

Addendum

**Addendum to the
Final Supplemental Environmental
Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2030
Concord General Plan EIR for the
Concord Development Code Project**



City of Concord

January 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1.0	PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM.....	1
SECTION 2.0	SEIR AND SPECIFIC PLAN BACKGROUND.....	3
2.1	SEIR BACKGROUND	3
2.2	SUMMARY OF THE DOWNTOWN CONCORD SPECIFIC PLAN	4
SECTION 3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND IMPACTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SEIR	5
3.1	AIR QUALITY.....	6
3.2	GREENHOUSE GASES	12
3.4	PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES.....	17
3.5	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	28
SECTION 4.0	CONCLUSION	36
SECTION 5.0	CHECKLIST SOURCES	37
SECTION 6.0	REFERENCES.....	38
SECTION 7.0	AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS.....	39

TABLES

Table 3.1-3	Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards	6
Table 3.1-6	BAAQMD Thresholds of Significant Used in Air Quality Analyses	8
Table 3.2-1	California Greenhouse Gas Inventory 2001-2011 (Biannual).....	13
Table 3.4-1	Projected Water Supply (Normal Year)	18
Table 3.4-2	Projected Water Supply (Single-Year Drought).....	19
Table 3.4-3	Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 1)	20
Table 3.4-4	Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 2)	21
Table 3.4-5	Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 3)	22

APPENDICES

Appendix A Transportation Assessment

SECTION 1.0 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) recognizes that between the date an environmental document is completed and the date the project is fully implemented, one or more of the following changes may occur: 1) the project may change; 2) the environmental setting in which the project is located may change; 3) laws, regulations or policies may change in ways that impact the environment; and/or 4) previously unknown information can arise. Before proceeding with a project, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to evaluate these changes to determine whether or not they affect the conclusions in the environmental document.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 states that when an EIR has been certified or a Negative Declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the Lead Agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 states that the Lead Agency or responsible agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. The CEQA Guidelines also state that an addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

The purpose of this Addendum is to update the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2030 Concord General Plan Environmental Impact Report for the Concord*

Development Code Project certified in July 2012. Updates in this Addendum are based on recent changes to local, state, and federal regulations, changes to environmental data (i.e., federal and state air quality standards, state greenhouse gas inventory data, and county water supply data), and implementation of the City's *Downtown Concord Specific Plan* (Specific Plan). Updates to Section 3.1 *Air Quality*, Section 3.2 *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Section 3.4 *Public Services and Utilities*, and Section 3.5 *Transportation/Traffic* of the SEIR are included in this Addendum. Noise was the other environmental issue addressed in the SEIR (Section 3.3); no updates to this section are required. This Addendum does not require major revisions to the SEIR and impacts in this Addendum are consistent with those in the SEIR. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred; therefore, this Addendum to the certified SEIR is consistent with CEQA Guidelines. The Specific Plan will not result in more significant impacts; no changes to and no new mitigation measures are required.

The air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and public services and utilities sections were updated based on changes to agency regulations and new data. The Transportation/Traffic section was reviewed and updated as appropriate to confirm that no new impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the Specific Plan, as described in this Addendum.

Conditions within the Downtown Concord Priority Development Area (PDA) have not changed substantially since the SEIR was adopted and the Specific Plan proposes development essentially identical to that envisioned in the General Plan and SEIR. The Specific Plan is a refinement of the General Plan to provide more detail and mechanisms to further encourage pedestrian-friendly, business-oriented development in Downtown Concord.

SECTION 2.0 SEIR AND SPECIFIC PLAN BACKGROUND

2.1 SEIR BACKGROUND

In October 2007, the Concord City Council adopted the *Concord 2030 Urban Area General Plan* (General Plan), which provides a framework for the urban area and articulates a vision for the City over the next 20 years. The General Plan includes a number of key themes and initiatives, such as the integration of economic development into land use planning, greater support of mixed-use development and transit-supportive land uses around the Downtown Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station and transportation corridors, and an emphasis on preserving environmental resources and community assets.

In connection with the City's approval of the General Plan, the City certified the *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Concord 2030 Urban Area General Plan* (General Plan EIR) in 2007, which evaluates at a program level, the environmental consequences of the General Plan and alternatives to the project, and includes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the General Plan's significant environmental effects. Subsequent projects can then tier from the General Plan EIR.

In July 2012, the City of Concord certified the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2030 Concord General Plan EIR for the Concord Development Code Project*. The Concord Development Code Project includes four major components: 1) amendments to the Concord 2030 General Plan text and General Plan Land Use Map; 2) adoption of the new Development Code (Concord 2012 Development Code); and 3) a new zoning map. The SEIR describes the potential impacts relating to a number of environmental issues associated with adoption of the Concord 2012 Development Code and related General Plan Land Use Map changes, and methods by which these impacts could be mitigated or avoided.

Over the past year (2013), the City has prepared the *City of Concord Downtown Concord Specific Plan* (Specific Plan), utilizing a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Specific Plan was developed through a public planning process, based on goals and policies of the Concord 2030 General Plan. The proposed Specific Plan outlines policies focused on what is achievable to implement in Downtown Concord over the next 20 to 30 years and sets forth actions and policies to be implemented by the City of Concord focusing on revitalizing the Downtown Concord PDA, accommodating growth in a future population and employment base combined with transportation and urban design implementation strategies (refer to Section 2.2 *Summary of the Downtown Concord Specific Plan* of this Addendum for a more detailed description of the Specific Plan).

2.2 SUMMARY OF THE DOWNTOWN CONCORD SPECIFIC PLAN

In general, a Specific Plan is a program-level tool for the systematic implementation of an adopted General Plan. A Specific Plan describes broad policy concepts and provides direction as to various aspects of development including the type, location and intensity of uses, design, and capacity of infrastructure.

The *Downtown Concord Specific Plan* establishes the character of streetscapes, the character and intensity of commercial and residential development, the circulation pattern (vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle and transit), and parking strategies to support businesses and overall vitality, while enhancing access and connectivity. The Specific Plan includes standards and guidelines for public and private enhancements to the Downtown Concord PDA and it offers strategies for financing and implementing public improvements.

More specifically, the purpose of the Specific Plan is to: 1) address the need for a development framework and account for all modes of transportation for the Downtown Concord PDA, 2) ensure that the City of Concord's current planning and economic efforts are reflected, including the goals and desires of the Downtown Concord residents and businesses; 3) plan in a manner that meets projected population and job growth needs; and 4) achieve the jobs/housing balance objectives, increase housing in Downtown Concord, and meet state law requirements for Concord's allocation of regional housing needs.

The proposed Specific Plan land use designations are consistent with General Plan and the Concord Development Code designations. The proposed land uses in the Specific Plan were developed in accordance with the General Plan and the Concord Development Code. Specific Plan implementation would not significantly increase the intensity of land uses, beyond what is already planned for in the General Plan and Concord Development Code, and does not require any changes to land use designations. The Specific Plan recognizes that the allowable densities and floor area ratios (FARs) in the current code are sufficient to achieve the goals of the Specific Plan. The proposed FARs for development in the Specific Plan are within the City's existing density allowances.

The Specific Plan proposes to implement new transportation/circulation policies that would develop a network of pedestrian friendly streets that integrate walking, biking, transit use and green infrastructure while improving access to BART and connecting Downtown Concord to the rest of the region. Transportation/circulation policies, which are consistent with the General Plan and Concord Development Code, are outlined in Section 3.5 *Transportation/Traffic* of this Addendum. The Specific Plan includes transportation/circulation goals and policies consistent with the General Plan.

