



CITY OF MARTINEZ

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
December 17, 2008**

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Karen L. Majors, Assistant City Manager Community and Economic Development

SUBJECT: Update – Proposed North Pacheco Annexation

DATE: December 10, 2008

RECOMMENDATION:

Provide direction to staff.

BACKGROUND:

Last summer City officials were approached by several property owners in the north Pacheco Blvd. area requesting to be annexed to the City of Martinez. The property owners requesting consideration represent properties in the vicinity of Pacheco Blvd., Blum Road and Interstate 680. Many of these properties are large lots, currently commercial or industrial in use and may have future development potential.

In order for the city to consider moving forward on a potential annexation of this area, data is needed for an application to LAFCO and for the Environmental Checklist. The City retained the services of CH2MHill to research the appropriate information and to assist the City staff in preparation of a draft application.

This scope of work focused primarily on planning related information including general plan and zoning consistency, assessed property valuation, current and past development proposals as well as the type and level of public services available in the area. The scope of work did not include a fiscal impact analysis nor did it include CEQA level documentation.

The following is a synopsis of the information obtained to date by CH2MHill and city staff:

1. Purpose for Annexation: Economic Development and infrastructure improvement of a main entrance road leading into downtown Martinez.
2. Total number or parcels: 61
3. Total number of acres 62

4. Land Use Data – Mix of vacant, light industrial, commercial service (including auto service and sales), office, government and residential uses. A number of the industrial and commercial service buildings are vacant.
5. No major zoning or General Plan inconsistencies – the few that exist can be changed or grandfathered.
6. Affordable Housing: New State law requires any area that is annexed by a City to assume some County affordable housing responsibilities.
7. Total 2007-08 Assessed Value \$20,575,156
8. Total 2007-08 Property Tax generated: \$270,693
9. Local Share of 2007-08 property tax : \$32,000
10. Tax Sharing Agreement – According to Rich Seithel of Contra Costa County, the County would likely look for tax sharing pursuant to the Master Tax Sharing Agreement which would likely reduce the above \$32,000 estimate. The County is fairly adamant in sharing 50% of any existing and future sales tax revenue generated. A more detailed and sophisticated estimate will be developed as part of the proposed fiscal impact analysis
11. Services to be transferred to City:
 - Police – possible impact
 - Streets – possible, Pacheco Blvd. is in bad shape, the rest of the streets are ok.
 - Stormwater – possible, Pacheco Blvd has none
 - Solid waste – no impact
 - Service levels are being reviewed and verified by city staff
12. Environmental Checklist – Potential Significant Impacts
 - Public Services – Possible
 - Land Use Planning - Minor
 - Utilities/Service Systems – Not likely
13. Next Steps
 - Update to City Council Annexation Sub-committee – December 9, 2008
 - Status Report to City Council – December 17, 2008
 - Fiscal Impact Analysis - \$10-15,000 January/February, 2009
 - Workshop meeting with LAFCO – Late January or February, 2009
 - CEQA document likely a Neg. Dec.
 - Formal Application to LAFCO

Discussion Questions:

- 1) Does the City Council concur with the proposed boundaries?
- 2) Does the City Council want to expand the boundaries to facilitate more economic development and a more comprehensive improvement of the general area?
- 3) Does the City Council want to consider future residential development as well as commercial/business/industrial park use?
- 4) Does the City Council support the expenditure of funds to undertake a fiscal impact analysis and a preliminary informational presentation to LAFCO?
- 5) Upon further review of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) planning guidelines there is currently \$13 million reserved for improved median islands, drainage and widening the street on North Pacheco Boulevard.
- 6) Should staff consider adding the proposed annexation properties to a redevelopment area if a redevelopment agency is formed in the future- it may help pay for some of the infrastructure and undergrounding costs?

Map of Proposed North Pacheco Annexation Area:



FISCAL IMPACT:

Staff time and approximately \$10,000 to \$15,000 to undertake the fiscal impact analysis. There will be future costs associated with the preparation of a CEQA document when a formal application to LAFCO is made. Staff will return to Council for future appropriations requests to cover the costs of completing an environment analysis.

ACTION:

Provide input to staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft LAFCO Application
Environmental Checklist

APPROVED BY:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Philip Vance". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P".

