



California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Concurrent Applications for a
Conditional Use Permit Amendment (UP-02-20) and
Design Review (DRB-04-20) to Allow the Construction of
a New Members-Only Fitness Facility, Bar and Grill, and
Recreation Pavilion Adjacent to the Existing Clubhouse
and Pool at the Moraga Country Club, as well as
Modifications to the Existing On-Site Parking Lots.

**Town of Moraga
November 6, 2020**

Section 1: Proposed Project

Introduction

This proposed Initial Study/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. The document analyzes the potential environmental impacts of a proposal to demolish an existing 1,200-square-foot tennis shop and construct a new 6,650-square-foot fitness facility, 4,300-square-foot bar and grill, and 860-square-foot recreation pavilion, all for members only, adjacent to the Moraga Country Club clubhouse located at 1600 St. Andrews Drive. The proposed plans also include replacing two existing tennis courts adjacent to the clubhouse with two new bocce ball courts on either side of a seating area and four new pickle ball courts, as well as increasing the size of the existing surface parking lots located along St. Andrews Drive. The project requires an amendment to the Country Club's existing Conditional Use Permit (UP-09-09) for the new clubhouse and parking facilities as well as Design Review Board approval for new construction in a non-residential land use district.

This CEQA document is divided into the following sections:

- Section 1: Proposed Project. This section provides project background and a description of the proposed project and the project's setting.
- Section 2: Environmental Evaluation. This section includes the standard CEQA Initial Study checklist form and a discussion of potential environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project.
- Section 3: References. This section identifies references used to assist in the preparation of this document.

Project Details

Setting

The Town of Moraga ("Town") is located in southwest Contra Costa County within the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The Town is bordered by the cities of Lafayette to the north and northeast and Orinda to the west and northwest, and by unincorporated areas of the county, including the community of Canyon, to the southwest and southeast. The Town's topography is varied, including flatter valley areas that generally follow the alignments of its main arterial roads, with hills and ridgelines rising above in all directions. The Town is a suburban, semi-rural community consisting primarily of single-family residential neighborhoods and is one of the smallest cities in Contra Costa County, with a population of approximately 17,250 people and a total land area of 9.4 square miles. Most of the land is comprised of low-density, single-family neighborhoods, two large commercial areas, public and private open space and large tracts of hilly, undeveloped land, much of which is under private ownership.

The Moraga Country Club ("MCC") is a private residential and recreational community located at 1600 St. Andrews Drive containing a total of 521 homes and featuring a

members-only swim, golf and tennis club. The MCC's current facilities include a large two-story clubhouse, an 18-hole golf course, an Olympic-size swimming pool, and 12 tennis courts with a 1,200-square-foot tennis shop. Membership within the MCC consists of the owners of each of the 521 homes (all homeowners and their family members residing at the property automatically become members when they purchase a home in the community), as well as an additional 628 non-resident members who pay an annual membership fee to use the club's facilities. The MCC, including the homes, golf course, tennis courts, and the original swimming pool and clubhouse were developed in 1974, but the original clubhouse and swimming pool were demolished and replaced with the present-day two-story, 20,271-square-foot clubhouse and pool in 2011/2012.

The clubhouse and parking lots abut existing single-family residential development and commercial office buildings across St. Andrews Drive to the southeast, single-family residential development and a service station across Moraga Way to the north and northeast, and single-family residential development to the west and southwest. The General Plan land use designation for the project site and the adjacent parking areas and golf course is MOSO Open Space. The surrounding residential development to the north, east, southwest and southeast is designated Residential 3-DUA. The current zoning of the clubhouse site, adjacent parking lots and golf course is MOSO Open Space (OS-M), while the zoning of the surrounding residential neighborhoods across Moraga Way to the north, across St. Andrews Drive to the southeast and beyond the clubhouse to the southwest and southeast is Three Dwelling Units per Acre (3-DUA). The existing office developments across St. Andrews Drive to the east are zoned Suburban Office, while the existing service station at the northeast corner of Moraga Way and St. Andrews Drive/Camino Ricardo is also zoned 3-DUA.

Background

The MCC, including the homes, golf course, tennis courts and swimming pool and clubhouse were originally developed in 1974. The MCC was originally developed as a permitted use because the Town of Moraga's Municipal Code allowed private recreational uses as part of residential developments at the time the plans for the MCC were proposed. However, in 1998 the area comprising the golf course and clubhouse facilities was rezoned to Moraga Open Space Ordinance (MOSO Open Space, or OS-M). Private recreational facilities such as the MCC are only permitted in the OS-M zoning district with a conditional use permit. As such, when the zoning of the clubhouse facilities and golf course were changed, the MCC became a legal, nonconforming use.

In 2010, the MCC's Homeowners Association (HOA) approached the Town with plans to replace the original clubhouse and swimming pool with a new, larger building featuring more on-site amenities for its members, as well as a larger pool. Since at that time the MCC was a legal, nonconforming use, the HOA was required to obtain a conditional use permit to make it a conforming use in order to expand the clubhouse and pool facilities. On January 15, 2010, the Town's Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit UP-09-09 establishing the clubhouse as a conforming use and allowing the replacement of the original pool and clubhouse building and its associated parking. Shortly thereafter,

on May 10, 2010, the Town's Design Review Board approved Design Review Board Application No. DRB-05-10 for the design of the new clubhouse, and in 2011/2012 the original clubhouse and pool were demolished and replaced with a new pool and 20,271-square-foot two-story clubhouse featuring a lobby with reception desk, lounge, golf pro shop, men's and women's locker rooms, restaurant, bar, kitchen, banquet and conference rooms, and administrative office space for the HOA's property management staff.

