with CEQA at which time air quality impacts would be evaluated and mitigated for as needed. The Housing Element does not introduce new policies that have the potential to generate air quality emissions beyond what has been anticipated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, air quality impacts would be insignificant.
  
- III.(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element policies would not substantially increase the risk to nearby sensitive receptors. Furthermore, air quality impacts to sensitive receptors would be reviewed and mitigated for, as necessary, on a site-specific basis if and when development is proposed. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts to sensitive receptors.
  
- III.(e). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document and does not introduce policies that would create objectionable odors that have not been previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. The potential for future development to generate odors during construction would be temporary, and would be subject to compliance with standards established for the BAAQMD for odor control. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors are expected to be insignificant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<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"/>	X

**Biological Resources Setting:** Biological resources are protected by statute including the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) affords protection to migratory bird species including birds of prey. These regulations provide the legal protection for plant and animal species of concern and their habitat.

The suburban landscape is the dominant vegetation in the Danville Planning Area, which is bordered by the remaining undeveloped grasslands, woodlands of the surrounding hillsides, and traversed by bands of riparian forest and scrub along the numerous creeks and drainages.

Wetlands include areas of freshwater marsh around stock ponds, seeps, springs and other water bodies. Most of the special-status animal species known or suspected to occur in the Planning Area include the burrowing owl, tiger salamander, and red legged frog. There are also a number of native and ornamental tree species within the urbanized area that are protected through Danville’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (Section 32-79 of the Municipal Code).

**Biological Impact Discussion:**

- IV.(a-d). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document and does not introduce policies that would adversely impact any special status species. Housing sites identified are located in urbanized areas of the Town, avoiding especially valuable and/or sensitive habitat. Any future development would be subject to an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources on a project by project basis, as required by CEQA. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts to sensitive habitat generated by the policies set forth in the Housing Element would be insignificant.
- IV.(e). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element encourages infill development in previously developed or urbanized areas of the Town. Thus, any potential for conflict with existing preservation policies have been previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Future potential impacts to biological resources resulting from development would be evaluated on a project by project basis as required by CEQA. The Housing Element remains consistent with the 2030 General Plan. Therefore, any potential impacts would be insignificant.
- IV.(f). *No Impact:* At present, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan exists for the Town of Danville. The Housing Element sets forth policies to accommodate new residential development within the existing, urbanized portions of the Town, thereby avoiding areas designated open space and/or those supporting significant animal or plant habitat. Therefore, the Housing Element would not generate impacts due to a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or any other Natural Community Conservation Plan.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Cultural Resources Setting:** Danville’s beginnings date back to 1854 when Daniel and Andrew Inman bought 400 acres of Old Town Danville with their mining earnings during the Gold Rush era. By 1858, the community boasted a blacksmith, a hotel, a wheelwright and a general store and the townsfolk wanted a post office. Later, agricultural industry and orchards became a dominant facet of the landscape well into the 1940s. The new I-680 freeway, built in the mid-1960's, altered Danville and much of the agricultural land began to transition to housing.

Danville is part of a rich archeological history due to the presence of the Tatcan, Seunen and Souyen Indians. The Tatcans, part of the Bay Miwok linguistic group, were closely related to the Saclans and probably lived in the Alamo-Danville area. Their territory was the San Ramon Creek watershed, which extends from around Crow Canyon Road to Walnut Creek

In order to maintain the unique character and to provide protection to potential significant historic structures in Danville, the Town adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code 32-72-1) and created a seven-member Heritage Resource Commission that reviews the impacts of proposed new development on the Town’s historic resources. There are 12 recorded cultural resources within the Danville Planning Area that have been documented on the California Department of Parks and Recreation Office of Historic Preservation recording forms, and nine of these are within the Town limits. Of the nine, five of are prehistoric archaeological sites and four are historic-era buildings.