City Manager

CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

**Proposal Justification Questionnaire for Annexations,
Detachments and Reorganizations**

(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

1. Name of Application: (The name should match the title on the map and legal description; list all boundary changes that are part of the application)

Application for the Annexation of North Pacheco to the City of Martinez.

2. Describe the acreage and general location; include street addresses if known:

The proposal area consists of approximately 61 acres located in unincorporated Contra Costa County. The area is roughly triangular in shape and is bounded by State Route (SR) 4 to the south, Interstate (I) 680 to the east, and the southeastern boundary of the City of Martinez to the west (see Figures 1 and 2).

The street addresses within the proposal area are listed in Table A.

3. List the Assessor's Parcels within the proposal area:

The Assessor's Parcels within the proposal area are listed in Table A.

4. Reasons for the proposal: (Why is this proposal being filed? Identify other actions that are part of the overall project, i.e., a tract map or development permit.)

The City is seeking to annex North Pacheco to facilitate future development at the crossroads of two major highways, SR-4 and I-680 and the gateway to the City from the south and east. The annexation would facilitate future economic revitalization of the proposal area and the visual improvement of the gateway to the City. The proposed annexation project does not include any redevelopment activities or construction.

5. Land Use and Zoning - Present and Future

- A. Describe the existing land uses within the proposal area. Be specific.

The northern portion of the proposal area includes the Contra Costa Canal and vacant land between the canal and I-680. The vacant land is unpaved, fenced, and has no public road access. Part of it is likely Caltrans right-of-way for I-680. The central and southern portions of the proposal area include a mix of commercial, government, and residential uses. Commercial uses are predominantly construction and landscape businesses, automotive repair shops, and vendors of automotive accessories. There are several other businesses in the proposal area, a few of which include a union office, car donation center, dental office, and a daycare facility. Several of the commercial spaces are vacant and have "for rent" signs posted outside them. The largest businesses are an RV

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

dealer, which occupies several parcels at the north end of the commercial district, and a trailer dealer between the industrial park along Blum Road and I-680.

Three occupied multi-family apartment buildings are located on Hanson Court. Two single family homes are situated at the south end of Pacheco Boulevard. A California Highway Patrol office is located in the east central part of the proposal area. Caltrans owns land that borders the highways and operates a park and ride lot at the south end of Blum Road. Contra Costa County Transportation Authority is planning to redevelop a portion of the site into a bus transfer facility that includes parking (see Attachment 4). Interchange enhancements are planned for all of the Caltrans properties.

B. Describe any changes in land uses that would result from or be facilitated by this proposed boundary change.

The proposed annexation would facilitate future redevelopment of this area which serves as a gateway to the City of Martinez from the south and east and would facilitate future economic revitalization. Future redevelopment would likely entail the conversion of certain parcels into a business or industrial park. Redevelopment could also entail residential development though this would require an amendment to the General Plan.

C. Describe the existing zoning designations within the proposal area.

There are currently six Contra Costa County zoning designations in the proposal area (see Figure 3 and Table A):

- General Commercial (C) which includes wholesale businesses, warehouses, freight terminals, trucking yards, lumberyards, cabinet shops, sheet metal shops, auto repair garages, and contractor's yards;
- Retail Business (R-B) which includes businesses that sell retail goods or services;
- Multiple Family Residential (M-29) which allows up to 29 apartment units per acre;
- Heavy Industrial (H-I) which includes the manufacturing or processing of petroleum, lumber, steel, chemicals, explosives, fertilizers, gas, rubber, paper, cement, sugar, and all other industrial or manufacturing products.
- Controlled Manufacturing (C-M) which includes manufacturing that is compatible with adjacent residential areas.
- Single Family Residential District 7 (R-7) which includes single family dwellings on lots that are no less than 7000 ft².

D. Describe any proposed change in zoning for the proposal area. Do the existing and proposed uses conform with this zoning?

Refer to 5E.

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

E. (For City Annexations) Describe the rezoning that will apply to the proposal area upon annexation. Do the proposed uses conform with this rezoning?

