

Appendix B
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title: Byron Airport Master Plan Update
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County Community Development Department
651 Pine Street, North Wing - 4th Floor
Martinez, CA 94553
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Colleen Culver-Jaffe – (925) 313-2236
4. Project Location: The project is located in the southeastern corner of Contra Costa County, near the community of Byron
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Contra Costa County Airports
550 Sally Ride Drive, Concord, CA 94520
6. General Plan Designation: Public and Semi-Public
7. Zoning: A-2 (General Agriculture), A-3 (Heavy Agriculture), A-4 (Agricultural Preserve)
8. Description of Project:

The project consists of updating the Master Plan for the Byron Airport. The airport Master Plan (the Plan) is a policy document that will provide the Byron Airport with growth and development direction through the year 2024. It is anticipated that there will be little change to the 1985 Byron Airport Plan; much of the development that was previously proposed has yet to be completed. The updated Plan will not have any environmental impacts that were not previously analyzed in the *1985 EIR for the Proposed East Contra Costa County Airport* (1985 EIR), with the exception of the change of circumstances in Biology (some species have been listed as Threatened or Endangered since the original plan). All potential improvements including construction activities associated with the runway extension, access and circulation improvements, paving of the pump station road, building of airport hangars, and fixed base facility operations (FBO's) are located in previously identified development areas and are consistent with the 1985 Plan. In addition, the Plan includes aviation activity forecasts and demand analysis, airfield layout requirements, building area and facilities requirements, and supporting infrastructure requirements that are consistent with the 1985 Plan. Development of this area was originally approved under the terms and conditions of agreements with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The area has remained relatively undisturbed since 1998. The Plan is not expected to change either air traffic or vehicular traffic in the area from the levels analyzed in the 1985 EIR. Although not expected, some Real Property transactions may be necessary in support of the project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Land surrounding the project area consists of undeveloped and agricultural uses as well as residences and businesses in the community of Byron. The project is located approximately three miles south of the town of Byron and 2.5 miles north of the Alameda County line.
10. Other public agencies whose approval (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). None required.

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"/>	Land Use & Planning Population & Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services Utilities & Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geological Problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics
<input type="checkbox"/>	Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy & Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Significant Impacts Identified

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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. 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 significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

Print Name

Contra Costa County
Community Development Department

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references (which are available for review at the Contra Costa County Community Development Department, 651 Pine Street 5th Floor-North Wing, Martinez) were consulted:

1. Contra Costa Resource Mapping System - Quad Sheet Panels for Byron Hot Springs and Clifton Court Quadrangles, CA
2. The (Reconsolidated) County General Plan (July 1996) and EIR on the General Plan (January 1991)
3. Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 1998, California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resources Protection, 1999
4. Soil Survey of Contra Costa County, Soil conservation Service, 9/77
5. Contra Costa County Flood Insurance Rate Zone Information Map (Panels 060025 0525 B and 060025 0550 B)
6. California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish and Game, March 2004, Byron Hot Springs Quadrangle
7. Special-Status Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Byron Airport, Contra Costa County, California, Prepared by Biosearch Associates, May 21, 2004
8. EIR For the Proposed East Contra Costa County Airport, State Clearinghouse #85042304
9. Field Reviews and Project Description (including coordination with Beth Lee)
10. Biological Assessment Byron Airport Expansion Project Contra Costa County California, Prepared by Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D.
11. Contra Costa County Public Works GIS, July 2004
12. M. Allaback, Biosearch Associates, Senior Biologist, pers. com., 7/28/04

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock, outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings:	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY:

The Plan will have no impact on Aesthetic resources beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR. All potential improvements including construction activities associated with the runway extension, access and circulation improvements, paving of the pump station road, building of airport hangars, and fixed base facility operations (FBO's) are located in previously identified development areas and are consistent with the 1985 plan. Further discussion on all environmental impacts can be found in the attached 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL 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 agricultural 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?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY:

The Plan will have no impact on Agricultural Resources beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR. The elements in the Plan will not encroach upon any farmland of importance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	_____	X
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)?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	_____	_____	_____	X
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Air Quality beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR. There is no projected increase in air or vehicular traffic.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. 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, polices, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
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?	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
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?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____

SUMMARY

The updated Plan does not impact any areas not previously identified as developable, and analyzed in the 1985 EIR. However, there have been a number of species that have been listed or proposed for listing since the 1985 EIR.