Adoption of the Specific Plan would only require minor revisions to the SEIR. Additionally, the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan and Concord 2012 Development Code goals and will assist in the implementation of these goals. Proposed revisions to the SEIR are included in Section 3.0 *Environmental Checklist and Impacts of Proposed Changes to the SEIR* of this Addendum.

SECTION 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND IMPACTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SEIR

This Addendum to the *SEIR to the 2030 Concord General Plan Environmental Impact Report for the Concord Development Code Project* evaluates the environmental impacts that could result from the minor changes in uses within the Downtown Concord PDA that were not addressed in the previously certified EIR. With the exception of the transportation/traffic and public services and utilities sections, all changes to the SEIR are due to changes in regulatory policies and law and resulting changes in data. Because the proposed project is not anticipated to result in new significant impacts and would not require major revisions to the previously prepared SEIR, an Addendum has been prepared for the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164), rather than a supplemental or subsequent EIR.

This section describes any changes that have occurred in existing environmental conditions on and near the project area, as well as the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan or the changed conditions. The environmental checklist, as recommended in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, was used to compare the environmental impacts of the “Proposed Project (Specific Plan)” with those of the “Approved Project (Concord Development Code Project)” and to identify whether the Proposed Project would likely result in new significant environmental impacts not previously evaluated in the EIR. The right-hand column in the checklist lists the source(s) for the answer to each question. The sources cited are identified in Section 5.0.

Mitigation measures are identified for all significant project impacts. “Mitigation Measures” are measures that will minimize, avoid, or eliminate a significant impact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15370). This analysis assumes all applicable mitigation measures identified in the previous program SEIR will be implemented by the project.

3.1 AIR QUALITY

Changes to air quality standards, laws and regulations have occurred since the adoption of the SEIR. This section also lists air quality standards that were established before the adoption of SEIR but were not included in the SEIR. Additionally, the section describes recent updates to BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.

3.1.1 Proposed Revisions to SEIR

Regulatory Framework

Federal and State Air Quality Standards

Federal and state ambient air quality standards are listed in Table 3.1-3 of the SEIR. Updates to the federal and state ambient air quality standards, including annual mean data, have been added to Table 3.1-3. The following Table 3.1-3 (listed below) includes updated data (shown in italics) and supersedes Table 3.1-3 in the SEIR:

Air Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	National Standard
Ozone	1-hour	0.090 pm	--
	8-hour	0.070 pm	0.075 ppm
Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)	24-hour	50 µg/m ³	150 µg/m ³
	Annual Mean	20 µg/m ³	--
Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})	24-hour	--	35 µg/m ³
	Annual Mean	12 µg/m ³	15 µg/m ³
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1-hour	20 ppm	35 ppm
	8-hour	9.0 ppm	9.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)	1-hour	0.18 ppm	0.100 ppm
	Annual Mean	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm
Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)	1-hour	0.25 ppm	0.075 ppm
	24-hour	0.040 ppm	<i>0.14 ppm¹</i>
	<i>Annual Mean²</i>	--	<i>0.030 ppm²</i>
Lead	30-day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	--
	Calendar Quarter	--	1.5 µg/m ³
	Rolling 3-Month Average	--	0.15 µg/m ³

Table 3.1-3 Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards <i>continued</i>			
Air Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	National Standard
Hydrogen Sulfide	1-hour	0.030 ppm	--
Sulfates	24-hour	25 µg/m ³	--
Vinyl Chloride	24-hour	0.010 ppm	--

Notes

¹ The National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for 24-hour SO₂ data is an addition to the SEIR.

² Annual mean standards for SO₂ is an addition to the SEIR.

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter
ppm = parts per million
-- = Standards not determined

Source: BAAQMD. *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status*. Available at: http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm. Accessed November 26, 2013.

Thresholds of Significance

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance are discussed in the SEIR in Section 3.1.6 *Thresholds of Significance, BAAQMD Thresholds*.

The following text is an update to the text in *Section 3.1.6 Thresholds of Significance* of the SEIR under *BAAQMD Thresholds*. This section provides an update to the California Building Industry Association lawsuit and provides a table of emissions thresholds based on *BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*:

As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), the determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment calls for careful judgment on the part of the Lead Agency and must be based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data. The City of Concord and other Lead Agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin often utilize the thresholds and methodology for assessing air emissions and/or health effects adopted by BAAQMD based upon the scientific and other factual data prepared by BAAQMD in developing those thresholds.

In December 2010, the California Building Industry Association (BIA) filed a lawsuit in Alameda County Superior Court challenging toxic air contaminants (TACs) and particulate matter with particle sizes that are 2.5 micrometers in diameter and smaller (PM_{2.5}) thresholds adopted by BAAQMD in its 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG10548693). One of the identified concerns was inhibiting infill and smart growth in the urbanized Bay Area. On March 5, 2012, the Superior Court found that the adoption of thresholds by the BAAQMD in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines is a CEQA project and BAAQMD is not to disseminate officially sanctioned air quality thresholds of significance until BAAQMD fully complies with CEQA.

At the time that the SEIR was adopted, it was unclear if the ruling would be appealed or if BAAQMD would proceed with preparing the appropriate CEQA documentation. The decision was appealed to the California Court of Appeal, First District (case A136212), where it was overturned.

Based on the Court of Appeal’s decision, the City has carefully considered the thresholds (established in June 2010 and updated in May 2011) previously prepared by BAAQMD and regards the thresholds listed below to be based on the best information available for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and conservative in terms of the assessment of health effects associated with TACs and PM_{2.5}. Evidence supporting these thresholds has been presented in the following documents:

- BAAQMD. *Thresholds Options and Justification Report*. 2009.
- BAAQMD. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. June 2010. Updated May 2011.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). *Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects*. 2009.
- California Environmental Protection Agency, California Air Resources Board (CARB). *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. 2005.

Based on the above information, the following table (Table 3.1-6) is an addition to the SEIR.

Table 3.1-6 BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance Used in Air Quality Analyses			
Pollutant	Construction	Operation-Related	
	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Maximum Annual Emissions (tons/year)
Reactive Organic Gases, Nitrogen Oxides	54	54	10
PM₁₀¹	82 (exhaust)	82	15
PM_{2.5}²	54 (exhaust)	54	10
Fugitive Dust (PM₁₀/PM_{2.5})	BMPs ³	None	None
Risk and Hazards for New Sources and Receptors (Project)	Same as Operational Threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased cancer risk of >10.0 in one million • Increased non-cancer risk of > 1.0 Hazard Index (chronic or acute) • Ambient PM_{2.5} increase: > 0.3 μ/m³ [Zone of influence: 1,000-foot radius from property line of source or receptor] 	
Risk and Hazards for New Sources and Receptors (Cumulative)	Same as Operational Threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased cancer risk of >100 in one million • Increased non-cancer risk of > 10.0 Hazard Index (chronic or acute) • Ambient PM_{2.5} increase: > 0.8 μ/m³ 	

Table 3.1-6 BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance Used in Air Quality Analyses			
Pollutant	Construction	Operation-Related	
	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)	Maximum Annual Emissions (tons/year)
		[Zone of influence: 1,000-foot radius from property line of source or receptor]	
Odors		Five confirmed complaints per year averaged over three years	
Notes ¹ Particulate Matter greater than 2.5 micrometers and less than 10 micrometers in diameter ² Particulate Matter greater than 2.5 micrometers or less in diameter ³ Best Management Practices ⁴ μ/m ³ = micrometer per cubic meter Sources: <i>BAAQMD Thresholds Options and Justification Report (2009)</i> and <i>BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines</i> (dated May 2011).			