The majority of the proposal area was rezoned in the early 1980s as part of a previous annexation effort (see Figure 4 and Table A). The rezoning was based on existing County zoning designations in an effort to convince property owners that nothing would change. This annexation effort was unsuccessful. Later, the County re-zoned four of the Multi-Family Residential (M-29) parcels to Commercial (C): 159210006, 159210010, 159210012, 159210028. These parcels remain rezoned M-29 (Multiple Family) by the City. Their existing uses are commercial and include construction, landscaping, and electrical services. The City would attempt to change the rezoning of these four parcels to Commercial.

F. List all known entitlement applications pending for the property (i.e., zone change, land division or other entitlements).

APN	Entitlement Application	County File
159-210-018	Rezoned	RZ07-3198
159-210-028	Rezoned	RZ01-3100
159-210-032	Land Use Permit	LP05-2091
159-210-040	Land Use Permit	LP05-2091
159-220-003	Zoning Investigation	ZI06-11497

6. Describe the area surrounding the proposal

In Table B at the end of this questionnaire, describe existing land uses, general plans and zoning designations for lands adjacent to and surrounding the proposal area. The application is incomplete without this table.

Refer to Table B.

7. Conformity with Spheres of influence

A. Is the proposal area within the sphere of influence of the annexing agency?

Yes, the proposal area is within the sphere of influence of the City of Martinez.

B. If not, include a proposal to revise the sphere of influence.

Not applicable.

8. Conformity with the County Urban Limit Line

Is the proposal area entirely within the County Urban Limit Line? If not, please explain.

Yes, the proposal area is entirely within the County Urban Limit Line.

9. Conformity with County and City General Plans

A. Describe the existing County General Plan designation for the proposal area.

As indicated in Figure 5 and Table A, there are three County Costa County General Plan land use designations within the proposal area: Public and Semi Public (PS), Commercial (CO), and Multiple Family Residential – Low Density (ML).

Public and Semi Public (PS) refers to properties owned by governmental agencies such as libraries, fire stations, schools, and public transportation corridors, as well as privately owned transportation and utility corridors such as railroads, PG&E lines, and pipelines. A variety of public and private uses are allowed by this designation. However, the subdivision of land and the construction of private residences or private commercial uses are not compatible with this designation.

The Commercial (CO) designation allows for commercial uses typically found in smaller scale neighborhoods and thoroughfare commercial districts including retail, personal service facilities, and limited office uses.

Multiple-Family Residential-Low Density (ML) allows between 7.3 and 11.9 multiple family units per acre. Compatible land uses include attached single family residences, multiple family residences, churches, second dwelling units, home occupations, and group care and/or childcare facilities.

In the County General Plan, the proposal area is included within the Vine Hill Ridge/Pacheco Boulevard Policy Area. None of the policies for this Policy Area conflict with the proposed annexation.

B. (For City Annexations) Describe the City general plan designation for the area.

The City General Plan, adopted in 1973, originally designated the proposal area Open Space/Conservation Use Land. The proposal area was part of the John Muir Parkway Policy Zone which included the east side of the City and unincorporated areas to the east. The Specific Area Plan for this zone emphasized urban development and a link to the east between old and new Martinez (Major Goal 33.2). It also emphasized improving the aesthetic appeal of gateways to the City and the annexation of unincorporated lands (Major Goal 33.2, Major Objectives 33.28 and 33.29) (City of Martinez, 1978). The John Muir Parkway Specific Area Plan was last amended in 1991 and designated the majority of the proposal area as Commercial (see Figure 6).

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

- C. Do the proposed uses conform with these plans? If not, please explain.

There are no conflicts between the City and County General Plans and the proposed uses of the proposal area. The proposed annexation does not conflict with County plans generally nor does it conflict with policies specific to the Policy Area (Vine Hill Ridge/Pacheco Boulevard) in which the proposal area is located. The proposed annexation does not conflict with policies of the City General Plan. It complies with the Commercial designation assigned to the majority of the proposal area by the City John Muir Specific Area Plan. It further complies with the Specific Area Plan in that it would facilitate future economic development and enhancement of the City's image (Major Goal 33.2). It would also facilitate the future improvement of the aesthetic appeal of entrances to the City (Major Objective 33.28). It complies directly with Major Objective 33.29, to "encourage the systematic annexation of unincorporated lands."

10. Topography and Natural Features

- A. Describe the general topography of the proposal area and any significant natural features that may affect the proposal.