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing 1,200-square-foot tennis shop and construct a new 6,650-square-foot fitness facility, 4,300-square-foot bar and grill, and 860-square-foot recreation pavilion, all for members only, adjacent to the MCC clubhouse located at 1600 St. Andrews Drive. The proposed plans also include replacing two existing tennis courts with two new bocce ball courts on either side of a new seating area and four new pickle ball courts, as well as increasing the size of the existing surface parking lots located along St. Andrews Drive adjacent to the golf course driving range and chipping/putting practice area.

The new fitness facility and bar and grill would be located behind the clubhouse on opposite sides of the existing swimming pool, thereby forming a U-shaped campus design with the pool in the middle. The two buildings would feature a similar, contemporary architectural design with their facades mirroring each other across the swimming pool. The architecture of the buildings features a very low-pitched, nearly flat shed roof design with abundant glazing across all four elevations to allow natural light and clear visibility into each space from vantage points within the clubhouse/swimming pool complex. Smooth-finish cement plaster would be used for the exterior building finish, and roofing would consist of tar and gravel. The bar and grill would sit on a gentle slope leading from the pool deck down to the adjacent sport courts, and have two floor levels, with the bar, dining room and kitchen, as well as a large, wraparound outdoor terrace occupying the main level at the pool deck, and storage and utility rooms occupying the lower level. The fitness club would have a single floor at the pool deck level, and would contain a weight/fitness machine room, a studio for workout classes, a children's activity room, restrooms, and a reception area with an administrative office. The new recreation pavilion would utilize the same architectural style and finishes as the fitness facility and bar and grill and contain a lobby, restrooms, and small office.

The bar and grill would be open for business Tuesday from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. for lunch only and Wednesday through Sunday from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. for lunch and dinner. It would be closed on Mondays. The fitness facility would be open daily from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. The recreation pavilion would provide equipment rentals for members and be open during the same hours as the sport courts and swimming pool.

The proposed changes to the sport court area would remove two existing tennis courts and a small landscaped area adjacent to the existing clubhouse and replace them with four new pickle ball courts, two new bocce ball courts separated by an outdoor seating area, and the new recreation pavilion and a small lawn area. These changes would not

result in any increase in the existing footprint of the developed area around the clubhouse; instead, they would replace existing improved areas with new, modified improvements.

Finally, as part of the proposal, 34 existing on-site parking spaces would be removed from the main parking lot at the clubhouse to accommodate the new fitness facility. The existing outer parking lots located along St. Andrews Drive adjacent to the golf course driving range and chipping/putting practice area would be expanded by 44 additional parking spaces, thereby resulting in a net gain of 10 new spaces for the entire clubhouse complex. The applicant is proposing to construct a new 16-foot-wide fire lane for emergency vehicle access only around the north (rear) and west (left) sides of the new fitness center that will connect to an existing paved golf course service road in order to establish an emergency vehicle turnaround area meeting the Moraga-Orinda Fire District's standards for maneuvering into and out of the project site and providing fire department access to the new buildings.

The existing decorative, ivy-covered wall bordering the northern edge of the main clubhouse parking lot would be preserved and continue to provide a physical barrier between the parking lot and proposed fire lane and the adjacent Moraga Creek corridor that separates the clubhouse complex from the driving range and chipping/putting practice area. No existing trees would be removed from the clubhouse complex, sport court area, or modified parking areas as a result of the project.

Section 2: Environmental Evaluation

Project Summary

1) Project Title: Moraga Country Club Clubhouse Facilities Expansion

2) Project Location: 1600 St. Andrews Drive, Moraga, CA 94556
(Assessor's Parcel Numbers 257-440-001, 257-470-004, 257-180-079)

3) Applicant's Name and Address: Moraga Country Club Homeowners Association,
c/o: Anne Wilcoxon, 1600 St. Andrews Drive, Moraga, CA 94556

4) Staff Contact Person: Steve Kowalski, Senior Planner
329 Rheem Boulevard, Moraga, CA 94556
Phone: (925) 888-7042; Email: skowalski@moraga.ca.us

5) Project Description: See Section 1, above, for a detailed project description.

6) Land Uses and Setting: The project site is occupied by a private, members-only swim, golf and tennis club that currently features a two-story, 20,271-square-foot clubhouse facility, an 18-hole golf course, an Olympic-size swimming pool, and 12 tennis courts with a 1,200-square-foot tennis shop. Parking for these facilities is provided in two separate areas accessible from St. Andrews Drive, with a large parking lot that wraps around the front (east) and right (north) side of the clubhouse building, and a smaller parking lot farther north that provides access to the driving range and putting/chipping green practice facilities. The main parking lot at the clubhouse currently contains 81 spaces while the secondary parking area adjacent to the practice facilities contains another 67 spaces.

The portion of the site where the clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis shop and main parking lot are located is generally level, with the facilities sitting at an elevation of 493 feet above sea level, while the tennis courts are located downhill and to the south and southwest at an elevation approximately 6 feet below the clubhouse facilities. Moraga Creek flows alongside the existing parking lot located along the north side of the clubhouse facilities, separating them from the golf practices facilities and secondary parking area further to the north. The creek bed sits at an elevation of 480 feet above sea level while the outer parking area beyond the creek sits at approximately 494 feet above sea level.

The General Plan land use designation for the project site, including the clubhouse and parking areas, is MOSO Open Space. The surrounding residential development to the north, east, southwest and southeast are designated Residential 3-DUA. The current zoning of the project site and adjacent parking areas is MOSO Open Space (OS-M), while the zoning of the surrounding residential neighborhoods is Three Dwelling Units per Acre (3-DUA). The existing office properties across St. Andrews Drive to the east are currently zoned Suburban Office, while the existing service station at the northeast corner of Moraga Way and St. Andrews Drive/Camino Ricardo is zoned 3-DUA.

7) Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required: Moraga-Orinda Fire District; East Bay Municipal Utility District, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Contra Costa County Conservation & Development Department, Contra Costa County Environmental Health Division

8) Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

None of the environmental factors listed below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural & Forest Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfires	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Steve Kowalski, Senior Planner

11/6/2020

Date



Afshan Hamid, AICP, Planning Director

11.6.2020

Date

Initial Study Checklist

I. Aesthetics

Would the project...		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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)	Conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) and d): Less-than-Significant Impact; b) and c): No Impact

The Moraga 2002 General Plan and Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 8.132 have designated eight local roadways as Scenic Corridors (but no state highways) that have been identified as an important component of the Town's overall scenic character, and contain numerous goals, policies, design guidelines and development standards that call for the strict protection of these corridors and the scenic vistas that they offer by reducing the visual prominence of new development located within them and ensuring that such development blends effectively with the surrounding natural landscape and minimizes obstruction of existing landforms, particularly hillsides and ridgelines. One of these roadways is Moraga Way, along which the project site is located. Pursuant to MMC Sections 8.132.020 and 8.132.040, any new building located on land within 500 feet of a designated Scenic Corridor (as measured from the edge of the public right-of-way) requires discretionary design review approval from the Planning Commission acting as the Design Review Board (DRB). Before it can approve an application for discretionary design review, the DRB must find that the proposed development complies with 14 different guidelines contained in MMC Section 8.132.050 Scenic Corridors Development Guidelines, as well as the applicable guidelines pertaining to Scenic Corridors and Scenic Vistas contained in Chapter 6 of the Town's Design Guidelines.

Of the proposed new buildings, the fitness facility would be located the closest to Moraga Way. However, its proposed location is approximately 550 feet from the edge of the Moraga Way

public right-of-way, as such, it is not subject to the provisions of MMC Chapter 8.132 or Chapter 6 of the Design Guidelines since it would be located more than 500 feet from a Scenic Corridor. Nevertheless, the proposed plans for this building, as well as for the new bar and grill, both feature a single-story floor plan with low-pitched rooflines. Furthermore, there is row of mature trees located along the MCC's Moraga Way street frontage which help to screen the existing clubhouse building, and also screen the proposed buildings from view of the street. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista or corridor.

Although the proposed project is not subject to the provisions pertaining to the protection of Scenic Corridors, pursuant to MMC Section 8.72.090, it does require design review approval by the Design Review Board as new construction in a non-residential zoning district. Chapter 7 of the Design Guidelines contains guidelines that apply to all new development in the Town, including Guideline ID6 pertaining to outdoor lighting. This guideline calls for all new exterior light fixtures to be downcast and designed only to safely illuminate the subject property without spilling across property lines or casting excessive glare into the night sky. All new development in the Town is required to comply with a standard list of conditions of approval, one of which requires that all new exterior lighting comply with Guideline ID6. This standard requirement would be included as a condition of approval for the proposed project when it is presented to the Design Review Board for consideration. Therefore, light and glare impacts from the project would be less than significant.

For the reasons enumerated above, the proposed project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts on a scenic resource or create a significant new source of light or glare, and therefore no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

II. Agricultural Resources

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through e): No Impact

The Town of Moraga does not contain any lands that are subject to Williamson Act Contracts or land identified as prime farmland, unique farmland, or forest land in any of its commercially zoned areas, including the site of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

III. Air Quality

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a), b) and d): Less than Significant Impact; c): Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Moraga is a predominantly residential community wherein the majority of air quality impacts derive from motor vehicle traffic and heavy equipment used during construction-related activities. The proposed project would see the construction of three new permanent buildings totaling 11,810 square feet, as well as various modifications to the existing surface parking lots at the clubhouse and the golf course driving range and chipping/putting practice area. Such construction could result in impacts to air quality from, primarily, construction-related emissions, but also from daily operations of the new facilities.

An air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analysis was conducted by Yorke Engineering, LLC on August 4, 2020 to analyze air quality impacts from the construction and daily operation of the proposed project against the thresholds of significance established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) for criteria air pollutants. The analysis was performed using CalEEMod® (California Emissions Estimation Model, version 2016.3.2), the official statewide land use computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for estimating potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations of land use projects under CEQA. Criteria air pollutants required to be analyzed by BAAQMD for projects having the potential to generate air quality impacts include diesel and dust particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) commonly resulting from fugitive dust and diesel engine exhaust generated by construction activities, as well as reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and carbon monoxide (CO). Construction-related emissions primarily consist of diesel emissions from heavy equipment such as excavators, graders and dump trucks as well as dust generated by such equipment and by windy conditions in areas where dry dirt/soil is exposed at construction sites. Operations-related emissions include tailpipe emissions from vehicles of people using a project's new facilities, emissions from a

new facility's heating and air conditioning equipment, and emissions from gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment such as lawn mowers and leaf blowers.

According to the analysis, construction and operations-related emissions that would be generated by the proposed project would fall well below the thresholds of significance established by BAAQMD for criteria air pollutants. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Bay Area is in nonattainment under either federal or state air quality standards. Nor would any of the proposed new uses be expected to generate emissions that could cause offensive odors that could adversely affect a large number of people.