**Cultural Impact Discussion:**

- V.(a). *Less than Significant Impact:* Historic resources located in or adjacent to identified housing sites are potentially vulnerable to new development. However, the Historic Preservation Ordinance establishes authority for the Heritage Resource Commission to review and analysis development proposals through discretionary permits (e.g., Development Plan requests) or through ministerial building permit reviews when a historic resource would be, or could potentially be, impacted by development plan. Further, the Housing Element is a policy document and does not introduce policies that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resource. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts to historic resources would be insignificant.
- V.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* Undisturbed lands within the Town’s Planning Area, particularly lands near San Ramon Creek watershed have a heightened potential to contain prehistoric archaeological resources. Disturbance to buried cultural resources

would constitute a potentially significant impact if not properly managed. The Housing Element is a policy document and does not introduce policies that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any archaeological resource. Adherence to CEQA Section 15064.5, Subdivision (F) at the time of future development would ensure that archeological resources are protected. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, potential impacts to archeological resources would be insignificant.

V.(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* Danville’s 2030 General Plan EIR did not identify the presence of any paleontological or unique geological resources within the boundaries of the Town planning area. Therefore, the project is not expected to impact any paleontological or unique geologic resources. Furthermore, each project would be reviewed pursuant to CEQA and be subject to conformance with all applicable General Plan policies. Therefore, implementation of the Housing Element would result in less than significant impact to paleontological resources or geologic feature.

V.(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 mandates that, in the event human remains are discovered in a location other than a dedicated cemetery, all disturbance or excavation must cease and the county coroner must be notified. If the human remains are found to be of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission would then identify and contact a likely descendent to inspect the site and recommend future treatment associated with the contents of the grave. In the event that future development on a housing site should encounter human remains, the project shall be subject to all requirements of state law. Proper adherence to CA Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 would ensure any impacts to interred human remains are avoided. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts due to discovery of human remains would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Publication 42.

(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Geology and Soils Setting:** Danville is located in the San Ramon Valley within the California Coast Ranges geomorphic province, a region generally defined by northwest-trending ridges and valleys that generally parallel the geologic structures including major fault systems.

The San Ramon Valley is surrounded by the East Bay Hills, formed from rocks uplifting between the Hayward and Calaveras fault zones. The Valley is drained by the San Ramon Creek, Sycamore Creek, and Green Valley Creek, which are actively cutting into the alluvial surface soils which contain deposits of interbedded clay, silt sand and gravel.

The Calaveras Fault is the major recognized fault system in the San Ramon Valley and is the dominant geologic feature of central Contra Costa County. Local regulations related to geologic concerns are set forth through the Town’s Building Code, which incorporate the most current California Building Code requirements. All development proposed within geographically hazardous areas are subject to detailed geotechnical investigation.

**Geology and Soils Impact Discussion:**

VI.(a).(i)-(a).(iv).(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* Danville, like the entire Bay Area, is located in a seismically active region. As noted earlier, the Calaveras Fault is the major recognized fault system in the San Ramon Valley. Although potentially active faults do pose seismic hazards, it is reasonable to assume that the requirement to adhere to the stipulations outlined in the Building Code will ensure that potential risks will be avoided or appropriately minimized.

All vacant, underdeveloped and opportunity sites identified in the Housing Element inventory are located outside of the Alquist-Priolo fault zones and therefore no impact from fault rupture is expected. There is potential for liquefaction and or ground failure on the San Ramon Valley floor, especially adjacent to streams and/or creeks. However, with proper geotechnical considerations and adherence to code requirements, future development would not be at risk for impacts related to liquefactions or subsidence.

The primary geotechnical consideration is that of strong ground shaking generated by seismic activity. It is expected that any geotechnical concerns related to strong ground shaking would be anticipated in design and construction activities in accordance with California Building Code.

All future development projects proposed would be subject to separate subsequent CEQA review and would require a site specific geotechnical evaluation. The Housing Element does not introduce any new policies that would conflict with measures intended to protect residents from the adverse effects of seismic activity. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, potential impacts due to seismic impacts would be insignificant.