The proposal area covers 61 acres and is roughly triangular in shape. The west side of the proposal area is bounded by the Contra Costa Canal which is below ground for the majority of the proposal area. The proposal area is flat, sloping upward toward the west. The base of a hill runs along the southwest side of the proposal area along the west side of Pacheco Boulevard.

- B. Describe the general topography of the area surrounding the proposal.

The proposal area is situated approximately 2.25 miles south of Suisun Bay and the eastern edge of the Carquinez Straits. It is located in a broad, relatively flat valley formed as the floodplain of Pacheco Creek. A tributary to Pacheco Creek is 0.30 miles east of the proposal area. The valley contains the cities of Martinez, Concord, Pleasant Hill, and Walnut Creek and is nestled between the Briones Hills to the west and the northern extension of the Black Hills to the east.

11. Impact on Agriculture

- A. Does the property currently produce a commercial agricultural commodity?

No

- B. Is the property fallow land under a crop rotational program or is it enrolled in an agricultural subsidy or set-aside program?

No

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

C. Is the affected property Prime Agricultural Land as defined in Government Code §56064?

No

D. Is any portion of the proposal area within a Land Conservation (Williamson) Act contract?

No

1) If “yes,” provide the contract number and date the contract was executed.

Not applicable.

2) If “yes”, has a notice of non-renewal be filed? If so, when?

Not applicable.

3) If this proposal is an annexation to a city, provide a copy of any protest filed by the annexing city against the contract when it was approved.

Not applicable.

12. Impact on Open Space

Is the affected property Open Space land as defined in Government Code Section 65560?

Though the proposal area was designated Open Space by the City in 1973 and today parts of it are vacant, no part of the proposal area currently meets the definition of Open Space in Section 65560: “any parcel which is essentially unimproved and which is designated on a local, regional or state open-space plan as open space for the preservation of natural resources, for the managed production of resources, for outdoor recreation, or for health and public safety.” The majority of the proposal area, including the vacant areas, was rezoned Commercial in an amendment (Resolution 107-87) to the City General Plan. No parts of the proposal area are unimproved.

13. Relationship to Regional Housing Goals and Policies (City annexations only)

If this proposal will result in or facilitate an increase in the number of housing units, describe the extent to which the proposal will assist the annexing city in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by ABAG.

This proposal could result in or facilitate an increase in the number of housing units. However, this would require an amendment to the City’s General Plan.

14. Population

A. Describe the number and type of existing dwelling units within the proposal area.

Much of the proposal area was originally developed as residential, though today it has become predominately commercial and most of the former dwelling units have been demolished or converted into commercial space. The remaining dwelling units include three multi-unit properties on Hanson Court that were built in the 1950s and 1960s and are currently occupied (APN: 159210031, 159210026, 159210030). In addition, the south end of Pacheco Road contains two single family homes that appear to be currently occupied as residential dwelling units (APN: 161010019 and 161010018).

B. How many new dwelling units could result from or be facilitated by the proposal?

Single-family _____ Multi-family _____

Residential may be a potential use in the future.

C. What is the projected population growth due to the proposal?

If residential is proposed in the future, the population may grow due to the proposed annexation.

15. Plan for Providing Services - Government Services and Controls (per §56653)

A. Describe the services to be extended to the affected territory by this proposal.

The following agencies would retain their services in the proposal area upon annexation:

- Water services would remain under the jurisdiction of Contra Costa Water District (CCWD). CCWD provides treated water to the eastern part of the City of Martinez and other incorporated and unincorporated parts of Contra Costa County. See Attachment 1 for existing water service plans.
- Wastewater services would remain under the jurisdiction of Mt. View Sanitary District (MVSD). MVSD provides treatment services to the central portion of the City and the adjacent unincorporated area to the northeast. See Attachment 2 for existing wastewater service plans.
- Schools services would remain under the jurisdiction of Mount Diablo School District.
- Fire services would remain under the jurisdiction of Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.

Upon annexation, jurisdiction over the following services would change:

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

- Stormwater jurisdiction would transfer from the County to the City and the City would be required to maintain the existing public infrastructure. No new stormwater infrastructure is anticipated to be required as a result of the proposed annexation. Stormwater would have to be addressed with any future redevelopment of the area. See Attachment 3 for existing stormwater service plans.
- Mt. View Sanitary District (MVSD) currently has the solid waste franchise for the proposal area. After annexation, the City would have the right to request the transfer of the franchise to its jurisdiction (Leptien, 2008, personal communication). The request is likely since the MVSD does not hold the franchise for any City property.
- Police patrol and emergency response services would be transferred from the County Sheriff's office to the City of Martinez Police department.