3.1.2 Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as "Approved Project"	Less Impact Than "Approved Project"	Checklist Source(s)
Would the project:						
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-5
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,4,6
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,4,6

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as "Approved Project"	Less Impact Than "Approved Project"	Checklist Source(s)
Would the project:						
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,6

3.1.2.1 Air Quality Impacts

With the implementation of General Plan policies, BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (updated May 2011), and state and federal regulations, the Specific Plan adoption would not result in a significant air quality impact not previously identified. Projects implemented under the Specific Plan would comply with BAAQMD’s thresholds and would be consistent with General Plan goals and policies set forth to reduce air quality impacts. Pollutant emissions resulting from the Specific Plan’s land uses are assumed in the General Plan and would be consistent with state and/or federal ambient air quality standards.

3.1.3. Conclusion

The Specific Plan would be in accordance the BAAQMD 2010 Clean Air Plan. The Specific Plan would allow high density office/commercial zoning and housing developments, consistent with the General Plan and Concord Development Code near the Downtown Concord BART station and transit connections with the goal of reducing daily vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as approved SEIR])

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Projects implemented within the Plan Area would comply with BAAQMD standards and General Plan policies.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as approved SEIR])

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors. Projects within the Downtown Concord PDA would be consistent with the BAAQMD 2010 Clean Air Plan and General Plan policies.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as approved SEIR])

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Specific Plan would not create new sources of toxic air contaminants near or proposed sensitive receptors relative to the existing General Plan.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as approved SEIR])

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The Specific Plan would not create new sources of odors near existing or proposed sensitive receptors relative to the existing General Plan.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as approved SEIR])

3.2 GREENHOUSE GASES

Since the adoption of the SEIR to the 2030 General Plan EIR for the Concord Development Code Project, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has adopted *Plan Bay Area* and the City of Concord has adopted the *Citywide Climate Action Plan* (Citywide CAP)¹. New data has been added to the California Air Resources Board's Greenhouse Gas Inventory since the adoption of the SEIR.² The section below describes the aforementioned changes.

3.2.1 Proposed Revisions to SEIR

3.2.1.1 *Regulatory Framework*

SB 375 and Adopted Plan Bay Area

Section 3.2.4 - *Regulatory Framework, State, SB 375* of the SEIR describes the sustainable communities strategy (SCS) required by California Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) under Senate Bill 375. The MTC is the MPO for the San Francisco Bay Area (including Contra Costa County).

Consistent with the requirements of SB 375, the MTC has partnered with ABAG, BAAQMD, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) to prepare the region's SCS as part of the regional transportation plan (RTP) process.³ The SCS is referred to as *Plan Bay Area*.

The original projected date for the adoption of the Plan Bay Area was April 2013 (per Section 3.2.4 of the SEIR). MTC and ABAG, however, adopted *Plan Bay Area* in July 2013. The strategies in the plan are intended to promote compact, mixed-use development close to public transit, jobs, schools, shopping, parks, recreation, and other amenities, particularly within PDAs identified by local jurisdictions.

Adopted Climate Action Plan

Section 3.2.4 - *Regulatory Framework, Regional and Local* of the SEIR describes regional and local climate action plans/programs that have been adopted to reduce local, regional, and statewide GHG emissions. Since the certification of the SEIR, the City of Concord has adopted the Citywide CAP to identify policies that would help reduce GHG emissions and the state (California) reach its GHG emissions reduction goals.

¹ City of Concord. *City of Concord Citywide Climate Action Plan*. July 2013.

² California Air Resources Board. *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2011 – by Category as Defined in the 2008 Scoping Plan*. Last Updated August 2013. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>. Accessed November 22, 2013.

³ ABAG, BAAQMD, BCDC, and MTC. *One Bay Area Frequently Asked Questions*. Available at: http://onebayarea.org/about/faq.html#.UQceKR2_DAk. Accessed November 22, 2013.

City of Concord

The following section supplements the discussion of the Citywide CAP in Section 3.2-4 of the SEIR:

Concord Citywide Climate Action Plan

The Concord *Citywide Climate Action Plan* (Citywide CAP) was adopted in July 2013 in response to mandates from the State of California intended to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases statewide, because of their contribution to global climate change. The Citywide CAP identifies how the City will take action consistent with the state's goals while supporting the local economy and quality of life. The Citywide CAP is anticipated to bring the amended General Plan into compliance with regional and statewide greenhouse gas emission reduction goals, and incorporate regional reduction targets developed pursuant to SB 375.

3.2.1.2 Environmental Setting

Section 3.2.3 *Environmental Setting, Emissions Inventory and Trends* of the SEIR describes greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and trends by sector in California and the San Francisco Bay Area. Table 3.2-1 *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory 2000-2008* in the SEIR shows the biannual inventory for California's GHG emissions from 2000 to 2008 (i.e., 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008). Since more recent greenhouse gas inventory data is now available, the following Table 3.2-1 *California Gas Inventory 2001 – 2011* (which shows biannual data for 2001, 2003, etc.) supersedes the existing Table 3.2-1 in the SEIR. Greenhouse gas inventory data for the odd-numbered years (between 2001 and 2011) is included in Table 3.2-1 below.

Table 3.2-1 California Greenhouse Gas Inventory 2001 -2011 (Biannual)						
<i>Main Sector</i>	<i>Emissions MM CO₂^e per Year</i>					
	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011
Agriculture and Forestry	29.23	32.84	32.81	32.94	31.69	32.24
Commercial	14.43	14.05	14.34	15.13	15.53	15.62
Electricity Generation (Imports)	59.03	64.57	62.81	59.81	48.05	46.86
Electricity Generation (In-State)	62.98	48.05	45.05	54.12	55.52	39.71
Industrial	93.85	93.42	94.23	88.79	84.43	93.24
Recycling and Waste	6.26	6.32	6.47	6.57	6.81	7.00
Residential	28.72	28.41	28.18	28.69	28.65	29.85
Transportation	176.65	183.55	188.94	188.97	171.57	168.42
High Global Warming Potential (GWP) ²	7.12	7.87	9.25	10.50	12.45	15.17
Total	478.27	479.08	482.09	485.54	454.69	448.11
Notes						
¹ Million metric tons of CO ₂ equivalent						
² Includes Ozone depleting substance substitutes, electricity grid losses, and semiconductor manufacturing						
Source: California Air Resources Board. <i>California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2011 – by Category as Defined in the 2008 Scoping Plan</i> . Last Updated August 2013. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm . Accessed November 22, 2013.						