- VI.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* Housing sites identified in the Housing Element are underdeveloped or vacant lands. All future development on any of these sites would be required to evaluate and mitigate potential impacts related to the loss of topsoil and/or erosion. Any projects proposed for lands greater than one acre would be required to create a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and adhere to Best Management Practices. In addition, potential soil erosion and loss of topsoil impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Impacts related to erosion and/or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.
- VI.(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* Soils within the developed areas of Danville consists of clays and loams, and expansive properties. Future development would be individually reviewed pursuant to CEQA and Town regulations which require a thorough geotechnical investigation if there is reason to believe that geotechnical concerns may be present. The Housing Element does not introduce policies that would conflict with the requirements to perform site specific investigation, nor does it introduce any new development on land not previously evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts due to expansive soils would be less than significant.
- VI.(e). *No Impact:* The Housing Element identifies residential sites within existing developed areas, vacant lots, or underutilized lots. There is no expectation that development on any housing site identified in the Housing Element would warrant the use of septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system. All new development would be served by the existing sewer system. Therefore, no impacts associated with septic tanks or other wastewater disposal systems are expected.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Setting:** Current State of California guidance and goals for reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are embodied in Assembly Bill (AB) 32, passed by the California State legislature on August 31, 2006. AB 32 directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt discrete measures to reduce GHG emissions to year 2000 levels by 2010, 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

Concurrent with the 2030 General Plan, the Town also adopted a Sustainability Action Plan (SAP) in March 2013. The SAP documented Danville’s existing GHG emissions baseline (in year 2008) as generating an average of 351,590 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent gases annually. Danville’s biggest sources of GHGs were from transportation (45%), residential energy use (34%) and non-residential energy use (7%). Other sources included solid waste disposal (7%), water and wastewater use (2%), and miscellaneous other sources (5%).

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Discussion:**

VII.(a-b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document and would not result in the development of a specific housing site. All future development projects would be required to undergo separate and subsequent CEQA review and new residential projects would be subject to the adopted policies that require projects to minimize the generation of GHGs. The Housing Element does not introduce any polices or programs that would interfere with efforts to reduce GHG emissions communitywide. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG resulting from the Housing Element would be insignificant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</b> Would the project:				
(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"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(g) 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"/>	X
(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Hazards/Hazardous Materials Setting:** The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) defines a hazardous material as: “a substance or combination of substances that, because of its quantity, concentration or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may either: (1) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious, irreversible, or incapacitating illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to

human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.”

Regulations governing the use, management, handling, transportation and disposal of hazardous waste and hazardous materials are administered by Federal, State and local governmental agencies. Pursuant to the Planning and Zoning Law, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a hazardous waste and substances site list, also known as the “Cortese List.” Danville does not have any sites designated as Cortese sites per the DTSC. Contra Costa County’s Hazardous Materials Program (HMP) serves area residents by responding to emergencies and monitoring hazardous materials. Contra Costa Health Services – Hazardous Materials Programs (CCHSHMP) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for all businesses within Contra Costa County.

VIII.(a-b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document that identifies housing sites that can accommodate future residential development. Construction of these sites may result in the temporary presence of hazardous materials and other construction related materials onsite. However, future development is required to comply with all existing safety regulations. Additionally, future residential development projects would be subject to a separate and subsequent site specific CEQA review. The Housing Element does not identify any new lands or policies that have not been previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, potential impacts associated with hazardous materials would be insignificant.

VIII.(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element would not generate potentially hazardous emissions near or adjacent to an existing or proposed school. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Housing Element would have less than significant impacts due to the generation of hazardous materials in proximity to an existing or proposed school.

VIII.(d). *No Impact:* As of November, 2014, no sites identified as Cortese sites were listed as being present in Danville. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with locating a future residential development project on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites.

VIII.(e)-(f). *No Impact:* There are no airports or private airstrips located within the Planning Area. Therefore, there are no impacts associated with airport-related hazards.