On April 1, 2004, Biosearch Associates, biologists hired by the County, conducted a Habitat Assessment of the project site to determine which sensitive species may occur within the project area. All special-status wildlife species and other species of concern that occur or historically occurred in the region were considered for inclusion in the Habitat Assessment.

The biologist identified several special-status wildlife species, including four threatened, endangered or candidate animals known to occur in the general area or observed on the adjacent Habitat Management Lands. As part of the originally approved airport project, a comprehensive conservation strategy was employed to offset conversion of 214 acres of habitat for the federally-endangered and state-threatened San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*): 814 acres of the site were preserved under a Conservation Easement and designated as Habitat Management Lands (HML), which border the airport on the west, south and southeast. The San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*), which is listed as federally-endangered and state-

threatened, has been periodically observed in the vicinity of the airport and on HML and surrounding lands; at least 15 dens have been identified within 200 feet of the present study area.

The vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchineta lynchi*), a federally-listed species has been recorded from several seasonal pools on the HML. Most of the project area does not support wetlands and therefore does not provide suitable conditions for the vernal pool fairy shrimp. However, wetland habitats are present along the access route between the two runways. Vernal pool fairy shrimp were found in pools in this area. The 814 acres of land preserved under a conservation easement (when the Byron Airport was originally approved) offset losses to both kit fox and vernal pool habitats.

The California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), a federally-threatened species, inhabits Brushy Creek and uses other areas on the HML seasonally. Brushy Creek passes within 100 feet of the northwestern part of the project area, and the species could occupy this portion of the creek whenever it holds water.

The California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), a federally-listed species, breeds in several seasonal ponds onsite, including one that is 300 feet from the project site.

Biosearch Associates identified other Special-Status species that may occur on or near the project site. These species include western pond turtle, Golden eagle, ferruginous hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, and the tri-colored blackbird.

Much of the core of the study area is developed and therefore provides little habitat value for these special-status species. The undeveloped areas from Falcon Boulevard north are mowed regularly and support only ruderal vegetation. Certain special-status species, that are well adapted to sparsely vegetated areas, including the loggerhead shrike, California horned lark and burrowing owl, could forage in these areas. The expansion area south of the administration building and the area along the secondary runway have remained relatively undisturbed since they were initially graded during runway construction in 1993. The area consists of non-native grassland habitat. California ground squirrels have colonized some of these areas, resulting in suitable habitat for several special-status species including San Joaquin kit fox, California tiger salamander, ferruginous hawk, northern harrier, burrowing owl, and the California horned lark. The access route between the two runways was not disturbed during airport expansion between 1993 and 1995, and supports native upland and wetland habitats as well as California ground squirrel colonies. This area currently provides suitable habitat for several special-status species including vernal pool fairy shrimp, San Joaquin kit fox, California tiger salamander, ferruginous hawk, northern harrier, burrowing owl, and the California horned lark.

The Habitat Assessment concludes that the project is not expected to significantly impact any listed animal species based on a general lack of quality habitat as well as the implementation of appropriate mitigation. Mitigation for any potential impacts associated with the updated Plan will be conducted through conservation measures outlined in the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP). The following species are covered by the HCP: the San Joaquin kit fox, the California red-legged frog, the vernal pool fairy shrimp, the California tiger salamander, the burrowing owl, the tri-colored blackbird, the Golden eagle and the western pond turtle. Although covered by the HCP, potential impacts to San Joaquin kit fox and vernal pool habitat (vernal pool fairy shrimp) was already mitigated by preservation of the 814 acres of land preserved under a conservation easement. The HCP authorizes the incidental take of federally listed species. The HCP is being prepared to minimize and mitigate the take of listed species to the maximum extent possible while allowing for reasonable development. The HCP reduces conflicts between listed species and economic development activities, and provides a framework that encourages "creative partnerships" between the public and private sectors and state, municipal, and federal agencies in the interests of endangered and threatened species and habitat conservation.