3.2.2 Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as "Approved Project"	Less Impact Than "Approved Project"	Checklist Source(s)
Would the project:						
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,4,6
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,4,7

3.2.2.1 Greenhouse Gas Impacts

Greenhouse Gas Generation Impacts

Impact Analysis

As a result of the adoption of the Citywide CAP (July 2013), the following paragraph will supersede the second paragraph of Section 3.2.7 *Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures Greenhouse Gas Generation, Impact Analysis* in the SEIR:

As previously stated, the City adopted a Citywide CAP (July 2013). The Citywide CAP includes greenhouse gas emissions data for the City of Concord. The following text supplements the fourth paragraph of Section 3.2.7 *Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures Greenhouse Gas Generation, Impact Analysis* in the SEIR:

Forecasted GHG emissions for the City of Concord in 2035 without mitigation is 1,503,498 MTCO₂e. Based on the adopted Citywide CAP, the citywide emissions target for 2035 is 959,474 MTCO₂e. With implementation of the Citywide CAP, the projected emissions for 2035 is 741,271 MTCO₂e.⁴ The Citywide CAP is consistent with the General Plan’s goals and policies that support reductions in GHG emissions, particularly in the Specific Plan area. Because land uses and densities assumed in the General Plan and Concord Development Code are consistent with the Specific Plan, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in significant GHG emissions impacts.

⁴City of Concord. *Citywide Climate Action Plan. Attachment A: Draft Forecast Calculations.* Adopted July 2013.

Mitigation Measures

The following text supplements Section 3.2.7 *Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures Greenhouse Gas Generation, Mitigation Measures* of the SEIR:

Greenhouse gas reduction goals and targets from the Citywide CAP are listed under mitigation measure (MM) GHG-1 in the SEIR. In the SEIR, the second measure of MM GHG-1 indicates that the citywide CAP shall establish a level below which the contribution to GHG emissions from activities covered by the General Plan would not be cumulatively considerable. The second measure of MM GHG-1 also indicates that the City's carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) plan-level emissions threshold (an emissions threshold for an adopted plan) could be the BAAQMD 2020 plan-level threshold, which is 6.6 metric tons CO₂e/person/year, or an emissions reduction level determined in consultation with BAAQMD and ABAG. While the BAAQMD 2020 plan-level threshold is 6.6 metric tons CO₂e (MTCO₂e)/person/year, it would be contrary to the purpose of the Citywide CAP to include a target that is higher than the current emissions of 5.0 MTCO₂e (based on 2005 baseline data provided in the Citywide CAP). Based on BAAQMD's guidance, the City used the baseline figure of 5.0 MTCO₂e as the Citywide CAP target for 2020, and established greater reductions for 2030 (4.0 MTCO₂e threshold) and 2035 (3.2 MTCO₂e threshold).

While Impact GHG-1 of the SEIR continues to be accurate, given that the Citywide CAP was adopted (July 2013) subsequent to the SEIR's certification, the MM GHG-1 has been revised as follows:

Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan and General Plan could generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Mitigation Measure: Implementation of the adopted Citywide CAP would reduce impacts from the implementation of the Specific Plan and General Plan to a less than significant level.

MM GHG-1: The City has incorporated the following components and performance measures into the citywide Climate Action Plan (adopted July 2013):

- The Citywide CAP quantifies greenhouse gas emissions, both existing and projected to the end date of the General Plan, resulting from activities within the city limits.
- The Citywide CAP establishes a level, based on substantial evidence, below which the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the General Plan would not be cumulatively considerable. This level is:
 - A citywide demonstration of the 5.0 MTCO₂e per service population metric, or
- The Citywide CAP identifies and analyzes greenhouse gas emissions resulting from specific actions or categories of actions anticipated to occur within the city limits.

- The Citywide CAP specifies measures, including performance standards, which demonstrate with substantial evidence that if implemented on a project-by project basis, the specified emissions level would be achieved.
- The Citywide CAP establishes a mechanism to monitor the plan's progress toward achieving the level described above (second bullet point of **MM GHG-1** of this Addendum) and requires an amendment if the Citywide CAP is not achieving the specified levels.

(Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation [Same as Approved Project])

Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Specific Plan, which is consistent with General Plan policies that serve to reduce GHG emissions would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])

3.2.3 Conclusion

With the implementation of **MM GHG-1**, Citywide CAP, and local goals and policies, greenhouse gas emissions that are generated as a result of implementation the Specific Plan, would not result in a significant GHG emissions impact.

(Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation [Same as Approved Project])

Implementation of the Specific Plan, consistent with the Citywide CAP, would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

3.4 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

This section is an update to Section 3.4.3 *Environmental Setting, Potable Water, Reliability* of the SEIR and the City's water supply data. As mentioned in the SEIR, the City's water supplier is Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), which provides water service to the City from the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.

This section is also an update to the California Energy Commission's Energy Efficiency Standards listed in Section 3.4.4 *Regulatory Framework, State, Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings* of the SEIR. The energy standards established in 2005 were listed in the SEIR; this section includes the standards established in 2008, the most recent standards available.

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

Tables 3.4.1 through 3.4.5, in Section 3.4.3 *Environmental Setting, Potable Water: Reliability* of the SEIR have been updated in accordance with CCWD's 2011 *Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP). The 2011 UWMP is an update to the 2005 UWMP. The tables below show the existing and planned sources of water supply for the City and their expected availability under various supply conditions in five year increments through 2035. The updated data is shown in italics in the Tables 3.4.1 through 3.4.5 below.

**Table 3.4-1
Projected Water Supply (Normal Year)**

Normal ¹ Year	CVP ² (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard ³ Slough (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions ⁴ (af/yr)	Groundwater ⁵ (af/yr)	East Contra Costa County Irrigation Purchases (af/yr)	LV Supply ⁶	Recycled Water ⁷ (af/yr)	Planned Purchases (af/yr)	Conservation Savings ⁸ (af/yr)	Total Planned Supply (af/yr)
<i>Near-Term</i>	<i>170,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>3,100</i>	<i>6,400</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>6,000</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>8,500</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>7,900</i>	<i>214,900</i>
2015	183,000	10,000	3,100	6,400	3,000	7,100	-	10,500	-	11,000	234,100
2020	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,400	3,000	8,200	-	12,500	-	16,200	250,900
2025	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,400	3,000	8,200	-	13,300	-	17,000	256,000
2030	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,400	3,000	8,200	-	14,100	-	19,200	259,000
2035	195,000	10,000	3,100	6,400	3,000	8,200	-	14,800	-	21,200	261,700

Notes:
af/yr = acre-feet per year

1. Basis of water year data is as follows: Normal (Average) represents a below normal or wetter year on the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 40-30-30 Water Supply Index. Single-Year drought represents 1977 conditions. Multiple-Year drought sequence represents 1987-1992 conditions.
2. The Central Valley Project (CVP) conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. Single Year Drought supply is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.
3. Mallard Slough average annual diversion over 15 year period (1995-2009).
4. Antioch Diversions is average annual diversion over 11 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999-2009).
5. Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, municipal customer owned wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.
6. Anticipated water supply reliability benefit resulting from expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir.
7. Recycled water does not include wildlife habitat enhancement and wetlands or plant use.
8. Anticipated conservation savings, including both active and passive conservation.