VIII.(g). *Less than Significant Impact:* None of the proposed policies or programs in the Housing Element would seriously impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Any future development projects would be required to comply with adopted plans and regulations to ensure emergency ingress and egress during construction and operation. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts due to conflicts with an emergency response plan are expected to remain at levels below significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</b>				
Would the project:				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Hydrology and Water Quality Setting:** The drainage patterns in Danville are dictated by Mt. Diablo to the northeast and the East Bay Hills to the west. The Town is mostly within the San Ramon Creek watershed division of the Walnut Creek watershed. East of Crow Canyon Road, parts of Danville are also in the Upper Alameda Creek watershed. As such, limited areas within the Town have are located in areas designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as 100-year and 500-year flood hazard areas.

The primary source of domestic water for Danville is supplied by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), a public utility district serving many East Bay communities in Alameda County and Contra Costa County. EBMUD's water supply system consists of a network of reservoirs, aqueducts, treatment plants, and distribution facilities that extends from its principal water source, the Mokelumne River Basin in the Sierra Nevada range, to the East San Francisco Bay Area.

Danville implements numerous measures to protect the quality of surface water bodies as required under the Bay Area Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements. Danville also has an adopted Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance, which specifies measures required by projects to control and treat storm water runoff, and regulates the timing and method that stormwater enters the drainage facilities.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Impact Discussion:**

IX.(a). *Less than Significant Impact:* No policies within the Housing Element would directly alter or conflict with existing water quality regulations and discharge standards. All future development would be subject to regulations governing storm water runoff and water quality such as those stipulated by the Bay Area MRP, NPDES and local Stormwater management requirements. The Housing Element does not introduce any polices or programs that interfere with adopted regulation that protect water quality. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Housing Element would have a less than significant impact due to the violation of water quality and waste discharge requirements.

IX.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element identifies housing sites that could support residential land uses consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements. All sites identified support residential development at densities that are comparable to what has previously been anticipated by the 2030 General Plan. Furthermore, any future development projects proposed would be subject to separate and subsequent CEQA review and required to comply with all existing regulations governing water use. The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would interfere with groundwater recharge or otherwise compromise water supplies. Therefore, any impacts related to the depletion of groundwater would remain insignificant.

IX.(c).-(f). *Less than Significant Impact:* The housing sites identified in the Housing Element to support future residential development were previously evaluated as part of the 2030

General Plan EIR. There are no new land use designations that were not previously anticipated and addressed through that EIR. Furthermore, all future development proposed would be subject to local and state regulations governing erosion control, surface runoff and flooding. The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would interfere or otherwise conflict with adopted flood control, drainage, and stormwater runoff strategies. Therefore, potential impacts due to the alteration of drainage and contribution of stormwater would be insignificant.

- IX.(g)-(h). *Less than Significant Impact:* There are several drainage creeks with floodplains that are susceptible to the 100-year and 500-year flood zones in Danville. The proposed Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would interfere with protection associated with the 100-year flood hazard including the placement of structure within the 100-year flood hazard area. As mentioned, at the time that future residential development is proposed, all projects would be subject to separate and subsequent environmental review pursuant to CEQA, including an evaluation of potential flood zone impacts. All sites identified to hold an opportunity for residential development have previously been analyzed and assessed for flood hazards as a part of the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed Housing Element would have a less than significant impact due to the siting of structures within a flood hazard area.
- IX.(i). *Less than Significant Impact:* A dam inundation zone is shown for downtown Danville from the potential failure of a hillside reservoir located along Highland Drive, owned and operated by EBMUD. The reservoir has recently been reconstructed with a new concrete liner, seismic strengthening of the reservoir roof support structure and related work. The Housing Element does not introduce any policies that would alter the risk exposure associated the reservoir. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, potential associated with increased risk of exposure due to the failure of a dam or levee would be insignificant.
- IX.(j). *No Impact:* Danville is not located within an area that could be affected by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. There are no substantial water bodies within the Town limits that would pose a particular risk of exposure. Therefore, the Housing Element would not generate impacts from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

(c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**Land Use and Planning Setting:** The Town of Danville is nearly built out, with the predominant land use being residential.