However, as with any construction project involving a significant amount of ground disturbance and heavy equipment usage, construction of the proposed project could temporarily generate airborne dust, exhaust emissions, and fumes that could pose a nuisance to nearby sensitive receptors. Because there are residential neighborhoods, outdoor recreational facilities and professional offices all located a short distance from the project site to the north, east and south, the following mitigation measure shall be required to minimize construction-related emissions during construction of the project:

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Basic Construction Best Management Practices

The following Basic Construction Best Management Practices shall be noted on the grading and building permit plans and implemented to ensure that construction-related emissions, including fugitive dust, do not exceed applicable BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes [as required by the California airborne

toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)]. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

IV. Biological Resources

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

a) and d): Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated; b), c), e) and f): No Impact

The project site was originally developed as a swim, golf and tennis club in 1974 and the areas where new construction and/or parking lot modifications are being proposed have been improved with hardscape in the form of tennis courts, paved parking and circulation facilities and a swimming pool deck, or unnaturally/ornamentally-landscaped golf course practice facilities. Moraga Creek traverses the clubhouse site and its associated parking and circulation facilities directly to the north, and also bisects it from the secondary parking area adjacent to the driving range that would be expanded.

A biological resource study was conducted by LSA Associates, Inc. on August 7, 2020 to analyze potential impacts from the proposed project on special status species of flora and fauna that could either have migratory routes across, or reside or be present on or within the project site or the Moraga Creek riparian corridor that traverses it. The study identified 19 special-status species (nine plant species and 10 animal species) that have been observed within two miles of the project site; however, it concluded that there is no suitable habitat on or adjacent to the project site for any of the 19 identified species. Of the 10 identified animal species, the California red-legged frog, Western pond turtle, and San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat all have potential to occur within the Moraga Creek corridor or Laguna Creek, one of its main tributaries which drains into it from the north. However, the study concluded that there is no suitable habitat for any of these species on or adjacent to the project site, primarily due to the engineered channelization of the creek that occurred in the past, as well as the high

level of daily human and vehicular activity occurring on or immediately adjacent to it (including private vehicles, garbage trucks and food service trucks driving to and from the clubhouse facilities, golf carts and golfers, and everyday traffic traveling along St. Andrews Drive). Furthermore, the study concluded that the retention of the existing cinder block wall along the northern edge of the main clubhouse parking lot would serve as a physical barrier effectively preventing direct impacts to the Moraga Creek riparian corridor. As such, the study concluded that there are no special-status species, riparian habitat or wetlands on the project site, and that it does not serve as a movement corridor for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. In addition, the site is not regulated by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, and no tree removals are proposed that could conflict with a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

The study did identify several bird species occurring in an area of willow riparian habitat in the creek corridor adjacent to the project site that could be using trees within it as native nursery sites. As such, the study recommended that a preconstruction nesting bird survey be conducted if site disturbance and/or construction activities commence between February 1st and July 31st by a qualified wildlife biologist to ensure that such activities do not adversely impact any native nursery sites. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, below, would reduce any such impacts to less-than-significant levels, and therefore no further mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey

If project site development commences any time between February 1st and July 31st, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. Buffers shall be established and maintained for any nest found during the preconstruction survey until the young have fledged. The size of the buffer(s) shall be determined by the survey biologist.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

a) through c): Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:

The project site was originally developed as a country club and golf course in the early 1970s, and the existing clubhouse was built in 2012. As such, neither the clubhouse nor any of the other on-site structures are old enough to be eligible to be listed as historical resources. Furthermore, the project site is not known to contain any archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains. However, there is a possibility that unrecorded resources exist on the site which could be unearthed during grading activities or other site disturbance activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures Cult-1 through Cult-3, below, would reduce any potential impacts to such resources to a less-than-significant level:

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: Discovery of Archaeological Resources.

The project proponent shall include a note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is potential for exposing buried cultural resources. If prehistoric or historic-period cultural materials are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 200 feet of the find shall halt until a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative can assess the significance of the find. Prehistoric materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or tool making debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks and artifacts; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered-stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American representative, will develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: Discovery of Any Human Remains.

In the event of the discovery of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Alameda County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Commission shall attempt to identify the deceased or descendants of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

If the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent fails to make a recommendation within 24 hours after notified, or the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and mediation by the Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, then the land owner shall re-inter, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

Mitigation Measure CULT-3: Discovery of Paleontological Resources.

The project proponent shall include a note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is potential for exposing buried cultural resources. In the event of the discovery of Paleontological resources during construction or demolition, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site within a 200-foot radius of the location of such discovery until it can be evaluated by a qualified archeologist or paleontologist. Work shall not continue until the archeologist or paleontologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination as to the significance of the resource. If the resource is determined to be significant and mitigation is required, the first priority shall be avoidance and preservation of the resource. All feasible recommendations of the paleontologist shall be implemented. Mitigation may include, but not limited to, in-field documentation and recovery of specimens, laboratory analysis, preparation of a report detailing the methods and findings of the investigation, and curation at an appropriate paleontological collection facility.

VI. Energy

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

a) and b): No Impact

Construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency standards contained in Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations (the California Energy Code) which are designed to reduce inefficient and wasteful energy consumption by requiring energy-efficient light fixtures and heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems in all new construction throughout the state. The proposed buildings would consist of a fitness

club, bar and grill and recreation equipment rental and servicing pavilion, none of which would consume unusual amounts of energy during either construction or operation, since there are no unusual energy-consuming features proposed in any of the facilities. Furthermore, all of the new facilities would generally maintain the same hours of operation as the existing clubhouse, with no portion remaining open past 10:00 p.m. The proposed fitness club would be open the longest, from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. daily, but its construction would adhere to the energy efficiency requirements of the California Energy Code as stated above. Therefore, the construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, or conflict with any state or local plans for renewable energy and/or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VII. Geology and Soils

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv. Landslides?				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project...