**Table 3.4-2
Projected Water Supply (Single-Year Drought)**

Single-Year Drought ¹	CVP ² (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard ³ Slough (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions ⁴ (af/yr)	Groundwater ⁵ (af/yr)	East Contra Costa County Irrigation Purchases (af/yr)	LV Supply ⁶ (af/yr)	Recycled Water ⁷ (af/yr)	Planned Purchases (af/yr)	Conservation Savings ⁸ (af/yr)	Total Planned Supply (af/yr)
<i>Near-Term</i>	127,500	0	0	0	3,000	10,000	10,000	8,500	-	7,900	166,900
2015	137,250	0	0	0	3,000	11,100	10,000	10,500	-	11,000	182,900
2020	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	12,500	-	16,200	197,500
2025	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	13,300	-	17,000	201,800
2030	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,100	3,100	19,200	207,900
2035	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,800	7,200	21,200	214,700

Notes:
af/yr = acre-feet per year

1. Basis of water year data is as follows: Normal (Average) represents a below normal or wetter year on the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 40-30-30 Water Supply Index. Single-Year drought represents 1977 conditions. Multiple-Year drought sequence represents 1987-1992 conditions.
2. The Central Valley Project (CVP) conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. Single Year Drought supply is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.
3. Mallard Slough average annual diversion over 15 year period (1995 - 2009).
4. Antioch Diversions is average annual diversion over 11 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999-2009).
5. Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, municipal customer owned wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.
6. Anticipated water supply reliability benefit resulting from expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir.
7. Recycled water does not include wildlife habitat enhancement and wetlands or plant use.
8. Anticipated conservation savings, including both active and passive conservation.

**Table 3.4-3
Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 1)**

Multi-Year Drought (Year 1) ¹	CVP ² (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard ³ Slough (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions ⁴ (af/yr)	Groundwater ⁵ (af/yr)	East Contra Costa County Irrigation Purchases (af/yr)	LV Supply ⁶ (af/yr)	Recycled Water ⁷ (af/yr)	Planned Purchases (af/yr)	Conservation Savings ⁸ (af/yr)	Total Planned Supply (af/yr)
<i>Near-Term</i>	<i>144,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>8,500</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>7,900</i>	<i>183,900</i>
2015	155,550	0	0	0	3,000	11,100	10,000	10,500	-	11,000	201,200
2020	165,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	12,500	-	16,200	216,700
2025	165,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	13,300	-	17,000	221,300
2030	165,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,100	3,100	19,200	227,400
2035	165,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,800	7,200	21,200	234,200

Notes:

af/yr = acre-feet per year

1. Basis of water year data is as follows: Normal (Average) represents a below normal or wetter year on the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 40-30-30 Water Supply Index. Single-Year drought represents 1977 conditions. Multiple-Year drought sequence represents 1987-1992 conditions.

2. The Central Valley Project (CVP) conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. Single Year Drought supply is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.

3. Mallard Slough average annual diversion over 15 year period (1995 - 2009).

4. Antioch Diversions is average annual diversion over 11 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999-2009).

5. Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, municipal customer owned wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.

6. Anticipated water supply reliability benefit resulting from expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir.

7. Recycled water does not include wildlife habitat enhancement and wetlands or plant use.

8. Anticipated conservation savings, including both active and passive conservation.

**Table 3.4-4
Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 2)**

Multi-Year Drought (Year 2) ¹	CVP ² (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard ³ Slough (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions ⁴ (af/yr)	Groundwater ⁵ (af/yr)	East Contra Costa County Irrigation Purchases (af/yr)	LV Supply ⁶ (af/yr)	Recycled Water ⁷ (af/yr)	Planned Purchases (af/yr)	Conservation Savings ⁸ (af/yr)	Total Planned Supply (af/yr)
<i>Near-Term</i>	<i>127,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>10,000</i>	<i>8,500</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>7,900</i>	<i>166,900</i>
2015	137,250	0	0	0	3,000	11,100	10,000	10,500	-	11,000	182,900
2020	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	12,500	-	16,200	197,500
2025	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	13,300	-	17,000	201,800
2030	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,100	3,100	19,200	207,900
2035	146,250	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,800	7,200	21,200	214,700

Notes:

af/yr = acre-feet per year

1. Basis of water year data is as follows: Normal (Average) represents a below normal or wetter year on the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 40-30-30 Water Supply Index. Single-Year drought represents 1977 conditions. Multiple-Year drought sequence represents 1987-1992 conditions.

2. The Central Valley Project (CVP) conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. Single Year Drought supply is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.

3. Mallard Slough average annual diversion over 15 year period (1995 - 2009).

4. Antioch Diversions is average annual diversion over 11 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999-2009).

5. Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, municipal customer owned wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.

6. Anticipated water supply reliability benefit resulting from expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir.

7. Recycled water does not include wildlife habitat enhancement and wetlands or plant use.

8. Anticipated conservation savings, including both active and passive conservation.

**Table 3.4-5
Projected Water Supply (Multi-Year Drought – Year 3)**

Multi-Year Drought (Year 3) ¹	CVP ² (af/yr)	Industrial Diversions (af/yr)	Mallard ³ Slough (af/yr)	Antioch Diversions ⁴ (af/yr)	Groundwater ⁵ (af/yr)	East Contra Costa County Irrigation Purchases (af/yr)	LV Supply ⁶ (af/yr)	Recycled Water ⁷ (af/yr)	Planned Purchases (af/yr)	Conservation Savings ⁸ (af/yr)	Total Planned Supply (af/yr)
<i>Near-Term</i>	110,500	0	0	0	3,000	10,000	10,000	8,500	-	7,900	149,900
2015	118,950	0	0	0	3,000	11,100	10,000	10,500	-	11,000	164,600
2020	126,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	12,500	-	16,200	178,400
2025	126,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	13,300	-	17,000	182,300
2030	126,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,100	3,100	19,200	188,400
2035	126,750	0	0	0	3,000	12,200	10,000	14,800	7,200	21,200	195,200

Notes:
af/yr = acre-feet per year

1. Basis of water year data is as follows: Normal (Average) represents a below normal or wetter year on the Sacramento River Hydrologic Region 40-30-30 Water Supply Index. Single-Year drought represents 1977 conditions. Multiple-Year drought sequence represents 1987-1992 conditions.
2. The Central Valley Project (CVP) conditions used for supply planning are defined as follows: Normal is Adjusted Historical Use. Single Year Drought supply is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-year drought (year 1) supply is 85 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 2) is 75 percent of Historical Use. Multi-Year Drought (year 3) is 65 percent of Historical Use.
3. Mallard Slough average annual diversion over 15 year period (1995 - 2009).
4. Antioch Diversions is average annual diversion over 11 year period since pumping plant improvements (1999-2009).
5. Groundwater represents production from Mallard Wells, municipal customer owned wells, and miscellaneous other wells in the District's service area.
6. Anticipated water supply reliability benefit resulting from expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir.
7. Recycled water does not include wildlife habitat enhancement and wetlands or plant use.
8. Anticipated conservation savings, including both active and passive conservation.

Based on updates to the UWMP, the following paragraph supersedes the paragraph following Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-5 in Section 3.4.3 of the SEIR:

CCWD's 2011 UWMP included an evaluation of water demand, conservation, and existing and potential sources of supplies including continued use of Central Valley Project (see Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-5 above) water, groundwater, recycled water desalination, and water transfers. The supply and demand forecasts indicated that near-term demands can be met under all supply conditions, except in the latter years of a multi-year drought where short-term water purchases or voluntary short-term conservation of up to *nine (9) percent* (versus seven percent indicated in the SEIR) would be considered to meet demands. Future water demands will be achieved through implementation of the CCWD's Future Water Supply Study,⁵ which identifies alternative ways of meeting future water demand for the next 50 years.

3.4.2 Regulatory Framework

The following paragraph supersedes the paragraph under Section 3.4.4 *Regulatory Framework, State, Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings*. The standards are changed to reflect the current California Energy Commission Building Energy Efficiency Standards (established in 2008). Updated data is shown in italics.

Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations establishes California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. The standards were updated in 2008 and set a goal of reducing growth in electricity use by *561* gigawatt-hours per year (GWh/y) and growth in natural gas use by *19.0* million therms per year (therms/y). The savings attributable to new nonresidential buildings are *459* GWh/y of electricity savings and *11.5* million therms. For non-residential buildings, the standards establish minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs.

⁵ Contra Costa Water District. *Future Water Supply Study*. August 1996 (updated 2002).

3.4.3 Environmental Checklist and Discussion Impacts

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as "Approved Project"	Less Impact than "Approved Project"	Checklist Source(s)
Would the project:						
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-4,8
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-4,8
3. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-4
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-4,9
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-4,8
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-3
7. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-3

3.4.3.1 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the Specific Plan, which is consistent with General Plan policies adopted for the purpose of reducing or avoiding impacts associated with public services and utilities, the CCWD's UWMP and Future Water Supply Study, California's energy efficiency standards, and local, state and federal regulations, would not result in a significant impact on public services or utilities. The following discussion supplements Section 3.4.7 of the SEIR. Impacts of public services and utilities in this Addendum are consistent with those of the SEIR.

Impacts on Water and Wastewater

Future development in the Concord Downtown PDA would increase the demand for water supply. CCWD's Future Water Supply Study Update (2002) and 2010 UWMP indicate that the City is on target with meeting the future demands of its service areas, while accounting for future growth throughout the area. Development in the Concord Downtown PDA is not anticipated to require any significant upgrades to water supply infrastructure.

Densification of the Downtown Concord PDA and changes in land use will likely increase sewage generation. The current Downtown Concord Sewer and Streetscape Improvements Phase II project (includes replacement of sewer mains and laterals), however, takes into consideration this increased density as projected by the General Plan. Although local lines may need to be upsized or extended to serve redeveloped parcels, no significant infrastructure deficiency mitigation is anticipated in order to serve the Downtown Concord PDA.

As stated in the SEIR, water demand with implementation of the General Plan, would not change substantially. Furthermore, the City's future water conservation measures may reduce future water demand. For these reasons, the proposed Specific Plan would not require water supply in excess of the demand assumed in the General Plan.

Impacts on Stormwater Drainage

The Downtown Concord PDA includes primarily developed parcels. Redevelopment of existing parcels would likely decrease stormwater runoff with the anticipated reduction in impervious area, additional greening, and compliance with regional and state stormwater requirements for water quality and quantity reductions. New development that increases stormwater runoff may be subject to Hydrograph Modification requirements to mitigate the additional flow if the increased runoff negatively impacts receiving stormwater facilities.

Local storm drainage infrastructure that collect and convey runoff to the major storm drain systems would likely be reconfigured to allow for redevelopment. New development may require that storm drainage infrastructure be extended to serve parcels if existing improvements are not currently available. Design would be in accordance with City of Concord design standards and specifications and would be coordinated with the City. No significant infrastructure impacts are anticipated in order to serve the Downtown Concord PDA.

State stormwater requirements require that new developments or re-developed areas more than 10,000 square feet (s.f.) maintain post-construction stormwater flows from the site at pre-construction levels; since the implementation of projects under the Specific Plan would comply with this requirement, no significant changes in stormwater flows are anticipated for the Downtown Concord PDA. Private and public projects would mitigate increased stormflows in effort to ensure that flows generated by the development are not increased. New developments would meet regional requirements for stormwater quality prior to being approved. Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as detention basins, bio-filtration basins, flow-through planters, and green roofs would also be implemented to mitigate stormwater runoff.

Solid Waste

Based on the Concord General Plan EIR, the City's solid waste capacity is sufficient to meet the needs of projected growth until 2030. With the implementation of General Plan policies established to reduce waste, solid waste impacts associated with the Specific Plan's new developments would not be significant. Projected population growth under the proposed General Plan is not anticipated to generate significant additional solid waste demand. Furthermore, the Concord Development Code includes development standards relating to solid waste, recycling, and green waste materials storage. Impacts of solid waste, associated with the Specific Plan's implementation, on solid waste landfills would be less than significant. New developments would be required to comply with General Plan policies, federal, state, and local solid waste regulations.

3.4.4 Conclusion

Development under the Specific Plan would cause sewage treatment plant servicing area to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wastewater flows associated with development assumed in the General Plan in the Downtown Concord PDA is accounted for in the City's projected wastewater flows.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of that could cause significant environmental effects. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

New development from the implementation of the Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of that could cause significant environmental effects.

(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])

With implementation of the City's UWMP and water conservation efforts, new development resulting from the implementation of the Specific Plan would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded entitlements. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Projects under the Specific Plan would not result in an increase of capacity of the City's wastewater treatment system. The Central Contra Costa Sanitary District is anticipated to have the capacity to

serve developments under the General Plan and Specific Plan in addition to its existing commitments. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

New developments resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects' solid waste disposal needs. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Projects under the Specific Plan would comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

3.5 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The Specific Plan proposes development that would allow for all modes of travel, with an emphasis on pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. Focusing new development in and around the BART station and Downtown core with a diversity of uses in proximity to BART, reduces the reliance on private motor vehicles, which helps minimize traffic congestion and the amount of land designated for parking.

The transportation and circulation goals and policies in the Specific Plan are consistent with the General Plan and Concord Development Code. The Specific Plan outlines transportation and circulation goals, policies and objectives planned for implementation and/or development in the Downtown Concord PDA. Transportation and circulation goals and objectives proposed for implementation of the Specific Plan's Downtown Concord PDA are to develop the following:

- A vehicular circulation system that accommodates both local traffic and through traffic with built-in flexibility to allow other modes of travel to take priority on specific streets as defined by this Specific Plan.
- An integrated pedestrian network of expansive sidewalks within the Downtown Concord PDA, with an emphasis on streets within the pedestrian priority zone.
- A bicycle network that builds upon existing plans and integrates more fully with the downtown and proposed public space improvements in the area.
- An integrated circulation plan that supports transit use.
- A public parking strategy and management plan that efficiently accommodates downtown visitors and supports downtown businesses.
- Flexible parking standards for private development based on current industry standards.

The following discussion is based on the *Transportation Assessment* (refer to Appendix A of this Initial Study) prepared by Fehr and Peers in January 2014 to confirm that implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in traffic impacts not previously identified in the SEIR.

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

The following section supplements *Section 3.5.3 Environmental Setting, Study Area, Traffic Operations and Analysis* of the SEIR. The section describes the City of Concord's benchmarks for Levels of Service (LOS) for signalized intersections and roadway segments, specifically for the Central Business District (CBD) in the City of Concord.

The Concord 2030 General Plan established a performance threshold for vehicle operations of LOS E for signalized intersections and roadway segments in the CBD. The CBD is generally defined as the area from Downtown Concord to I-680 including the area from Concord Avenue to Clayton Road. The Downtown Concord PDA is within the CBD. The LOS E benchmark is also applicable to the Downtown Concord BART Station vicinity and the City's transit routes, which are generally defined as roads with two or more bus transit lines.

The *Transportation Assessment* evaluated existing conditions and future conditions (implementation of the Specific Plan) of intersection and roadway segment levels of service. LOS based on the

implementation of the Specific Plan were compared to LOS based on the implementation of the General Plan and Concord Development Code to evaluate traffic impacts.