Any potential impacts to those species which have been identified as special-status species, and are not covered by the HCP (the northern harrier, and the California horned lark), shall be mitigated for in the Mitigation Monitoring Program and as follows: planning and pre-construction surveys by a qualified biologist during the breeding season (March-July) shall be required. If nests are identified, construction shall be scheduled to begin after the young have fledged. Ferruginous hawks are a wintering species and do not nest on the site; therefore no mitigation measures are required or appropriate. (Allaback, pers. com)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Cultural Resources beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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.	_____	_____	_____	X
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	_____	_____	_____	X
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	_____	_____	X
4. Landslides?	_____	_____	_____	x
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Geology and Soils beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	_____	_____	_____	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.	_____	_____	_____	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?	_____	_____	_____	X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interferes with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	_____	_____	_____	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?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Hazards or Hazardous Materials beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	_____	_____	_____	X
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)?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	_____	_____	_____	X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Hydrology and Water Quality beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Land Use and Planning beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR. All potential improvements including construction activities associated with the runway extension, access and circulation improvements, paving of the pump station road, building of airport hangars, and fixed base facility operations (FBO's) are located in previously identified development areas and are consistent with the 1985 Plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source #)	_____	_____	_____	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? (Source #)	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on Mineral Resources beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. 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?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____	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 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

SUMMARY

The Plan will have no impact on noise levels beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. 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)?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will not have any impact on the population or housing of the region beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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:

1. Fire Protection?
2. Police Protection?
3. Schools?
4. Parks?
5. Other Public facilities?

_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will not impact any public services beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. RECREATION

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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?

_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will not impact any recreation resources beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. 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)?	_____	_____	_____	X
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	_____	_____	_____	X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	_____	_____	_____	X
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	_____	_____	_____	X
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Plan will not impact transportation or traffic beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR. There is not projected increase in air or vehicular traffic with the updated Plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	_____	X
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?	_____	_____	_____	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?	_____	_____	_____	X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?	_____	_____	_____	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?	_____	_____	_____	X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	_____	_____	_____	X
g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	_____	_____	_____	x

SUMMARY

The Plan will not impact any utilities and service systems beyond that previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and 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?
- 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)?
- c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X
_____	_____	_____	X

SUMMARY

The Byron Airport Master Plan update is consistent with the 1985 Master Plan and will not change impacts on any environmental issues, beyond those previously analyzed in the 1985 EIR for the Proposed East Contra Costa County Airport. The change in circumstance relates to the change in status for a number of Special-Status species, which have achieved that standing during the interim. These special-status wildlife species inhabit the region or were known historically from the area. Several of these species, including four threatened, endangered or candidate animals have been recorded from the adjacent Habitat Management Lands. Development of the study area over the next 20 years has the potential to affect these species. Mitigation associated with potential impacts to these species will be implemented through the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP). Potential impacts to those species not covered by the HCP will be mitigated as discussed in the Biological Resources section of this Mitigated Negative Declaration.

**Mitigation Monitoring Program
Byron Airport Updated Master Plan**

Biological Resource Impacts

Potential Impact	Mitigation Requirement	Mitigation Obligation	Department Responsible for Monitoring Implementation
<p>Implementation of the updated Master Plan could impact these sensitive species or their habitat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Joaquin kit fox* 2. California red-legged frog 3. California tiger salamander 4. vernal pool fairy shrimp* 5. western pond turtle 6. golden eagle 7. burrowing owl 8. tri-colored blackbird <p>* previously mitigated under originally approved project</p>	<p>Mitigation will be conducted through conservation measures outlined in the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/ Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HCP).</p>	<p>Public Works Department will make a contribution to the HCP fund at a mitigation ratio outlined within the HCP.</p>	<p>Public Works Department</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. California horned lark 10. northern harrier 	<p>Mitigation will include planning and pre-construction surveys. If nests are identified construction shall be scheduled to begin after the young have fledged.</p>	<p>Public Works Department</p>	<p>Public Works Department</p>