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and d): Less than Significant Impact; b), c), e) and f): No Impact

The San Francisco Bay Area is a geographic region that contains a number of active earthquake faults and, as such, the entire area is subject to the potential for occasional strong shaking, liquefaction, and ground rupturing as a result of earthquakes. However, any new construction of commercial development is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code (CBC) which requires the preparation of a geotechnical report for all new commercial construction and prescribes certain construction methods and materials that have been tested to withstand strong seismic shaking and ensure the safety of structures and their occupants. A geotechnical investigation was conducted for the proposed project by Rockridge Geotechnical on August 30, 2020 and peer-reviewed by the Town’s geotechnical consultant on September 9, 2020, which included evaluating subsurface conditions at the site to determine soil conditions and providing recommendations for ensuring the safety and integrity of the foundations of the proposed structures and pavement/flatwork given the characteristics of the site’s geology and soils. The investigation determined that the site is underlaid by clayey fill from 3 to 7 feet below the ground surface. This clayey material is underlain by native alluvium to the maximum depth explored of 31.5 feet below the ground surface. The investigation concluded that the project could be subjected to strong-to-very-strong ground shaking during a large earthquake, but that the risk of fault rupture, liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides or other similar seismic-related hazards was low to nil due to the site’s geology and soil characteristics. Additionally, the site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.

The geotechnical investigation did conclude, however, that the site contains highly-expansive to very-highly expansive soils and, as such, provided a number of standard recommendations for new construction on expansive soils to guide the design of the foundations for the new buildings as well as the new pavement and other flatwork being proposed. These recommendations include methods for moisture-conditioning the expansive soil prior to the pouring of foundations, providing non-expansive Engineered Fill below all slabs, and supporting foundations below the zone where soil moisture levels are highest with deep footings, as well as properly managing surface and subsurface drainage across the project site to prevent saturation of the soil adjacent to and below all new building foundations, retaining walls and pavement/flatwork. The Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development is responsible for reviewing the structural plans for all new structures, including foundations and retaining walls, within the Town of Moraga and for ensuring conformance to all recommendations contained in the peer-reviewed geotechnical report. Conformance to the recommendations contained in the peer-reviewed geotechnical report in accordance with the requirements of the CBC would mitigate the effects of the expansive soils and other geological

hazards on the proposed structures and paving/flatwork to less-than-significant levels.

The project site is already served by piped underground sanitary sewer service from the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, so no septic systems or other alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as all proposed wastewater sources will connect to the existing sewer laterals serving the MCC. Furthermore, there are no known paleontological resources or other unique geological features on the subject property that could be impacted by the proposed project. As such, any impacts on the project from site-specific geological hazards would be less than significant, and therefore no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

a) and b): No Impact

Greenhouse gases (GHG) – primarily carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous (N₂O) oxide, collectively reported as carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) – are directly emitted from stationary source combustion of natural gas in equipment such as water heaters, boilers and furnaces. GHG are also emitted from mobile sources such as on-road vehicles and off-road equipment burning fuels such as gasoline, diesel, biodiesel, propane and natural gas. Indirect GHG emissions also result from the consumption of electricity generated elsewhere (i.e., at power plants) to operate equipment, lighting and heating/air conditioning systems in a building. Also included in GHG quantification is electric power used to pump the water supply (e.g., aqueducts, pipelines, etc.) and sanitary sewage to and from a proposed project site, as well as the disposal and decomposition of municipal solid waste that would be generated by a proposed project in landfills.

An air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analysis was conducted by Yorke Engineering, LLC on August 4, 2020 to analyze GHG-related air quality impacts from the daily operation of the proposed project against the thresholds of significance established by BAAQMD. BAAQMD has adopted a stationary source (industrial facility) mass emissions threshold of 10,000 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e per year and a land use project (e.g., residential, commercial, or recreational

development project) mass emissions threshold of 1,100 MT of CO₂e per year which public agencies must use when analyzing a project’s GHG-related air quality impacts. BAAQMD has not established any significance thresholds for construction-related GHG emissions; as such, the analysis did not study such emissions.

According to the analysis, the daily operations of all the proposed facilities and improvements is estimated to generate 136 MT of CO₂e per year. This figure is well below the 1,100 MT of CO₂e per year significance threshold established by BAAQMD for new land use projects such as the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on GHG emissions or conflict with an established air quality plan adopted for the purpose of reducing such emissions, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Town of Moraga
 Initial Study/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
 Moraga Country Club Clubhouse Facilities Expansion Project

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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) If 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) through g): No Impact

The proposed project would not involve the routine transport of hazardous materials, except for materials commonly found at bar and grill-type restaurants and fitness clubs, such as new or used cooking oils, commercial grade cleaning agents, or sanitary bathroom supplies. Furthermore, the applicant would be required to receive, handle, store and dispose of any hazardous materials in accordance with the applicable environmental health and safety regulations prescribed by the Environmental Health Division of Contra Costa Health Services at all times. Compliance with those regulations would result in no impacts from the routine transport, storage and handling of hazardous materials.

The subject property has no known history of contamination and is not included on the most recent Cortese List published by the State Department of Toxic Substances Control pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Furthermore, there are no private or public airports or air strips in Moraga or the surrounding area, and no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of any customers or employees to safety hazards from site contamination or any danger or excessive noise from air traffic, nor have the potential to expose any existing or proposed schools to hazardous emissions or materials.