3.5.2 Regional Framework

3.5.2.1 *Applicable Plans and Policies*

Section 3.5.4 Regulatory Framework, Local, 2030 Concord General Plan of the SEIR outlines applicable General Plan policies related to traffic and circulation in the City of Concord. Traffic and circulation Specific Plan goals and policies are consistent with the General Plan. The following paragraphs outline Specific Plan goals and policies for Circulation, Vehicle Circulation, Pedestrian Circulation, Bicycle Circulation, Transit, Accessibility and Parking Strategy

Circulation

GOAL C-1: A system of complete streets that recognizes the modal priorities of each facility.

Policy C-1.1 (General Plan Policy T-1.1.5): Maintain transportation levels of service benchmarks which consider not only vehicle travel time and intersection delay, but also broader goals relating to environmental quality and community character. Lower levels of service may be acceptable in Downtown Concord, within one half mile of the City's two BART stations, along designated transit routes, and in other locations as deemed appropriate by the City Council.

Policy C-1.2: Adopt a street designation overlay for the Specific Plan Area.

Vehicle Circulation

GOAL C-2: Efficient but managed vehicle access in the Specific Plan Area.

Policy C-2.1: Continue to evaluate the effects of land use development on the overall circulation system through the preparation of focused transportation impact studies. Guidelines should be developed that identify the analysis procedures for evaluating all modes of travel.

Policy C-2.2: Eliminate the level of service benchmark for vehicles within the pedestrian priority zone.

Policy C-2.3: Update the City's Transportation Impact Fee to include non-motorized projects within the Specific Plan Area. These improvements would shift existing and future trips to non-auto modes, thereby freeing up capacity for new vehicle trips within the plan area.

Policy C-2.4: Evaluate potential improvements on Galindo Street between Salvio Street and Laguna Street to improve vehicle flow within the existing cross-section and facilitate pedestrian, bicycle and transit access.

Pedestrian Circulation

GOAL C-3: Quality pedestrian facilities and amenities that create a safe and aesthetically pleasing environment that encourages walking and accommodates increased pedestrian activity.

Policy C-3.1: To the extent feasible, eliminate existing and minimize future driveways and curbcuts within the pedestrian priority zone, specifically along Grant Street and Willow Pass Road. Sidewalks across driveways should be set back from the driveway so that they remain level.

Policy C-3.2: Widen sidewalks within the pedestrian priority zone and provide landscape buffers on connector and transit streets.

Policy C-3.3: Reduce street crossing widths and increase pedestrian visibility by installing curb extensions and crosswalk markings at intersections on key pedestrian streets where feasible.

Policy C-3.4: Provide pedestrian scale wayfinding throughout the Specific Plan Area.

Policy C-3.5: Provide pedestrian-scale street lighting along all streets in the Specific Plan Area, especially streets with commercial frontage.

Policy C-3.6: When traffic signals are upgraded, provide pedestrian countdown timers and audible devices.

Bicycle Circulation

GOAL C-4: A bicycle network with safe and efficient connections to major destinations within the Specific Plan Area and throughout the City of Concord and adjacent communities where feasible.

Policy C-4.1: Develop the bicycle network as depicted in the Specific Plan and further refined as part of the Bicycle Master Plan process.

Policy C-4.2: Enhance bicycle facilities at key intersections with high bicycle and automobile traffic. Potential changes may include facilities such as bicycle detection and extension of green times and bicycle boxes.

Policy C-4.3: Increase bicycle parking supply in the public realm.

Policy C-4.4: Explore the feasibility of providing a bike share program within the Specific Plan Area.

Transit

Policy C-5.1: Collaborate with Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) to improve bus service in the plan area and support Specific Plan objectives by incorporating the following recommendations into its Transit Performance Initiative.

Policy C-5.2: Evaluate and implement a free local circulator shuttle through the creation of a business improvement district.

Policy C-5.3: Coordinate enhancements for all modes of travel in the Plan Area with BART to provide seamless connections to and from the BART Station and the rest of the Specific Plan area.

Accessibility

The goals and policies identified within pedestrian, bicycle and transit sections would improve mobility within the study area for all users, including those with physical disabilities. Design of transportation and pedestrian infrastructure within the public right-of-way will meet requirements as set forth by the Americans with Disability Act (ADA).

Parking Strategy

GOAL C-7: A parking supply that supports Downtown businesses and stimulates economic growth, while not promoting excessive driving.

Policy C-7.1: To the extent feasible, encourage private entities to allow public parking after typical business hours for shared parking use within each development and between different developments.

Policy C-7.2: Develop a parking management plan that includes a wayfinding component to encourage a “park once” strategy and a special event parking management strategy.

Policy C-7.3: Adjust parking requirements for developments within the Specific Plan Area.

Policy C-7.4: Evaluate the potential to provide more flexible parking standards to provide flexibility to developers as minimum parking requirements can reduce the feasibility of in-fill developments on small lots, including a requirement to unbundle parking from the purchase price of residential units.

Policy C-7-5: Encourage car sharing to occur throughout the plan area through partnership with zipcar or other car sharing entity.

3.5.3 Environmental Checklist and Discussion of Impacts

	New Potentially Significant Impact	New Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	New Less Than Significant Impact	Same Impact as "Approved Project"	Less Impact Than "Approved Project"	Checklist Source(s)
Would the project:						
1. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,4,10
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,4,10
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,3,4
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,2,4,10

3.5.3.1 *Transportation/Traffic Impacts*

The following assessment of traffic impacts compares the results of the SEIR to those of the *Transportation Assessment* prepared for the Specific Plan. The *Transportation Assessment* utilized updated traffic information, including traffic counts reflective of 2013 conditions, the most current regional modeling tools, and intersection LOS analysis tools that take into account pedestrian and bicycle activity, as well as intersection signal timings. Overall, the updated *Transportation Assessment* has similar conclusions as the General Plan transportation analysis since the Specific Plan would generate essentially the same amount of development (consistent with the Concord Development Code) in the Downtown Concord PDA that is projected in the General Plan.

Impacts Applicable Plans, Policies, or Ordinances

Trip Generation

Implementation of the Specific Plan and the General Plan would increase vehicle traffic that leaves the Downtown Concord PDA by approximately 9,560 trips on a daily basis, including 1,100 morning and 1,370 evening peak hour trips. Adoption of Specific Plan transportation policies that encourage vehicle trip reduction may reduce anticipated vehicle trips assumed in the General Plan. A local circulator shuttle connecting the BART station to various destinations within the Downtown Concord PDA, including transit stop enhancements, would also be further evaluated for its feasibility to encourage greater transit usage throughout the Downtown Concord PDA. Changes in trip generation were taken into account for the preparation of the *Transportation Assessment*.

Freeway Impacts

As described in the SEIR, the General Plan would contribute to impaired freeway operations, which would remain at a substandard level of services (i.e., F). No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce freeway impacts to a less than significant level. Increasing freeway capacity by adding lanes is currently under review by CCTA (Contra Costa County's Congestion Management Agency) and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Because the Specific Plan allows essentially the same amount of development within the Downtown Concord PDA as the General Plan, no new significant impacts on freeway traffic would result from the implementation of the Specific Plan.

Roadway Impacts

The SEIR and the *Transportation Assessment* prepared for the Specific Plan analyzed roadway segments within the Downtown area. The *Transportation Assessment* was completed with more up to date information; therefore, it has been confirmed that major roadways within the Downtown area would operate within the levels of service identified in the SEIR with Specific Plan implementation.