B. Describe the level and range of the proposed services.

City police services would be provided to the proposal area. The Office of the Sheriff (2008) reported that they responded to 12 incidents in the beat that includes the proposal area from April 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008. The Martinez Police Department estimates that with the annexation of the proposal area, response times would stay constant or increase slightly (Sergeant Walkup, 2008, personal communication).

Responsibility for the stormwater system would be transferred from the County to the City upon annexation. The City would be required to maintain the existing public stormwater infrastructure causing a **minimal impact** to City stormwater services (see Attachment 3).

[City to confirm]

If the City acquires the solidwaste franchise, it would contract with the same hauler that currently services the proposal area for Mt. View Sanitary District, Allied Waste Services. The addition of the proposal area to the City's solidwaste contract would likely cause a **minimal impact** to City solidwaste services.

[City to confirm]

C. Indicate when the services can feasibly be provided to the proposal area.

The City of Martinez would provide police and stormwater service to the proposal area upon annexation.

D. Indicate any improvements or upgrading of structures, roads, sewers or water facilities or other conditions that will be required as a result of the proposal.

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

No upgrading would be necessary.

- E. Identify how these services will be financed. Include both capital improvements and ongoing maintenance and operation.

These capital improvement projects could be funded through State, Regional, or County Transportation funding.

- F. Identify any alternatives for providing the services listed in Section (A) and how these alternatives would affect the cost and adequacy of services.

[City to provide]

16. Ability of the annexing agency to provide services

Attach a statement from each annexing agency describing its ability to provide services that are the subject of the application, including the sufficiency of revenues (56668j).

[City to provide letters describing its ability to provide police, stormwater, and solidwaste services]

17. Dependability of Water Supply for Projected Needs (56653)

If the proposal will result in or facilitate an increase in water usage, attach a statement from the retail water purveyor that describes the timely availability of water supplies that will be adequate for the projected needs.

No increase in water usage would result from the proposed annexation.

18. Bonded indebtedness and zones – These questions pertain to long term debt that applies or will be applied to the affected property.

[To be answered by City]

- A. Do agencies whose boundaries are being changed have existing bonded debt?
_____ If so, please describe.
- B. Will the proposal area be liable for payment of its share of this existing debt?
_____ If yes, how will this indebtedness be repaid (property taxes, assessments, water sales, etc.)
- C. Should the proposal area be included within any 'Division or Zone for debt repayment? _ If yes, please describe.

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

- D. (For detachments) Does the detaching agency propose that the subject territory continue to be liable for existing bonded debt? _____. If yes, please describe.

19. Environmental Impact of the Proposal

- A. Who is the "lead agency" for this proposal? City of Martinez

- B. What type of environmental document has been prepared?

Categorically Exempt -- Class ____ EIR ____ Negative Declaration ____

Mitigated ND _ x (anticipated)____ Subsequent Use of Previous EIR _____

Identify the prior EIR. _____

- C. If an EIR has been prepared, provide 13 copies of the Final EIR and one copy of the lead agency's resolution listing significant impacts, mitigation measures and, if adopted, a statement of overriding considerations.

Not applicable.

20. Boundaries

- A. Why are these particular boundaries being used? Ideally, what other properties should be included in the proposal?

These boundaries of the proposal area were chosen because they represent a logical geographic expansion of the City of Martinez. They would take the City boundary to the intersection of two major highways, I-680 and SR-4 which separate the proposal area from other County land. Annexation would facilitate the future development of a gateway to the City from the south and east to enhance the City's economy. No other properties would need to be included in the proposal area.

- B. If any landowners have included only part of the contiguous land under their ownership, explain why the additional property is not included.

Not Applicable.

21. Final Comments

- A. List any conditions LAFCO should include in it's resolution of approval.

None.

Preliminary Draft
for Discussion Only

- B. Provide any other comments or justifications regarding the proposal from any affected local agency, landowner or resident.

Some property owners within the proposal area are in favor of the annexation.