**Land Use and Planning Impact Discussion:**

X.(a). *Less than Significant Impact:* Division of an established community typically occurs when a new physical feature, in the form of an interstate or railroad, physically transects an area, thereby removing mobility and access within an established community. The division of an established community can also occur through the removal of an existing road or pathway, which would reduce or remove access between a community and outlying areas.

The Housing Element does not introduce any polices or programs that would substantially reduce mobility or access. Therefore, impacts due to the division of an established community as the result of its implementation would be insignificant.

X.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element is consistent with all 2030 General Plan goals and policies and with the Zoning Ordinance. It does not introduce any policies or programs that would result in a conflict with the General Plan goals and policies or with zoning regulations. Future development proposals would be subject to separate and subsequent CEQA review and would require review to ensure consistency with the 2030 General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other regulations as appropriate. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of the Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts.

X.(c). *No Impact:* Danville is not subject to a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan. Therefore, the Housing Element would have no impact to any conservation plan or natural community plan.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Mineral Resources Setting:** No portion of the Town of Danville is designated by the California Department of Conservation as having the potential for being a significant source of composite minerals or industrial minerals.

**Mineral Resources Impact Discussion:**

XI.(a)-(b). *No Impact:* No active mineral extraction activities occur within the Town limits. As noted above, Danville is not a source of minerals. Further, the Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs related to Mineral Resources. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are expected to result from implementation of the proposed Housing Element.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. NOISE:</b> Would the project result in:				
(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

levels existing without the project?

(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?    X

(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?    X

**Noise Setting:** Traffic continues to be the most significant source of noise within the Danville Planning Area, with Interstate 680 being the most significant source of traffic noise. There are no stationary sources that make a significant contribution to Danville’s noise environment.

Danville regulates the noise environment through the Noise Ordinance within the Danville Municipal Code. Specific prohibitions include the operation of machinery, equipment or power tools in a manner which causes excessive noise to nearby residents during pre-defined hours. General Plan policies ensure that new residential development projects meet acceptable noise level guidelines. Noise analyses of new development proposals are required, when appropriate, in order to maintain consistency with interior and exterior noise standards of the Noise Element. The interior noise level limits are established by the State Building Code.

**Noise Impact Discussion:**

XII.(a)-(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would conflict with adopted regulations that protect the noise environment. At the time that any housing site identified in the Housing Element is proposed, a separate and subsequent site specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA would be required, including an acoustical analysis in conformance with 2030 General Plan policies. Compliance with federal, state and local regulations including the Town’s 2030 General Plan and Municipal Code would ensure that noise and vibration impacts related to exposure of persons to in excess of those would be identified, disclosed and mitigated accordingly. Therefore, impacts due to excessive noise or vibration resulting from the Housing Element would be less than significant.

XII.(c)-(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* The gradual increase in dwelling units over the housing planning cycle and distributed across different areas of the Planning Area is not expected to introduce a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise environment as a result of stationary or mobile sources. Stationary noise sources may include daily activities and movements by residents, landscaping, maintenance and the use of HVAC. All of the noise sources emit intermittent sources of low level noise and are not expected to cause a perceptible noise increase. Mobile noise sources may include increased traffic proximate to the project site. However, the wide distribution of development across opportunity sites and the gradual nature of development collectively lead to a reasonable assumption that development that will occur will not substantially increase ambient noise levels. Further, any potential impacts were

previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. The Housing Element does not introduce new policies or programs or anticipate rates of growth beyond what has previously been anticipated nor would it result in a temporary or permanent increase in the ambient noise environment. Therefore, impacts would be insignificant.

XII.(e)-(f). *No Impact:* Danville does not contain any airports or provide airstrips. Thus, there are no such facilities that would be located within two miles of a future residential development site. Therefore, the Housing Element would not expose people residing or working onsite to significant noise levels generated by an airport. No impacts associated with the exposure of people to aircraft related noise are expected.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:</b> Would the project:				
(a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Population and Housing Setting:** Over the twenty year period extending from 1990 to 2010 Danville’s population grew from 31,300 to 42,039 persons (a 34% increase). The projected growth rate between 2014 and 2020 is just another 3% growth. Danville’s population is trending older and slightly more ethnically diverse. The 2010 Census counted 15,420 households in Danville, most of which are characterized as family households, with a slight drop in the average household size to 2.74 persons from the 200 Census. The number of housing units has grown 3.8% over the past decade to 15,962 by 2013, and its housing stock continues to be primarily owner-occupied.