The proposed changes to the parking and circulation facilities have been designed to meet all applicable emergency vehicle access requirements of the Moraga-Orinda Fire District and, thus, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Specifically, the applicant is proposing to construct a new 16-foot-wide fire lane for emergency vehicles only around the north (rear) and west (left) sides of the new fitness center that will connect to an existing paved golf course service road. The connection to the existing service road will establish a hammerhead turnaround area meeting the Fire District’s standards for maneuvering into and out of the project site. The District has already reviewed and approved the proposed emergency vehicle access plans for the project. Furthermore, the project site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone; therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death from wildfires.

For these reasons, the project would not result in any significant impacts to the public from hazards or hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

i.) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through e): No Impact

The applicant's civil engineer, BKF Engineers, has prepared grading and drainage plans, a hydrology report and a stormwater control plan, all dated October 1, 2020, that the Town's Engineering Department has determined comply with the requirements of Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit as prescribed by the Contra Costa Clean Water Program by incorporating Low Impact Development site design measures that reduce stormwater runoff volumes and temporarily store and treat runoff on the site. According to the stormwater control plan, the project would result in a net increase of 31,436 new square feet of impervious surface area and 16,714 square feet of replaced impervious surface area, for a total of 48,150 square feet of new and replaced impervious surface across the entire project site. As such, the applicant is required to comply with the applicable hydromodification requirements of Provision C.3 to reduce peak runoff flows from the site. The stormwater control plan features several new landscaped-based bioretention areas where the runoff from the new and/or replaced impervious surface areas will be conveyed to for retention and treatment before being discharged into the on-site underground piped storm drain system. Compliance with the requirements of Provision C.3 would result in no impacts to water quality or groundwater quality or in any violations to an existing water quality control plan or groundwater management plan.

The grading and drainage plans would not modify the existing drainage patterns on the site and would instead design the newly-disturbed areas to drain into new bioretention areas that connect to existing on-site storm drains. Furthermore, most of the areas of the site that would be modified by the project are already paved with vehicular parking and circulation facilities, pool decking, tennis courts and/or walkways/patios. As such, the project would result in no impact to existing drainage patterns or groundwater recharge, nor would it significantly increase the amount of runoff from the property that could result in substantial erosion or sedimentation or flooding either on- or off-site.

The project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, so there is no risk of release of pollutants from the site from potential inundation by such catastrophic events. Implementation of the proposed grading and drainage plans, combined with compliance with Provision C.3 of the Municipal Regional Permit as shown in the stormwater management plan prepared by BKF Engineers would result in the project having no impact on hydrology or water quality, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XI. Land Use and Planning

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through b): No Impact

The proposed project does not have the potential to physically divide an established community. The subject property has been developed as a country club since 1974, and the proposed buildings, parking lot modifications and sport court modifications would not impact any established neighborhoods since they would all located entirely within the boundaries of the MCC. The project site is located in the OS-M zoning district, and private recreation facilities such as members-only swim/tennis/golf clubs are an allowed use subject to approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) by the Planning Commission. The existing clubhouse obtained approval of a CUP from the Town of Moraga Planning Commission in 2010; therefore, the

proposed project only requires approval of an amendment to the current CUP by the Planning Commission to allow for the construction of the new fitness club and bar and grill buildings, as well as the modifications to the existing parking lots and sport courts. As such, the proposed project would not have an adverse land use impact or conflict with a land use plan or policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For these reasons, the proposed project would not have a significant land use or planning impact, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XII. Mineral Resources

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

a) through b): No Impact

There are no known mineral resources of local, regional or statewide importance in Moraga or locally important mineral resources delineated on a local land use plan. As such, the proposed project would have no impact with regard to mineral resources since it would not affect or involve any lands known to contain mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIII. Noise

Would the project result in...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) and b): Less than Significant Impact; c): No Impact

The proposed project would not generate a permanent operational increase in noise in excess of the Town’s standards. The fitness facility would be fully enclosed, so any noise generated by the usage of exercise equipment within it would be effectively buffered by the exterior walls of the building. Furthermore, although the bar and grill would be partially open outside toward the pool deck, its operations would not be expected to generate any additional noise above and beyond the levels that already occur from the regular usage of the swimming pool (such as loud splashing, raised voices of children having fun, and public address systems with microphones and speakers used for swim meets, etc.).

Construction of the proposed buildings and parking lot modifications would generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels and short-term groundborne vibration from construction-related activities, but such impacts would be of a limited duration of approximately six months, and the project would be required to adhere to the Town’s construction hour limitations set forth in Moraga Municipal Code Section 7.12.090 during the duration of the project so as to not generate excessive early-morning or late-night noise or vibration that could pose a nuisance to nearby residential properties. For these reasons, the project would have less-than-significant noise and vibration impacts and no mitigation is required.

There are no private or public airstrips located within two miles of the subject property; therefore, there would be no impact from air traffic noise on the proposed use.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIV. Population and Housing

Would the project...	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through b): No Impact

The proposed project would not affect any residentially-zoned lands, result in the removal of any existing housing units, or induce population growth either directly or indirectly. Instead, it would only result in an expansion of the clubhouse facilities for a members-only, private club located on land that is already permitted for such a use. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on the area's population or housing, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XV. Public Services

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 these public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

a) through b): Less than Significant Impact; c) through e): No Impact

The proposed project would not generate a significant increase in demand for public services. This is due to the fact that the MCC is already served by all necessary public services, including police, fire and other municipal services. No increase in the MCC’s residential population would occur as a result of the proposed project, and no parks or other recreational facilities would be removed or displaced as part of the project. As such, the project would result in no impact to schools, parks or other public facilities or services. The proposed project would result in an increase in the number of structures requiring fire protection at the MCC, as well as a new eating and drinking establishment where alcohol would be served, thereby requiring additional police protection and regulation. Impacts to these public services from the proposed project are expected to be less than significant, as discussed in greater detail below.