- C. Enclose all pertinent staff reports and supporting documentation related to this proposal. Note any changes in the approved project that are not reflected in these materials.

[City to provide]

22. Notices and Staff Reports - List up to three persons with mailing addresses to receive copies of the LAFCO notice of hearing and staff report.

Rob Schroder, Mayor
Philip Vince, City Manager
Karen Majors, Assistant City Manager

Address: City of Martinez – City Hall; 525 Henrietta Street; Martinez, CA; 94553

Who should be contacted if there are questions about this application?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Karen Majors, Assistant City Manager,	525 Henrietta Street, Martinez, CA 94553,	925-372-3514

Signature _____

Date _____

Preliminary Initial Study Checklist

North Pacheco Annexation

Prepared for

City of Martinez

525 Henrietta Street

Martinez, CA 94553

December 5, 2008

Prepared by

CH2M HILL

155 Grand Avenue, Suite 1000

Oakland, California 94612

Initial Study Checklist

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The following Environmental Checklist considers the proposed annexation.

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
X	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
X	Utilities / Service Systems	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

I. AESTHETICS:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d) Though there are no designated state scenic vistas or highways on or adjacent to the proposed annexation area, State Route 4 is a designated scenic highway in both the City of Martinez General Plan (1973) and the Contra Costa County General Plan (2005). No City or County designated scenic ridgelines or waterways are on or adjacent to the proposed annexation site (Contra Costa County, 2005). The project is not expected to affect aesthetics or visual resources because it would not involve any physical changes to the landscape.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

<p>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:</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

Discussion:

a-c) No land in the proposal area is zoned or designated agricultural. No impacts to farmlands are expected to result from the implementation of this action.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-e) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to air quality are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-f) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to biological resources are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-e) Strong seismic shaking could occur in the proposal area since the Concord-Green Valley fault is about 1 mile to the east. However, no impacts to geological resources are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation. Construction is not part of the proposed annexation.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-h) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts of hazards and hazardous materials are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-j) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to hydrology and water quality are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation. The proposal area is being served by Mt. View Sanitary District for wastewater treatment. No change in water service would occur due to annexation.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a and c) The proposed annexation would not physically divide an established community nor would the proposed annexation conflict with any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

b) The proposed annexation would not conflict with the County General Plan (Vine Hill Ridge/Pacheco Boulevard) nor the City General Plan (John Muir Parkway) adopted area policies that apply to the proposal area. However, there are several potential inconsistencies between existing land use, City rezoning, County zoning, and General Plan land use designations in the proposal area. The inconsistencies are listed in Table A. These inconsistencies mean that a potentially significant impact in land use may occur after annexation.

There are four categories of potential inconsistencies. The first applies to parcels that contain multi-family dwellings where City and County zoning reflect residential use but general plan land use designations reflect commercial use. The second applies to former residential dwelling lots that have been converted to commercial use where City and County zoning still reflect residential use. The third applies to former residential lots where existing use, County zoning, and County land use designations all reflect commercial use, but City rezoning reflects residential use. The fourth applies to vacant parcels between the Contra Costa Canal and I-680 in the northern part of the proposal area which have no public road access. They are not rezoned by the City, but are zoned Single Family Residential (R-7) by the County.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

XI. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-f) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed and no change to existing utilities is anticipated. Thus no impacts to noise are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) Following annexation, residential development could potentially be proposed for the proposal area. Residential development would require an amendment to the City's General Plan. Any redevelopment proposals for the area will undergo environmental review on a project-level basis.

b-c) The proposed annexation could lead to indirect impacts such as redevelopment of the proposal area and reduced housing (and displaced residents). Any redevelopment proposals for the area will undergo environmental review on a project-level basis.

XIII. 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The Contra Costa County Fire Protection Department (CCCFFPD) provides fire and emergency services to residents of the City of Martinez as well as the proposal area. There would be no change in this service as a result of the proposed annexation.

Upon annexation, police patrol and emergency response would be transferred from the County Sheriff's office to the City of Martinez Police Department. The Sheriff's Office reported only 12 criminal incidents in the beat which includes the proposal area in the six months from April 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008 (Office of the Sheriff, 2008). The Martinez Police Department estimates that annexation of the area would cause police response times to remain constant or increase slightly (Sergeant Walkup, personal communication, 2008). Therefore annexation would represent a less than significant impact on City police services.