**Population and Housing Impact Discussion:**

XIII.(a). *Less than Significant Impact*: The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for Danville for the 2014-2022 planning cycle is to 557 housing units. The 2014-2022 Housing Element projects that future development would be accommodated through use of vacant lands and underdeveloped sites, with much of the development anticipated to occur at higher residential densities than are in place in Danville today. Assuming historic vacancy rates (i.e., 3%) and 2.74 persons per household, the population growth anticipated as a result of the projected residential development over the eight year planning period would be in a range of 1,800 to 1,950 additional residents. Presuming that all new housing units anticipated are occupied with new residents, the population of Danville in 2020 would be approximately 45,000 persons, consistent with growth in the region and consistent with previous analysis and projections in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Thus, the Housing Element would have less than significant impacts due to induced growth.

XIII.(b).-(c). *No Impact*: The Housing Element anticipates that future development would be accommodated through use of vacant lands and redevelopment of underdeveloped properties. As a policy document, the Housing Element does not introduce any programs that would displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people elsewhere. Therefore, implementation of the Housing Element would not generate impacts associated with the displacement of housing or people.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

(a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

(a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Public Services Setting:** Danville collects development impact fees for schools, parkland, and other facility improvements. These fees are necessary in order to finance, and ensure that new developments pay for their fair share of the costs of, improvements the required improvements to public facilities and services.

**Public Services Discussion:**

XIV.(a)-(e). *No Impact:* All potential impacts to public facilities generated by the development of any housing sites identified in the Housing Element have been previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Furthermore, any future development of any housing site would be subject to the Town’s Impact fees which are intended to offset increased demands placed on Public Services and the associated costs. All future development would be reviewed on a separate and subsequent project-specific basis, pursuant to CEQA. Given the 2030 General Plan anticipated the growth that is consistent with what would be supported by the Housing Element, the potential cumulative impacts to public services have already been identified and determined to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION</b>				
(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Recreation Setting:** There are approximately 178 acres of parkland and active recreation facilities in Danville, which is anticipated to increase to 181 acres after acceptance of acreage located at the southeast corner of Oak Hill Park Community Center. In addition, the Town improved and/or maintains another 34 acres of non-Town owned facilities (such as play fields on school sites). Another 66.58 acres of non-Town owned or non-Town maintained facilities (such as the Iron Horse Trail) exist in the Town that is available for recreation purposes. Danville meets its parkland standard of 5 acres of improved parkland per 1,000 residents as of January 1, 2011. For the entire Planning Area (including the unincorporated sphere of

influence), the estimated population of 47,130 was served by 278.26 acres of parkland, for a ratio of 5.9 acres per 1,000 residents.

**Recreation Discussion:**

XV.(a).-(b). *No Impact:* The Housing Element indicates that the anticipated development in the 2014-2022 planning period would add around 2,000 new residents, assuming the completion of a range of 682 to 737 dwelling units during the planning period and assuming the historic vacancy rate of 3%+/- is maintained (3%) and that the historic average household size of 2.74 persons is maintained. While the increase in population may put increased pressure on the Town’s recreational facilities, this has been previously identified and by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Further, potential impacts to recreational resources associated with future development of housing sites would be evaluated through a separate and subsequent environmental review pursuant to CEQA, with mitigation secured as appropriate to potential impacts. The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would conflict with the provision to provide adequate park land facilities. Therefore, no impacts to recreational facilities are expected.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</b>				
(a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

equipment)?