As stated in the SEIR, several roadway segments could improve with implementation of improvements included in the General Plan. For these reasons, and because additional development is not proposed, roadways within the Downtown Concord PDA would operate at similar unacceptable levels and significant unavoidable impacts identified in the SEIR would still occur.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Based on the *Transportation Assessment*, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are expected to increase as the City continues to grow. The level of VMT growth, however, is within the range predicted within the SEIR and the Citywide CAP. Therefore, no new significant impacts would result from the increase of VMT resulting from Specific Plan implementation.

Intersection Levels of Service

Similar to roadway segments, the *Transportation Assessment* was completed to determine if impacts associated with the development envisioned in the Specific Plan would be greater than impacts of General Plan and Concord Development Code Project development. Two intersections were evaluated in the *Transportation Assessment* that were also evaluated in the SEIR (based on development assumed in the General Plan and Concord Development Project). More up to date information was used in the *Transportation Assessment* for the existing and future levels of service at the intersections. For these intersections, impacts associated with Specific Plan implementation would be consistent with the City's LOS E benchmark.

Other intersection LOS impacts were identified in the SEIR that are assumed to continue to be significant and unavoidable. As stated in the SEIR, widening impacted intersections would require acquisition of property and the displacement of businesses and/or residents. Two mitigation measures were identified to reduce potential impacts; however, impacts would not be reduced to a less than significant level. This conclusion is consistent with the conclusions of the SEIR.

Transit System

Transit services in Downtown Concord include BART trains and County Connection buses. Implementation of the Specific Plan has the potential to further increase transit system ridership in the Downtown Concord PDA; however, the increase in ridership is already assumed in the General Plan. The Specific Plan, therefore, would not result in a new significant impact on the City's transit system.

3.5.4 Conclusion

The General Plan and Specific Plan propose several goals intended to encourage an efficient land use pattern, manage future traffic congestion, and reduce commute trips and length. Consistent with the SEIR analysis, however, implementation of the Specific Plan would contribute to freeway congestion and would conflict with the City's LOS benchmarks establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, specifically roadways and intersections. Impacts on roadways and intersections are considered significant and unavoidable since planned mitigation measures for physical improvements do not currently exist that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. **(Significant and Unavoidable Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with the standards established by the CCTA, including level of service standards, travel demand measures or other standards established by the CCTA. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. **(No Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

The Specific Plan's implementation would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses. Projects implemented under the Specific Plan would comply with the City's project design standards and Development Code (that address traffic hazards). **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. Projects under the Specific Plan would comply with the City's zoning requirements and project design standards intended to address emergency access. The City of Concord Police Department and Contra Costa County Fire Protection District would review individual development proposals to ensure that access needs are met. **(Less Than Significant Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

Implementation of the Specific Plan would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. **(No Impact [Same as Approved Project])**

SECTION 4.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis and discussion, no substantive revisions to the SEIR are needed because no new significant impacts or impacts of substantially greater severity would result from the approved Specific Plan. There have been no changes in circumstances in the Downtown Concord Priority Development Area that would result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe impacts and no new information has come to light that would indicate the potential for new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts than were discussed in the SEIR. For these reasons, no further evaluation is required, and no Subsequent EIR is needed pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, and an SEIR Addendum has therefore appropriately been prepared, pursuant to Section 15164.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164(c), this Addendum will be included in the public record file for the *Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to the 2030 Concord General Plan EIR for the Concord Development Code Project*.

The *draft Downtown Concord Specific Plan* is available for public review at the City of Concord Permit Center, located at 1950 Parkside Drive, Building D, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding holidays. The document may also be accessed on the City's website during the public comment period at <http://www.cityofconcord.org/downtownplan/> under "Project Documents". While circulation of the *Addendum to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2030 Concord General Plan EIR for the Concord Development Code Project* (Addendum) is not required, in the interest of transparency, *the Addendum, the SEIR, and the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Concord 2030 Urban Area General Plan (General Plan EIR)*, are available for public inspection as of January 28, 2014 at the City of Concord Permit Center, located at 1950 Parkside Drive, Building D, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding holidays. The document may also be accessed on the City's website during the public comment period at <http://www.cityofconcord.org/citygov/dept/planning/eir.htm>.

By:

Victoria Walker, Director
Community and Economic Development Department
City of Concord

Signature

Date

SECTION 5.0 CHECKLIST SOURCES

1. CEQA Guidelines - Environmental Thresholds (Professional judgment and expertise and review of project plans).
2. City of Concord. *The Concord 2030 Urban Area General Plan. Amendments Volume I.* July 2012.
3. City of Concord. *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to the 2030 Concord General Plan EIR Concord Development Code Project City of Concord, Contra Costa County, California.* June 2012.
4. City of Concord. *Downtown Concord Specific Plan.* September 2013.
5. BAAQMD. 2010. Clean Air Plan. Adopted September 2010.
6. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.* June 2010. Updated May 2011.
7. City of Concord. *Citywide Climate Action Plan.* Adopted July 2013.
8. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region. *Central Contra Costa Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Plant and its Associated Wastewater Collection System. Order Number (No.) R2-2012-0016, NPDES No. CA0037648.* Adopted in February 2012.
9. Contra Costa Water District. *Urban Water Management Plan.* June 2011.
10. Fehr and Peers. *Downtown Concord Specific Plan - Transportation Assessment.* December 2013.

SECTION 6.0 REFERENCES

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status*. Available at: <http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm>. Accessed November 26, 2013.

--. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. Updated May 2011.

Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region. *Central Valley Project (CVP) Water Contractors*. Revised August 2013.

City of Concord. *Citywide Climate Action Plan*. Adopted July 2013.

--. 2012. *City of Concord 2012 Development Code*. Adopted July 2012 (Effective August 2012).

--. 2013. *Downtown Concord Draft Specific Plan*. September 2013.

--. 2007. *Final Environmental Impact Report: Concord 2030 Urban Area General Plan*. April.

--. 2012. *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to the 2030 Concord General Plan EIR Concord Development Code Project City of Concord, Contra Costa County, California*. State Clearinghouse No. 2006062093. June 2012.

California Energy Commission. *2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Nonresidential Compliance Manual. 2Q-2010*. Revised July 2010.

California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board. *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2011 - by Category as Defined in the 2008 Scoping Plan*. Updated August 2013.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region. *Central Contra Costa Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Plant and its Associated Wastewater Collection System*. Order Number (No.) R2-2012-0016, NPDES No. CA0037648. Adopted by Regional Water Quality Control Board in February 2012.

Contra Costa Water District. *Future Water Supply Study*. August 1996.

--. 2011. *Urban Water Management Plan*. June 2011.

Fehr and Peers. *Downtown Concord Specific Plan - Transportation Assessment*. January 2014.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments. *Plan Bay Area*. Adopted July 2013.

SECTION 7.0 AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS

Lead Agency

City of Concord

Community and Economic Development Department

Planning Division

Carol Johnson, Planning Manager

Joan Ryan, Senior Planner/Project Manager

Consultants

Perkins + Will

Urban Design and Planners

Prakash Pinto, Urban Design Principal

Dennis Dornan, Senior Project Manager

Laura Shifley, Urban Designer

David J. Powers & Associates, Inc.

Environmental Consultants and Planners

Jodi Starbird, Principal Project Manager

Amber Sharpe, Assistant Project Manager

Fehr & Peers

Transportation Consultants

Kathrin Tellez, AICP, PTP, Senior Associate