The proposal area is currently served by Mount Diablo Unified School District which serves parts of Martinez, surrounding cities, and unincorporated areas (Mount Diablo Unified School District, 2008). No change in school district would result from the proposed annexation. There are no parks in the proposal area. There would be no change to other public facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed at this time. Thus no impacts to recreational facilities are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-g) The proposed annexation is a jurisdictional change that is anticipated to have no direct, physical effects on the environment. No construction is proposed. Thus no impacts to traffic and transportation are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed annexation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a, b, d, e) The proposal area is currently served by Mt. View Sanitary District (MVSD) for wastewater. MVSD also serves the central portion of the City of Martinez and unincorporated areas to the northeast and has been determined by LAFCO to serve its service areas adequately (LAFCO, 2008(b)). After annexation, MVSD would continue to serve the proposal area. No change in the amount of wastewater is expected to result from the proposed annexation. No Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements would be exceeded and no new facilities would be necessary as a result of the proposed annexation.

Treated water is currently provided to the proposal area by Contra Costa Water District (CCWD). CCWD also serves the rest of Pacheco, the east part of the City of Martinez,

Clayton, Clyde, Concord, Port Costa, and parts of Pleasant Hill and Brentwood. CCWD has been determined by LAFCO to have sufficient supply and conveyance capacity to accommodate current customers and planned growth (LAFCO, 2008(b)). CCWD would continue to serve the proposal area after annexation. No change in the amount of treated water is expected to result from the proposed annexation.

c) No new stormwater discharge facilities or infrastructure would be required as a result of the proposed annexation.

f-g) Mt. View Sanitary District currently holds the solid waste franchise for the proposal area. Upon annexation, the City could request that the franchise be transferred to the City. This would likely cause a less than significant impact since both the City and the Mt. View Sanitary District contract with the same solid waste service provider, Allied Waste Services.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The proposed jurisdictional change is a procedural action and would not degrade the quality of the environment.

b) The City of Martinez contemplates future redevelopment of the proposal area which may include redevelopment of parts of the proposal area as an industrial park, business park, or for residential uses. These activities could have short-term and long-term impacts on various resources including traffic, air quality, noise, biological resources, aesthetics, utilities, and public services. However, any future redevelopment would be considered separate from the proposed annexation and would require project-level analysis under CEQA.

c) The proposed jurisdictional change is a procedural action and would have no adverse effect on human beings.

References

- City of Martinez, 1973. *Martinez General Plan*. Martinez, CA.
- City of Martinez, 1978. *John Muir Specific Area Plan*. Martinez, CA. May 2, 1978.
- City of Martinez, 1995. *General Plan Amendments from 1973 to January 1995*. Martinez, CA.
- Contra Costa County, 2005. *Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005 – 2020*. Contra Costa County Community Development Department. January 18.
- LAFCO, 2008 (a). Contra Costa County LAFCO. Water and Wastewater Municipal Service Reviews. Section 4: Contra Costa Water District Water Services. April 9, 2008.
- LAFCO, 2008 (b). Contra Costa County LAFCO. Water and Wastewater Municipal Service Reviews. Section 7: Mt. View Sanitary District Wastewater Service. April 9, 2008.
- LAFCO, no date. Contra Costa LAFCO Commissioner Handbook: Policies and Standards.
- Leptien, 2008. Randy Leptien, District Engineer, Mt. View Sanitary District personal communication to MariaElena Conserva/CH2M HILL. November 10, 200.
- Mount Diablo Unified School District, 2008. "Find Your School" website accessed November 3, 2008. <http://www.mdusd.k12.ca.us/mdusd/schoolfind.php>
- Office of the Sheriff, 2008. Contra Costa County, Office of the Sheriff. Memo to CH2M HILL titled: Criminal Statistics for 5034 Blum Road for six month from April 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008. October 22, 2008.

List of Preparers:

The Initial Study Checklist was prepared in consultation with the City of Martinez by CH2M HILL staff:

Karen Majors/City of Martinez, Assistant City Manager

Loretta Meyer/CH2M HILL, Project Manager

Karin Lilienbecker/CH2M HILL, Senior Reviewer

MariaElena Conserva/CH2M HILL, Task Manager

Frankie Burton/CH2M HILL, Planner