- |   |                          |                          |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| (e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Traffic/Transportation Setting:** The Town’s circulation network consists of an interstate freeway corridor and the local street system. The transportation network is well established and provides local and regional access within Town limits and to neighboring jurisdictions. Roadways within Danville are classified into several categories ranging from interstate freeway to local streets. Regional access to the Town is provided by Interstate 680 and Major and Minor arterials, some of which are considered Routes of Regional Significance, as defined by the Tri-Valley Transportation Plan/Action Plan. Danville has jurisdiction over its local streets and operates 52 traffic signals.

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) serves as the independent public agency formed by Contra Costa voters in 1988 to manage the county's ½-cent transportation sales tax program and to undertake countywide transportation planning. It is responsible for congestion management, specific highway improvement projects, and serves as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for jurisdictions within Contra Costa County including Danville. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) serves as the regional transportation planning agency for the SF Bay Area.

**Traffic/Transportation Discussion:**

XVI.(a). *Less than Significant Impact:* Although the Housing Element would facilitate increased residential densities authorized through the adoption of the 2030 General Plan, the development potential does not exceed what has been evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Expected growth rates and associated increases in traffic volumes under the proposed Housing Element are consistent with the growth rate utilized for local and regional traffic management efforts. Any increase in traffic related impacts would be evaluated through a separate and subsequent environmental project specific review pursuant to CEQA. Given that the Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would introduce new or exacerbated cumulative impacts, impacts associated with traffic and circulation would be less than significant.

XVI.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* Danville strives to maintain Level of Service (LOS) D operations at all signalized intersections under Town jurisdiction and LOS E along Routes of Regional Significance identified in the Tri-Valley Transportation Plan/Action Plan. The development potential of the housing sites identified by the Housing Element is consistent with the level of growth evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Potential environmental impacts to circulation and traffic from future residential development projects would be analyzed pursuant to CEQA on a project

specific basis. Therefore, the Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts due to a conflict in level of service.

- XVI.(c). *No Impact:* Given the nature and location of potential future residential development, which is located well outside of established airport flight patterns, the Housing Element would have no impact on air traffic patterns.
- XVI.(d). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element does not introduce any new policies or program that would conflict with the provisions for safe access set forth in the 2030 General Plan. As part of any future development review process, the Town would require a Traffic Impact Analysis which includes an evaluation of design features. All future circulation and traffic improvements are required to be constructed pursuant to the Town’s roadway safety standards. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts resulting from site design hazards would be insignificant.
- XVI.(e). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would conflict with the provision to provide for emergency access. All development projects would be reviewed in accordance with CEQA, including an evaluation of adequate emergency access. This process would identify any potential constraints in emergency access and require that the design of all new residential development sufficiently accommodates emergency access. Additionally, projects would be subject to review and approval by the San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts associated with the Housing Element would be at levels less than significant.
- XVI.(f). *Less than Significant Impact:* The Housing Element does not introduce any policies or programs that would substantially impact existing alternative transportation facilities. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, any impacts associated with alternative transportation would be less than significant as a result of implementation of the Housing Element.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</b>				
Would the project:				
(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(b) Require or result in the construction of new	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
(c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

**Utilities and Service Systems Setting:** The planning area is currently served by existing public utilities and service systems. Utility providers are responsible for the continued availability of services and increase and expand as necessary to meet demands.

***Water Service System***

The primary source of water for Danville is supplied by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), a publicly owned utility, formed under California's Municipal Utility District Act. EBMUD's water supply system consists of a network of reservoirs, aqueducts, treatment plants, and distribution facilities that extends from its principal water source, the Mokelumne River Basin in the Sierra Nevada range, to the East San Francisco Bay Area. The district produces an average of 220 MGD in non-drought years to an estimated 1.3 million people. The 2030 General Plan EIR concluded that the Town's 2030 General Plan is consistent with EBMUD's Urban Water Management Plan forecasts.

***Wastewater***

Danville is served by the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD), a special district that collects and cleans an average of 45 million gallons of wastewater per day for approximately 462,000 residents and 3,000 businesses in a 146 square mile area of central Contra Costa County. At 2030 General Plan build-out, the Town's wastewater treatment needs can be adequately accommodated, consistent with the 2010 CCCSD Collection System Master Plan Update.