Fire Protection

The Moraga-Orinda Fire District has reviewed the proposed plans and conditionally approved them subject to compliance with various sections of the California Building and Fire Codes, including requirements for the provision of automatic fire extinguishing sprinkler systems, sprinkler monitoring systems and fire alarm systems in all of the new buildings. The proposed changes to the parking and circulation facilities at the project site have been designed to meet all applicable emergency vehicle access requirements of the Fire District and, as such, would not impede the Fire District’s ability to access the new buildings and other site improvements. Specifically, the applicant is proposing to construct a new 16-foot-wide fire lane for emergency vehicle access only around the north (rear) and west (left) sides of the new fitness center that will connect to an existing paved golf course service road. The connection to the existing service road will establish a hammerhead turnaround area meeting the Fire District’s standards for maneuvering into and out of the project site and providing access to the new buildings. In addition, the District’s aforementioned conditions of approval pertaining to fire/life safety would be included as conditions of approval for the proposed project that must be satisfied prior to issuance of a building permit for the project or of final occupancy of the new structures.

Police Protection

The Town of Moraga Police Department has reviewed the proposed plans and conditionally approved them subject to procurement of the necessary alcoholic beverage service license from the State Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, including requiring proper training for all staff who will be serving alcoholic beverages to customers in the new bar and grill, as well as the installation of surveillance cameras in all new facilities to the satisfaction of the

Police Chief. Compliance with these requirements would assist the Police Department in preventing criminal activity from occurring on the premises and reduce the likelihood of customers driving while intoxicated after leaving the bar and grill, thereby reducing impacts to police services to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVI. Recreation

Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through b): No Impact

As an expansion of an existing private, members-only recreational facility/use that offers golf, tennis and swimming on-site, the proposed project would not generate new or increased demand for local or regional recreation facilities in the Town or its immediate surroundings. As such, it would not have an impact on recreation facilities and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVII. Transportation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through d): No Impact

Construction of the proposed project would result in the removal of 34 existing on-site parking spaces in the area where the new fitness facility would be located. The existing outer parking lots located along St. Andrews Drive adjacent to the golf course driving range and chipping/putting practice area are proposed to be expanded by 44 additional parking spaces, thereby resulting in a net gain of 10 new parking spaces at the project site. While the proposed project includes the construction of two new facilities – a fitness club and bar and grill - that would provide new amenities for the MCC’s membership, the facilities would remain private and for use by members only, not the general public. The provision of 10 net new parking spaces on the premises coupled with the access to the new facilities being limited to members only would not result in a significant increase in vehicle trips to and from the MCC that could impact the circulation system or result in conflicts with existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities that currently serve the site in that their design would not result in the removal or obstruction of any such facilities.

The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) which calls for reducing vehicle miles traveled in that it would only include a nominal increase in parking spaces and provide new services for members on-site which could preclude the need for them to drive across the Town or to neighboring jurisdictions such as Lafayette or Walnut Creek to exercise at a fitness club, have a meal at a restaurant, or have an alcoholic beverage at a bar.

Finally, the proposed construction of the new buildings and the reconfigurations and expansions of the existing on-site parking and circulation facilities would not result in inadequate emergency access or an increase in any existing traffic safety hazards. No such hazards currently exist at the site, and the provision of the new 16-foot-wide fire lane around the north (rear) and west (left) sides of the new fitness center is being proposed in order to provide emergency vehicle access to the new buildings and establish a hammerhead

turnaround area meeting the Moraga-Orinda Fire District’s standards for maneuvering into and out of the project site. As such, the project would have no Transportation-related impacts and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

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

a): Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

On September 30, 2020, the Town sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites or Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs)

are listed in its Sacred Lands File for the project area. The NAHC conducted a check of the Sacred Lands File and sent a response on October 5, 2020 indicating that the results were negative. The NAHC included in its response a list of six tribal representatives available for consultation. To ensure that all Native American knowledge and concerns over potential TCRs that might be affected by the proposed project were addressed, the Town sent notices of the project to the six representatives named on the Native American Contacts list provided by the NAHC to solicit tribal consultation. No requests for such consultation were received by the Town and no TCRs have previously been identified on the project site. However, there is a possibility that unrecorded TCRs exist on the project site which could be unearthed during grading or other site disturbance activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-3, listed in Section V, above, would reduce potential impacts to such resources to a less-than-significant level, and no further mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new water or expanded wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through e): Less than Significant Impact

The two public utility districts that provide water and sanitary sewer service to the MCC, the East Bay Municipal Utility District and Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, respectively, have reviewed the plans for the proposed project. Both districts confirmed that the existing water and sanitary sewer mains serving the site were capable of accommodating the increased demand for service that would result from the construction of the new facilities and improvements without the need for upgrading (copies of the correspondence received from the two districts is available at the Planning Department). The MCC is also already served by electricity, natural gas and telecommunications, all services of which are also capable of accommodating the proposed facilities. As such, the demand resulting from the proposed project for such utility services as water, wastewater, electricity and gas would be less than significant.

All new mechanical, electrical and plumbing fixtures installed as part of the project would be required to comply with current California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requirements for energy and water savings, and the new facilities would be required to sort recyclable materials in accordance with the provisions of California State Assembly Bill 341 and organic waste materials in accordance with the provisions of California Assembly Bill 1826. These assembly bills mandate all commercial businesses that generate four (4) cubic yards or more of waste per week (four cubic yards is the size of a standard commercial dumpster) to have recycling and organic waste separation programs in place on the premises. The MCC already subscribes to these solid waste diversion services in its current operations. As such, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact to utilities and service systems, and no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XX. Wildfires

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

a) through d): No Impact

The proposed project involves the construction of three new, separate structures on relatively level land that is already developed with buildings, a swimming pool and tennis courts, and is located along two public rights-of-way that are served by existing fire hydrants, completely paved, and fully accessible to emergency vehicles. The proposed changes to the on-site parking and circulation facilities have been designed to meet all applicable emergency vehicle access requirements of the Moraga-Orinda Fire District and, thus, would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. In addition, construction of the improvements would not require significant grading that could expose them or their occupants to significant risk of downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or changes to existing drainage patterns.