### ***Stormwater***

Danville's storm drains convey runoff from impervious surfaces such as streets, sidewalks, and buildings to creeks that ultimately drain into the San Francisco Bay. Much of this water is untreated and carries with it any contaminants picked up along the way including solvents, oils, fuels, and sediments. The Town has standard conditions of approval for development projects that stipulates the use of Best Managements Practices and low impact development.

### ***Solid Waste***

Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority (CCCSWA) provides solid waste and residential recycling services for southern Contra Costa jurisdictions, including Danville. In 2014, CCCSWA holds franchise agreements with Allied Waste Services for the collection, transfer and disposal of residential and commercial solid waste; and with Valley Waste Management for the collection of residential recycling, green waste and food scraps. In March 2015, a new 10-year contract with garbage and recycling companies will go into effect with Republic Services (a.k.a. Allied Waste Services) for the collection, transfer and disposal of residential and commercial garbage, recycling and organics services, along with the commercial food recycling services. Mt. Diablo Recycling will hold the Franchise Agreement for the processing of residential and commercial recyclable materials. The landfills serving Danville include the Keller Canyon Landfill and Acme Landfill (2012). Danville's current disposal rate is 5.5 pounds of waste per person per day, which is well below the target of 6.5 pounds of waste per person per day.

### **Utilities and Service Systems Discussion:**

XVII.(a),(b),(d),and (e). *No Impact:* The Housing Element is consistent with the anticipated level of development and population growth previously identified and evaluated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. The Housing Element is a policy document does not include any specific development proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. All future residential development would be required to comply with local regulations. Environmental impacts of subsequent development projects would be evaluated on a separate and subsequent site-specific basis to assess potential impacts associated with public services pursuant to CEQA. Future development proposals would be reviewed by the appropriate service agencies as part of the development application review process in order to ensure that sufficient capacity in all utilities would be available on time to maintain desired service levels. Therefore, implementation of the Housing Element would have no impact regarding a significant increase in demand for wastewater and water services.

XVII.(c). *Less than Significant Impact:* Future residential development projects have the potential to result in an increase in impervious surfaces that could increase stormwater runoff. However, all new development projects would be subject to regulations including BMPs and low impact development standard that require onsite retention/detention and no net increase in offsite runoff. Site specific development proposals would be reviewed and evaluated to ensure consistency with applicable 2030 General Plan policies and CEQA requirements. Site specific design would be required to achieve the necessary storm flow requirements. The Housing Element does not introduce and policies or programs that would interfere with adequate storm water drainage. Further, any potential impacts were previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR.

Therefore, impacts to stormwater and drainage facilities as the result of implementing the Housing Element would be insignificant.

XVII.(f). and (g). *No Impact:* The Housing Element is a policy document that would not generate additional solid waste beyond what has previously been anticipated in the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, no new or expanded solid waste facilities would be required as a result of the Housing Element and impacts would be insignificant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
(a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVIII.(a). and (c). *Less than Significant Impact:* The proposed Project is the Danville 2014-2022 Housing Element and related conforming and implementation actions. The Housing Element is a policy-level document and while it encourages the provision of a range of housing types and affordability levels to meet the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 557 residential units. It does not include specific development proposals nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment to adversely affect human beings. All future residential development on any of the identified Housing Sites would be required to

comply with local regulations, including the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and subject to separate and subsequent site-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the proposed Housing Element would result in less than significant adverse impacts to the environment or to human beings as a result of environmental degradation.

XVIII.(b). *Less than Significant Impact:* As discussed above, the proposed Housing Element is a policy-level document that does not propose any specific development. Therefore, identifying or analyzing cumulative impacts would be speculative at this time. Future residential development projects and/or policies would be subject to environmental review, including a review of cumulative impacts. Further, any potential cumulative impacts resulting from the development of housing sites identified in the Housing Element have been previously analyzed by the 2030 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required beyond compliance with applicable General Plan policies, programs and action implementation.