Furthermore, the project site is not located in a State Responsibility Area or on land designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The existing clubhouse facilities, including the swimming pool, golf course and tennis courts are all downhill from and located to the northeast and southeast of the nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones comprising the heavily-wooded hills bordering the MCC to the southwest and northwest. As such, these facilities are already at risk of being exposed to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. However, the new fitness club would be fully enclosed and the bar and grill and recreation pavilion would be capable of being sealed shut in the event of a wildfire upwind of the property, and all facilities would be equipped with heating, ventilation and air conditioning. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate the current risks of exposure to pollutant concentrations from nearby wildfires.

Finally, the proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of new infrastructure such as roads or power lines that could increase fire risk or pose new temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. As such, the project would not subject any people or structures to potential impacts from potentially hazardous conditions that result either during or after a wildfire, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) 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)?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) and c) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated; b): No Impact

The proposed project would result in the construction of three new buildings, all in already-developed areas within the MCC's clubhouse complex. The sport court modifications would also only involve areas that have already been developed as tennis courts and, thus, would not disturb any previously undeveloped areas. The proposed changes to the parking lots would result in some minor increases in the total amount of paved parking and circulation areas on the site, but all such changes would occur within existing parking lots or in unnaturally- and/or decoratively-landscaped areas of the golf course's driving range and chipping/putting practice areas.

A number of studies were conducted by various professional consultants, including a geotechnical investigation, air quality/greenhouse gas emissions analysis, and biological resource study, to ensure that the project could be developed safely and without having any significant impacts on the environment. These studies, as well as the additional analysis contained in this Initial Study Checklist, concluded that the only potentially significant impacts that could occur as a result of the project would be: (a) temporary impacts to air quality and nearby sensitive receptors from construction-related activities such as airborne dust and diesel exhaust fumes generated by heavy construction equipment; (b) temporary impacts from loud construction-related noise and vibration to nesting birds that could be using trees in an area of willow riparian habitat in the Moraga Creek corridor adjacent to the project site as native nursery sites; and (c) impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources that may exist on the project site that are encountered during construction of the proposed project. The mitigation measures identified below would reduce all of the identified potential environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels. As such, the Town's Planning Department finds that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and that a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared and recommended for adoption by the approval authority.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Basic Construction Best Management Practices**

The following Basic Construction Best Management Practices shall be noted on the grading and building permit plans and implemented to ensure that construction-related emissions, including fugitive dust, do not exceed applicable BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes [as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)]. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

2. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Survey**

If project site development commences any time between February 1st and July 31st, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. Buffers shall be established and maintained for any nest found during the preconstruction survey until the young have fledged. The size of the buffer(s) shall be determined by the survey biologist.

3. Mitigation Measure CULT-1: Discovery of Archaeological Resources

The project proponent shall include a note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is potential for exposing buried cultural resources. If prehistoric or historic-period cultural materials are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 200 feet of the find shall halt until a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative can assess the significance of the find. Prehistoric materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or tool making debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks and artifacts; stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered-stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American representative, will develop a treatment plan that could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery.

4. Mitigation Measure CULT-2: Discovery of Any Human Remains

In the event of the discovery of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Alameda County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Commission shall attempt to identify the deceased or descendants of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

If the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent fails to make a recommendation within 24 hours after notified, or the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and mediation by the Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, then the land owner shall re-inter, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

5. Mitigation Measure CULT-3: Discovery of Paleontological Resources

The project proponent shall include a note on any plans that require ground disturbing excavation that there is potential for exposing buried cultural resources. In the event of the discovery of Paleontological resources during construction or demolition, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site within a 200-foot radius of the location of such discovery until it can be evaluated by a qualified archeologist or paleontologist. Work shall not continue until the archeologist or paleontologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination as to the significance of the resource. If the resource is determined to be significant and mitigation is required, the first priority shall be avoidance and preservation of the resource. All feasible recommendations of the paleontologist shall

be implemented. Mitigation may include, but not limited to, in-field documentation and recovery of specimens, laboratory analysis, preparation of a report detailing the methods and findings of the investigation, and curation at an appropriate paleontological collection facility.

Section 3: References

Documents

Town of Moraga General Plan, 2002

Town of Moraga General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report, February 2001

Town of Moraga Municipal Code

Town of Moraga Design Guidelines

Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Rockridge Geotechnical, originally dated January 24, 2020 and revised August 30, 2020

Technical Memorandum re: Moraga Country Club Structure Setback Calculations prepared by BKF Engineers, dated May 26, 2020

Stormwater Control Plan for Moraga Country Club prepared by BKF Engineers, dated October 1, 2020

Moraga Country Club Hydrology Report prepared by BKF Engineers, dated October 1, 2020

CalEEMOD Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared by Yorke Engineering, LLC, dated August 5, 2020

Biological Resource Study prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated August 7, 2020

Native American Heritage Commission Tribal Consultation Letter dated October 5, 2020

Report Preparers

Prepared by: Steve Kowalski, Senior Planner

Reviewed by: Afshan Hamid, Planning Director

Attachments:

A. Proposed Plans